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At its Special meeting held on May 4, 2022, the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee adopted the recommendations of the attached report, which is hereby transmitted for Council consideration, subject to the concurrence of the Mayor. Adoption of the report would authorize: 1) current-year budget adjustments that include the award of 2021-22 program maintenance ( $\$ 8.24$ million), inflation funds ( $\$ 5.68$ million) and additional specified "GAP" funds ( $\$ 8.0$ million); 2) the proposed 2022-23 expenditure plan and funding earmarks for fiscal years 2023-24 through the program's conclusion in 2026-27; and, 3) various implementing authorities, as detailed in the attached report.

The Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program was established through a 1996 Ballot Measure that authorizes the City to collect up to $\$ 25$ million annually over a 30 -year period. To avoid permanent funding reductions, the City is required to satisfy various administrative requirements by June $30^{\text {th }}$, which includes: holding a public hearing for the proposed assessment, adoption of a City Resolution/Ordinance to indicate the intention to levy and confirm the assessment for the upcoming year, along with adoption of the City Engineer's Report.

The City will receive total reimbursements of $\$ 12.97$ million in Proposition K funds over a two-year period for the current-year ( $\$ 7.96$ million) and upcoming year ( $\$ 5.01$ million). As City projects funded through the program are completed, there is an anticipated General Fund impact for additional operating and maintenance (O\&M) costs that will be addressed through the future City budgets. At this time, the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) estimates an O\&M impact of $\$ 9.62$ million once active projects are completed, which will be partially offset by annual awards of Proposition K maintenance funds. In the current year, RAP will receive total maintenance awards of $\$ 7.01$ million.
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## CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: $\quad$ May 4, 2022

To: Honorable Members of the City Council

From: L.A. for Kids Steering Committee
Matthew Szabo, City Administrative Officer
Sharon Tso, Chief Legislative Analyst
Michael Affeldt, Office of the Mayor

## Subject: 2022-23 PROPOSITION K ASSESSMENT REPORT

## SUMMARY

The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee presents for Council and Mayor consideration the 2022-23 Proposition K Assessment Report that includes the recommended 2022-23 expenditure plan and funding earmarks for 2023-24 through 2026-27. Recommendations for current year budget are provided along with recommended awards of program maintenance, inflation, and additional specified ("GAP") funds.

The Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program was established through a Ballot Measure approved by City voters on November 5, 1996, which authorized the City to collect up to $\$ 25$ million annually in local assessments over a 30-year period. Prior to June $30^{\text {th }}$ of each year, the City is required to adopt an expenditure plan for the upcoming fiscal year. On October 20, 2021, Council took the first action for levying the 2022-23 assessment by adopting the Resolution to Initiate Proceedings (C.F. 21-1145). This report recommends that Council proceed with actions one through three and initiate actions four through six, as follows:

1. Approve the 2022-23 expenditure plan adjustments to the 2021-22 adopted budget along with the recommended reprogramming of prior-year funding for administrative costs;
2. Adopt the City Engineer's report describing the proposed improvements for 2022-23;
3. Adopt a Resolution and Ordinance of Intention to levy the assessment;
4. Hold a public hearing on the proposed assessment;
5. Acknowledge the status of environmental documents for the projects being considered for inclusion in the assessment; and,
6. Adopt an Ordinance confirming the assessment for the 2022-23 fiscal year.

## 2022-23 Expenditure Plan

The proposed 2022-23 expenditure plan presented in Section 4 of the report findings, totals $\$ 25$ million, with a breakdown as detailed in the chart below:

| 2022-23 Proposition K Expenditure Plan (in millions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capital <br> Projects | Administration | Maintenance | Inflation | Additional Specified <br> ("GAP") Funding | Total <br> Budget |  |
| $\$ 12.02$ | $\$ 0.72$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 3.14$ | $\$ 4.12$ | $\$ 25.0$ |  |

The proposed 2022-23 program expenditure plan is reflected as part of the Proposition K Five Year Plan (Attachment 1) and the "A List" of projects (Attachment 2) recommended for funding in 2022-23. Projects earmarked for funding in Fiscal Years 2023-24 through 2026-27 form the "B List" of projects (Attachment 3) and serve as alternates that may be substituted for A List projects that cannot be implemented during the course of 2022-23. The "C List" (Attachment 4) includes projects that did not receive the full eligible funding amount requested in Tenth Cycle Proposition K competitive funds, but qualify to receive eligible funding if projects that received competitive funds are later withdrawn or become infeasible.

## 2021-22 Budget Modifications

Several actions needed prior to the close of this fiscal year to fully obligate the $\$ 25$ million in 2021-22 program funds are presented in Section 5 of the report findings. These recommendations include:

- Reprogramming of current Year 25 project allocations (Attachment 13).
- Authorizing $\$ 8.24$ million in maintenance awards for projects qualifying through a competitive application process administered each year (Attachment 9).
- Awarding a combined $\$ 13.68$ million in current year funding to address acquisition and construction shortfalls for eligible projects, which includes $\$ 5.68$ million in inflation funds (Attachment 14) and $\$ 8.00$ million in additional specified ("GAP") funds (Attachment 15).


## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the City Council, subject to the concurrence of the Mayor:

1. Adopt the attached City Engineer's Report for the 2022-23 Proposition K Assessment (Attachment 10);
2. Adopt the Resolution of Intention to Levy an Assessment authorized by Proposition K, pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Attachment 11);
3. Adopt the Ordinance of Intention to Levy an Assessment authorized by Proposition K, pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Attachment 12);
4. Approve the 2022-23 maintenance awards totaling $\$ 8.24$ million (Attachment 9 );
5. Approve the reprogramming of 2021-22 funding allocations (Attachments 1 and 13);
6. Approve the 2021-22 Proposition K inflation awards totaling $\$ 5.68$ million (Attachment 14 );
7. Approve the 2021-22 Proposition K additional specified ("GAP") funding awards totaling $\$ 8$ million (Attachment 15);
8. Authorize the City Engineer to execute or amend grant agreements with Proposition K grantees that are recommended for 2021-22 project allocations (Attachment 1), and as needed to effectuate the 2021-22 maintenance awards (Attachment 9), and reprogramming actions (Attachment 13), subject to approval of the City Attorney;
9. Authorize the Controller to adjust accounts pursuant to instructions to be provided by the City Administrative Officer, for current year maintenance awards (Attachment 9), reprogramming actions (Attachment 13), inflation awards (Attachment 14) and additional Specified (GAP) funding (Attachment 15), within the following Proposition K Funds: Projects Fund No. 43K; Maintenance Fund No. 43L; and, Administration Fund No. 43M;
10. Instruct the City Clerk to publish notice by May 26, 2022, of a public hearing to take place on June 7, 2022, at 10:00 A.M., during the regular Council meeting;
11. Request the City Attorney to prepare and present the Ordinance Confirming the Assessment for Fiscal Year 2022-23 to be considered during the public hearing on June 7, 2022;
12. Instruct the City Clerk to set an agenda item for public hearing on the Council agenda for June 7, 2022, to include the following actions:
a. With respect to the projects in List 3 of Attachment 8:

Acknowledge that the City Council's action is exempt from CEQA under Article II, Section 2.i. of the City's CEQA guidelines, because the underlying project has already been evaluated and processed in accordance with the City CEQA Guidelines.
b. With respect to the project in List 4 of Attachment 8:

Acknowledge that a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project and submitted under Council File \#22-0247 and will be reviewed and considered by the City Council as part of the final approval of the project.
c. With respect to the projects in List 5 of Attachment 8:

Acknowledge that these are projects that may be considered for funding after CEQA compliance. No further action is required at this time.
d. Adopt the Ordinance Confirming the Assessment, as prepared and transmitted by the City Attorney, confirming the assessments and approving the diagram for the District for Fiscal Year 2022-23;
e. Instruct the City Engineer to record a Notice of Assessment with the County Recorder;
f. Approve the 2022-23 Five Year Plan for the L.A. for Kids Program and related schedules, as set forth in Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7;
g. Approve the 2022-23 allocation of administrative funds up to the following amounts within Proposition K Fund 43M, as set forth in Attachment 7:

| Department | Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
| PW/Bureau of Engineering | $\$ 214,290$ |
| PW/Board/Office of Accounting | 136,457 |
| Office of the City Administrative Officer | 78,000 |
| Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst | $\underline{33,356}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{T o t a l}$ |

h. Instruct the Information Technology Agency to prepare the assessment file containing the assessment levy information confirmed by the City Council for 2022-23 for each parcel in the Assessment District and make it available for the Bureau of Engineering to verify and transmit to the County;
i. Authorize the City Engineer to negotiate and execute Proposition K grant agreements with grantees that are recommended for 2022-23 project allocations (Attachment 1), except for competitive projects awarded to City departments, subject to approval of the City Attorney;
j. Authorize the Controller to:

1. Set up accounts for the 2022-23 Proposition K assessment within the following Funds, pursuant to instructions to be provided by the City Administrative Officer: Proposition K Projects Fund No. 43K; Proposition K Maintenance Fund No. 43L; and, Proposition K Administration Fund No. 43M;
2. Increase the 2022-23 appropriations for the Information Technology Agency by $\$ 50,000$ from Proposition K Fund 43K/10, Account No. (TBD) - Information Technology Agency to Fund 100/32, Account 9350 - Communication Service Request;
3. Transfer $\$ 140,000$ in prior year balances from Proposition K Fund No. 43K/10, originally allocated for the Central and Trinity Recreation Centers to the Southern Pacific Trails (aka. Slauson Connect ), project, in order to effectuate the reprogramming of funds previously authorized (C.F. 20-1124);

FROM: 43K/10, Proposition K Projects Fund 10 K898 - PRJ - Trinity Recreation Center
10K020 - PRJ - Central Recreation Center
10L898 - PRJ - Trinity Recreation Center 10 L020 - PRJ - Central Recreation Center

Total
\$ 20,000
\$ 20,000
\$ 25,000
$\$ 75,000$
\$ 140,000

| TO: | 43K/10, Proposition K Projects Fund |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10K888 - PRJ- Southern Pacific Trails | $\$ 40,000$ |  |
|  | 10L888 - PRJ- Southern Pacific Trails | $\$ 100,000$ |
|  | Total | $\$ 140,000$ |

4. Establish a new account within the HATS Fund No. 43G/10, and transfer and appropriate \$750,000 from the Cash Balance available within the Fund, as follows:

| Account No. | Account Title | Amount |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| TBD | Anderson Senior Center | $\$ 750,000$ |

5. Transfer cash from Proposition K Fund No. 43K/10, on an as-needed basis upon proper documentation from the Information Technology Agency and approval by the Bureau of Engineering Program Managers and the City Administrative Officer; and
6. Transfer assessment revenues to the appropriate program funds in the following distribution:

| Proposition K Fund | Percentage Distribution | Year 26 Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 43K/10 - Capital Projects | $68.18 \%$ | $\$ 17,043,969$ |
| 43L/10 - Maintenance | $29.97 \%$ | $7,493,928$ |
| $43 M / 10-$ Administration | $1.85 \%$ | 462,103 |
| Total: | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |

k. Authorize the reprogramming of $\$ 328,000$ in competitive funds to the Algin Sutton Pool and Splashpad Project from the eligible C-List as incorporated into the Year 26 funding allocation recommendation for the upcoming year (Attachments 1 and 13).
I. Instruct the City Engineer, City Administrative Officer, Chief Legislative Analyst and Board of Public Works, Office of Accounting to submit journal voucher requests supported by documentation of work order charges for program administrative and project construction management staffing costs to the City Administrative Officer;
m.Instruct the Department of General Services and the Department of Recreation and Parks to submit expenditure reports to the Bureau of Engineering and the City Administrative Officer on a monthly basis;
n. Authorize the City Engineer to make technical corrections to the City Engineer's Report to reflect the intent of those transactions;
o. Authorize the City Administrative Officer to make funding adjustments and prepare technical adjustments as needed to fully commit annual assessment funds and carry out the intent of this Council action and authorize the Controller to implement those technical adjustments; and
p. Authorize the Controller, pursuant to instructions to be provided by the City Administrative Officer, to revert residual funds within Proposition K Funds to the originating Proposition K project accounts for projects completed by the Department of General Services and the Department of Recreation and Parks as part of ongoing project closeout activities.

## FISCAL IMPACT

Adoption of an Ordinance and Resolution of Intention to Levy the Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Assessment for Fiscal Year 2022-23 indicates the Council's intention to levy assessments totaling $\$ 25$ million to acquire and construct park and recreational and cultural facilities serving youth. The assessment can only be used for capital improvements, acquisition of land, Proposition K Program administration and maintenance of completed projects. The operating cost for Proposition K projects completed in future years will be funded by the annual operating budget adopted for City departments and with independent funding for projects operated by external entities.

Proposition K will provide $\$ 7.96$ million in the current fiscal year, and $\$ 5.01$ million in the upcoming fiscal year, in City cost recovery. These monies provide reimbursements for program administration and maintenance of completed projects. In total, there are ten City Departments that qualify for cost recovery through the program, which includes: the Bureau of Construction Administration, Bureau of Engineering, Office of the City Attorney, Cultural Affairs Department, Information Technology Agency, Office of the City Administrative Officer, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst, Public Works Accounting, the Zoo Department and the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP).

RAP reports an annual fiscal impact of $\$ 9.62$ million once active Proposition K projects, currently in various stages of development, become operational over future years. This includes $\$ 4.19$ million for maintenance and $\$ 5.43$ million for operations (Attachments 5 and 6 ). The fiscal impact for completed projects will be partially offset by Proposition K maintenance funding. However, this annual offset will no longer be available once the program sunsets in 2026-27. In 2021-22, RAP will receive an award of $\$ 7.01$ million for current year maintenance awards. (Attachment 9).

## FINANCIAL POLICIES

The actions recommended in this report comply with the City's Financial Policies.

## FINDINGS

## 1. Basis for Report

On October 20, 2021, the City Council adopted a Resolution to Initiate Proceedings that directed the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE) and the Office of the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to report on the 2022-23 capital program proposed for Program Year 26 of the Proposition K Program (C.F. 21-1145). This Assessment Report transmits the 2022-23 Five Year Plan along with proposed adjustments to 2021-22 funding allocations.

## 2. Proposition K Program Overview

The Proposition K Program, currently in its twenty-fifth year of a 30-year program, was established by the adoption of a Ballot Measure approved by City voters in November 1996. The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee (Steering Committee) was created by City ordinance in the subsequent year as the program's administering entity. Committee membership consists of representatives from the Offices of the Mayor, the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) and the CAO, with the latter serving as the chair. Council transferred project management to BOE in April 2002 (C.F. 01-0600-S51) and administration of the program's competitive awards process in December 2003 (C.F. 03-0515-S2). The Board of Public Works, Office of Accounting (PW Accounting) provides program accounting services.

Funding deliberations begin each year with the convening of three Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees (RVNOC) for the Central, Southern and Valley Proposition K Program planning areas of the City. Two RVNOC members are appointed by each of the fifteen Council Offices to represent district funding priorities. At the conclusion of the RVNOC deliberations, five-year expenditure plans for each region were presented to the Steering Committee for further deliberation, including consideration of staff input. While RVNOC recommendations are limited to the upcoming five-year funding period, staff recommendations also include proposed changes to the current year expenditure plan.

The Steering Committee transmits to Council initial funding recommendations through an annual Assessment Report that coincides with the release of the Mayor's Proposed Budget. Prior to the public hearing scheduled by June of each year, any proposed changes to the initial funding recommendations are transmitted to Council through an amending Motion. Program funding recommendations must conform to use restrictions established by the 1996 Ballot Measure, which are summarized in the remainder of this section.

Approval of the 2022-23 expenditure plan includes adoption of a Resolution and Ordinance of Intention that formally indicates the City's intention to levy program assessment funds (Attachments 11 and 12). The Engineer's Report, which is provided in draft form as report Attachment 10, reflects the proposed 2022-23 expenditure plan and the associated costbenefit methodology used to allocate the assessment levy to parcels throughout the City. After Council approves the draft Engineer's Report and adopts the Ordinance confirming the assessment, BOE will finalize the Engineer's Report. The final Engineer's Report and related assessment documents, including the assessment levy information for each parcel in the Assessment District that is prepared by the Information Technology Agency (ITA), will be filed with the Los Angeles County Recorder, the County Assessor, and the County AuditorController, as applicable.

## a) Project Categories: Specified and Competitive

Proposition K funds two types of projects: 1) those that were specified in the Ballot Measure; and, 2) those awarded through a competitive process open to City entities, other governmental agencies and qualified non-profit agencies. Specified and competitive projects are further divided into local and regional categories.

Under the terms of the Proposition K Ballot Measure authorizing the program, the City is required to complete 183 specified projects and award a minimum of $\$ 143.65$ million in competitive funds across eight funding categories. At this stage of the program, with five additional years remaining, the majority of the Proposition K funding requirements have been satisfied. To date, full or partial funding has been allocated to 174 of the specified projects. For competitive grant awards, the City has awarded $\$ 144.7$ million through ten prior rounds of funding. In total, there are 285 competitive projects (excludes withdrawn or rescinded projects). As presented in Section 4b of this report, an additional $\$ 11.4$ million in restricted funds will need to be awarded through the Eleventh Cycle in order to satisfy the Proposition K funding requirements for the competitive program. All unrestricted competitive funds have been allocated.

| RVNOC Recommendations - 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Cycle |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | Specified Projects* |  | Competitive Projects** |  |
| Central | \$ | 1,679,875 | \$ | 1,985,000 |
| Southern |  | 2,075,883 |  | 1,805,923 |
| Valley |  | 2,179,251 |  | 632,000 |
| Totals: | \$ | 5,935,009 | \$ | 4,422,923 |
| *Specified projects in the upcoming Program Year 26 <br> ${ }^{* *}$ Programmed over a three-year cycle (Program Years 26-28; Fiscal Years 2022-23 through 2024-25) |  |  |  |  |

b) Proposition K Funding Restrictions

The Proposition K Ballot Measure specifies expenditure ratios that the City must achieve over the 30-year life of the program for capital expenses (82\%), maintenance (15\%) and administration (3\%). State law prohibits the use of program funds for operational costs.

Maintenance funds are awarded on a current year basis through a competitive process administered by BOE. Eligibility is limited to projects completed by December $31^{\text {st }}$ of the awarding year. Since these monies only partially offset annual maintenance expenses, external agencies applying for competitive project funds must demonstrate an ability to maintain and operate the completed project before competitive funds are awarded.

Program administration funds are allocated on a first priority basis to fund the estimated fee charged by the County of Los Angeles for collecting assessment monies. The remaining administration funds are allocated to partially offset City staffing costs.

## c) Program Expenditure Requirements

To facilitate reporting and tracking requirements, Proposition K collections are deposited on an annual basis into three separate funds, with funding over the 30 year term of the program limited to the percentages and funding totals reflected in the chart below:

| Proposition K Accounting Funds |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Fund No. | Share of <br> Revenues | Funding Limit <br> $(30$ Year Total) | Primary Use |  |
| 43 K | $82 \%$ | $\$$ | 615.0 million | Capital expenses |
| 43 M | $15 \%$ | 112.5 million | Maintenance expenses |  |
| 43 L | $3 \%$ | 22.5 million | Administrative expenses |  |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 5 0 . 0}$ million | (Maximum Collections) |  |

## 3. City Reimbursements - Program Administration and Maintenance

The City will receive $\$ 8.6$ million in 2021-22 and $\$ 5.46$ million in 2022-23, for a combined reimbursement level of $\$ 14.06$ million in program cost recovery over the two years. These monies will provide reimbursements for eligible administrative and maintenance expenses, as summarized in the chart below:

| City Reimbursements for Eligible Program Expenses: FYs 2021-22 and 2022-23 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Cost Category | 2021-22 |  | 2022-23 |  |
|  | Awarded |  | Proposed |  |
| Administration | $\$$ | 462,103 | $\$$ |  |
| Maintenance | $\$$ | $7,493,927$ | 462,103 |  |
| Totals: | $7,956,030$ | $\$$ | $4,549,691^{*}$ |  |

* Projected figure. Actual amount would be subject to the outcome of the award process based on relative need and funding availability.

The recommended allocation of administrative funds in the current and upcoming program years will provide an annual reimbursement of $\$ 462,103$ for four City Departments, as reflected in bold in the chart below.

| Proposition K Administrative Allocations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recipient | 2021-22 |  | 2022-23 |  |
|  | Awarded |  | Proposed |  |
| BOE | \$ | 214,290 | \$ | 214,290 |
| PW Accounting |  | 136,457 |  | 136,457 |
| CAO |  | 78,000 |  | 78,000 |
| CLA |  | 33,356 |  | 33,356 |
| City Totals: | \$ | 462,103 | \$ | 462,103 |
| County Assessment Fee |  | 261,172 |  | 261,172 |
| Grand Total: | \$ | 723,275 | \$ | 723,275 |

## 4. 2022-23 Proposed Five Year Expenditure Plan

The 2022-23 Five Year Plan (Attachment 1), incorporated as part of the Engineer's Report, includes the proposed Year 26 expenditure plan also referred to as the A List (Attachment 2), along with funding earmarks for Years 27 through 30 that comprise the B List (Attachment 3). The chart below provides a summary of the funding allocations recommended for Council and Mayor approval as part of the adoption of the 2022-23 Assessment Report.

| 2022-23 Five Year Plan Funding Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Funding Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2022-23 } \\ & \text { Year } 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2023-24 } \\ & \text { Year } 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2024-25 \\ & \text { Year } 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2025-26 } \\ & \text { Year } 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2026-27 \\ & \text { Year } 30 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | A List | B List |  |  |  |
| Specified Funds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional | \$ 2,841,196 | \$ 3,056,000 | \$ 1,796,000 | \$ 814,275 | \$ - |
| Local | 2,136,679 | 3,940,528 | 2,300,120 | 250,000 | 1,129,875 |
| Subtotal: | \$ 4,977,875 | \$ 6,996,528 | \$ 4,096,120 | \$ 1,064,275 | \$ 1,129,875 |
| Competitive Funds |  |  |  |  |  |
| $11^{\text {th }}$ cycle (future)* | \$ - | \$ 5,697,176 | \$ 5,697,177 | \$ | \$ - |
| Tenth Cycle | 4,054,923 | 368,000 |  |  |  |
| Prior Cycles | 2,933,007** |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal: | \$ 6,987,930 | \$ 6,065,176 | \$ 5,697,177 | \$ - | \$ |
| ITA Set-Aside | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Total - All Projects | \$ 12,015,805 | \$ 13,111,704 | \$ 9,843,297 | \$ 1,114,275 | \$ 1,179,875 |
| Administration | \$ 723,275 | \$ 723,275 | \$ 723,275 | \$ 723,275 | \$ 723,276 |
| Maintenance | 5,000,000 | 4,484,575 | 4,484,576 | 4,484,575 | 4,900,000 |
| Inflation | 3,138,351 | 3,479,759 | 3,241,318 | 4,018,074 | 4,341,697 |
| Debt Service | - | - | - | - |  |
| GAP | 4,122,569 | 3,200,687 | 6,707,534 | 14,659,801 | 13,855,152 |
| Total - Other Costs | \$ 12,984,195 | \$ 11,888,296 | \$ 15,156,703 | \$ 23,885,725 | \$ 23,820,125 |
| Grand Totals | \$ 25,000,000 | \$ 25,000,000 | \$ 25,000,000 | \$ 25,000,000 | \$ 25,000,000 |
| *Tentative earmarks for future awards of Eleventh Cycle funds will be adjusted based on actual awards. **Includes $\$ 328,000$ in C-List reprogramming to the Algin Sutton 9th Cycle aquatic project (refer to the discussion on page 12 of this report). |  |  |  |  |  |

The City is only required to balance the program budget to the $\$ 25$ million annual funding limit for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 program years. The remaining four years (Program Years 27 through 30) are funding earmarks that are utilized to effectively plan for completing the remaining program requirements prior to the sunset of the program in 2026-27. During the 2022-23 program year, delayed A List projects may be substituted with any of the B List projects, up to the level of funding earmarked for Program Years 26 through 30. Council approval would be required in order to reprogram funds between the A and B lists.

## a. RVNOC Funding Deliberations - Specified and Competitive Projects

This year the RVNOCs conducted the 2022-23 funding deliberations over a four-week period. The RVNOCs met between October 5, 2021 and October 28, 2021. Each of the three RVNOC planning areas received a funding limit ranging from $\$ 1.68$ to $\$ 2.18$ million for specified projects recommended for funding in Program Year 26 (July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023). Each of the RVNOC bodies deliberated and split their recommendations between regional and local projects. A breakdown of the RVNOC funding recommendations for specified projects is reflected in the following chart:

| RVNOC Region | Year 26 <br> Spending Limit |  | Specified Project Funding Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Regional |  | Local |  | Total |  |
| Central | \$ | 1,679,875 | \$ | 350,000 | \$ | 1,329,875 | \$ | 1,679,875 |
| Southern |  | 2,075,883 |  | 1,513,321 |  | 562,562 |  | 2,075,883 |
| Valley |  | 2,179,251 |  | 750,000 |  | 1,429,251 |  | 2,179,251 |
| Totals | \$ | 5,935,009 | \$ | 2,613,321 | \$ | 3,321,688 | \$ | 5,935,009 |

## b. Competitive Funds - Cumulative Totals and Tenth Award Cycle

The City is required under the terms of the Proposition K Ballot Measure to award $\$ 143.65$ million through a competitive award process. The Ballot Measure established minimum funding levels for eight categories of competitive projects. To date, the City has awarded $\$ 144.33$ million in Proposition K competitive funding through ten award cycles conducted every two to three years. This aggregate award level satisfies the funding requirements for five of the eight categories, while exceeding the minimum funding level for three of the categories by $\$ 10.70$ million.

In response to the Tenth Cycle Competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process, a total of 16 applications were received by BOE, of which two were deemed non-responsive and ineligible for consideration. At its meeting held on October 13, 2021, the Steering Committee heard an appeal from the Pico Union Hope Center and concurred with BOE's determination of ineligibility. Of the 14 eligible project proposals, four projects were recommended for an aggregate funding award of $\$ 4,422,923$.

Due to insufficient requests for funding available within three of the competitive funding categories, an Eleventh Cycle RFP process will need to need to be initiated to fully satisfy the remaining award requisites defined in the Ballot Measure. An administrative adjustment recommended through this report would enable the City to fully satisfy the funding award requirement for one of the remaining competitive categories (Aquatic - \$328,000). The two remaining competitive categories would be satisfied through the Eleventh Cycle RFP that would be initiated in January / February 2023, for a total funding availability of $\$ 11,394,353$, with awards to be programmed across fiscal years 2024-25 to 2026-27.

| Distribution of Proposition K Competitive Funding: Award Cycles One Through Ten |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Competitive Categories | Minimum Funding | Cumulative Awards* | Excess Funding (over minimum)* | Remaining Award* |
| 1.Regional Recreation / Educational Facilities | \$ 20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$ -- | \$ -- |
| 2. Neighborhood At-Risk <br> Youth Facilities | 20,000,000 | 22,089,776 | 2,089,776 | -- |
| 3. Youth Schools / Recreation Projects | 20,000,000 | 9,349,381 | -- | 10,650,619 |
| 4. Aquatic upgrades | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000** | -- | -- |
| 5. Athletic Fields | 16,650,000 | 19,346,871 | 2,696,871 | -- |
| 6. Lighting | 16,000,000 | 21,916,807 | 5,916,807 | -- |
| 7. Urban Greening | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | -- | -- |
| 8. Acquisition of Parks/Natural Lands | 20,000,000 | 19,256,266 | -- | 743,734 |
| TOTALS: | \$ 143,650,000 | \$142,959,101 | \$ 10,703,454 | \$ 11,394,353 |
| TOTAL UNRESTRICTED | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| *Total reflects all adjustments for withdrawn projects and reprogramming actions previously approved by Council. ${ }^{* *}$ This total reflects C-list reprogramming action. |  |  |  |  |

## C-List Reprogramming for Aquatic Category (Program Year 26)

As part of the overall funding available through the Tenth Cycle RFP, a remaining balance of $\$ 500,000$ was available for award to fully satisfy the award requirement for the Aquatic category. However, with only one funding request in the amount of $\$ 172,000$ eligible to receive funding under the Aquatic category to conduct repairs to a pool lift, there is still a balance of $\$ 328,000$ remaining under this category for award.

Typical aquatic projects for pool or splash pad elements would require funding in excess of the $\$ 328,000$ in remaining funding under this category. To satisfy this remaining award requirement for the Aquatic category, staff recommends a reprogramming action through the cumulative program "C-List" of alternative competitive projects to award the remaining eligibility to the Ninth Cycle, Algin Sutton Pool and Splash Pad (ASPSP) project.

The ASPSP project applied for total funding of $\$ 4$ million, of which $\$ 2.34$ million was previously awarded through a prior C-List reprogramming action, leaving a remaining C-List award eligibility of over $\$ 1.65$ million. The proposed reprogramming action would be implemented in the upcoming program year using 2022-23 assessment funds. Since the ASPSP is a completed project, program staff will implement the required administrative actions to effectuate a transfer of eligible expenses in an amount sufficient to fully expend the cumulative Proposition K award for this project. Once these adjustments are complete, six of the eight competitive funding categories will be fully satisfied, with the two remaining categories to be achieved through the final Eleventh Cycle award process.

## Eleventh Competitive Funding Cycle (Program Years 27-29)

In order to fully satisfy the funding requirements for the two remaining competitive funding categories, the $\$ 11.39$ million in remaining funding would be distributed, as follows:

- Youth Schools/Recreation Projects (\$10.65 million)
- Acquisition of Parks/Natural Lands $(\$ 743,000)$

BOE anticipates initiating an Eleventh Cycle of competitive applications in January-February of 2023. The preliminary funding recommendations will be presented to the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee (LAFKSC) after the Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees are provided a presentation in the Fall of 2023.

Funding for competitive projects that are withdrawn, rescinded, or become infeasible can be awarded to projects on the C-List of Alternate Competitive Projects (Attachment 4). Only projects that did not receive their full level of eligible funds requested under the prior Funding Cycle are eligible as C-List projects, with priority given to projects with similar scopes or those located within the same Council District or region. These reprogramming options enable the City to maintain the required $\$ 25$ million annual program funding obligation.

## c. Healthy Alternatives to Smoking Trust Fund (HATS)

In July, 1999 (C.F. 99-0600-S36 \& S40) the City Council approved a Motion which appropriated $\$ 4$ million dollars to the Healthy Alternatives to Smoking Trust Fund for the development of recreational facilities in under-served neighborhoods by leveraging existing resources, specifically the competitive grant process under Proposition K. The accompanying Ordinance (No. 172727) created the Trust Fund and specified that the funds be distributed through the Proposition K: LA for Kids Program Request for Proposals for acquisition of park land and recreational facilities in under-served communities. Therefore, while not a part of the Proposition K budget, the HATS projects are also evaluated by the RVNOC and recommended by the Steering Committee for approval by City Council. This Proposition K Tenth competitive cycle received one application for funding. Of the original appropriation there was $\$ 1.23$ million remaining and one project was awarded $\$ 750,000$, leaving a balance of $\$ 480,933$ for the Eleventh competitive funding cycle, as reflected in the chart below.

| Healthy Alternatives to Smoking (HATS) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Available | Current 10 th <br> Cycle Award | Project Title | Project Scope | Future <br> Funding Award |
| $\$ 1,230,933$ | $\$ 750,000$ | Anderson <br> Memorial Sr. <br> Citizen Center | Playground, <br> landscaping, lighting, <br> fencing, parking lot <br> improvement, path <br> of travel, and park <br> amenities. | $\$ 480,933$ |

## d. Fiscal Impact for Active Projects

Since a majority of Proposition K projects are operated by RAP, an estimate of the fiscal impact for increased maintenance and operational costs was prepared by the Department (Attachments 5 and 6, respectively). The preliminary estimate once all currently active projects become operational over future years totals $\$ 9.62$ million for the annual cost of maintenance ( $\$ 4.19$ million) and operations ( $\$ 5.43$ million). These future costs will be partially offset by Proposition K maintenance funding. As presented in Section 5b, RAP is recommended to receive $\$ 7.01$ million in total maintenance awards for projects completed in prior years. (Attachment 9).

## e. 2022-23 Maintenance, Inflation and Additional Specified ("GAP") Funding

The proposed 2022-23 maintenance ( $\$ 5$ million), inflation ( $\$ 3.14$ million), and additional specified ("GAP") funding ( $\$ 4.12$ million) allocations will be awarded to individual projects during the course of the 2022-23 program year. The individual project awards will be presented for Mayor and Council approval in May 2023, as part of the 2023-24 Assessment Report.

## 5. 2021-22 Reprogramming and Awards of Maintenance, Inflation and "GAP" Funds

To avoid forfeiture of uncommitted funds, the City must adopt a $\$ 25$ million expenditure program prior to the start of each program year. As each year progresses, adjustments to project allocations through reprogramming actions are necessary to ensure that the full funding commitment is maintained. Other current year funding actions include the award of Proposition K maintenance, inflation and interest, and additional specified funding monies. This section presents recommendations for both current year reprogramming and the award of program maintenance, inflation and interest, and additional specified funds.

## a. Reprogramming Adjustments

Reprogramming actions are taken each year to address changes in project status, funding availability and site conditions, and thereby maintain the program's full funding commitment level of $\$ 25$ million annually. The reprogramming actions recommended through this report will impact a total of 16 projects, with three projects reprogrammed within the current fiscal year and thirteen reprogrammed to future years as a result of the various factors described below:

## 2021-22 (Program Year 25) Reprogramming

Reprogramming actions for the current year include: 1) reduction of base funding for capital projects to reflect adjustments to project implementation schedules; 2) increased funding for 2021-22 maintenance awards; and, 3) increased funding for inflation monies and additional specified ("GAP") funds in order to provide the maximum award level to eligible projects, as summarized in the table below:

| Reprogramming Adjustments to Year 25 Budget (FY 2021-22) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Funding Categories | Adopted Budget |  | Proposed Allocations |  | Variance |  |
| Competitive Awards | \$ | -- | \$ | 177,000 | \$ | 177,000 |
| Specified - Regional Projects |  | 3,436,679 |  | 2,136,679 |  | $(1,300,000)$ |
| Specified - Local Projects |  | 3,423,358 |  | -- |  | $(3,423,358)$ |
| Capital Projects -Subtotal: | \$ | 6,860,037 | \$ | 2,313,679 | \$ | $(4,546,358)$ |
| ITA Set-Aside |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | -- |
| Administration |  | 723,275 |  | 723,275 |  | -- |
| Maintenance |  | 6,589,370 |  | 8,235,644 |  | 1,646,274 |
| Inflation |  | 3,702,055 |  | 5,677,402 |  | 1,975,347 |
| Additional Specified Funding |  | 7,075,263 |  | 8,000,000 |  | 924,737 |
| Year 25 Totals: | \$ | 25,000,000 | \$ | 25,000,000 | \$ | -- |

## b. Maintenance Awards

Maintenance awards are budgeted in the current year, but paid on a reimbursement basis in the subsequent year. The 2021-22 Proposition K expenditure plan adopted by Council (C.F. 19-1006), set aside $\$ 6,589,370$ in current-year maintenance funds. At its meeting held on December 16, 2021, the Steering Committee authorized the release of these maintenance funds, which occurred on January 6, 2022, with responses due February 10, 2022.

The maintenance award recommendations originally totaled \$6,589,370 (Attachment 9). The recommended maintenance award was subsequently increased as a result of reprogramming, to a revised total of $\$ 8,235,644$. Of this total, City Departments will receive $\$ 7,493,928$, which is programmed as part of the 2022-23 Mayor's Proposed Budget. As part of the eligibility review for maintenance award requests, BOE deducts costs unrelated to the completed project scope and prorates the eligible amount by the percentage of program fund contributing to the original capital project. Eligible awards may be reduced further by a proportionate rate to fall within available funding levels.

## Regular Maintenance Award Cycle

For the regular 2021-22 maintenance award cycle, a total of 107 applications were initially submitted by the first round of applicants for an aggregate funding request of \$15,559,081. Of this amount, BOE determined that eligible maintenance expenses total \$13,459,364 after deducting ineligible expenses, and then adjusting the remaining eligible expenses by the percentage of Proposition K funds expended on the original project. The amount of eligible maintenance expenses exceed the original available funding by \$6,869,994 (Attachment 9). Program staff were able to identify an additional \$1,646,274 through the reprogramming process and proportionally adjusted the initial award recommendations to the final award total of $\$ 8,235,644$, recommended through this report, as summarized in the table below:

| 2021-22 Maintenance Funding Award Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applicants: | Non-Profit <br> Agencies | Los Angeles <br> Unified School <br> District <br> (LAUSD) | Zoo <br> Department | Cultural <br> Affairs <br> Department <br> (DCA) | Department of <br> Recreation <br> and <br> Parks (RAP) | Grand Total |  |
| Applicant <br> Request: | $\$ 2,976,615$ | $\$$ | 225,733 | $\$ 108,830$ | $\$ 787,384$ | $\$ 11,460,519$ | $\$ 15,559,081$ |
| Eligible <br> Expenses: | $1,064,801$ | 147,311 | 76,181 | 710,552 | $11,460,519$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 4 5 9 , 3 6 4}$ |  |
| Final Proposed <br> Award: | $\$ 651,574$ | $\$$ | 90,142 | $\$$ | 46,616 | $\$ 434,801$ | $\$ 7,012,510$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 2 3 5 , 6 4 4}$| Eligible <br> Applicants: | 22 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## c. Allocation of Program Inflation and Additional Specified (GAP) Funding

In addition to the funding levels designated in the Proposition K Ballot Measure, specified projects with unresolved funding shortfalls may qualify for additional funding through sources that include Proposition K Inflation funds and Additional Specified (GAP) funds. The two funding sources are programmed each year as part of the $\$ 25$ million annual budget.

The award of program inflation funds is used to offset inflationary cost escalation over the life of the program, which is limited to specified projects during the year that acquisition and construction activities are initiated through a contractual obligation. The maximum award level for inflation funds is set at three percent compounded from year two of the program, up to the project shortfall level identified at the time of award.

The additional specified funding awards represents surplus funding capacity within the program, resulting from the early defeasance of program bond debt (C.F. 14-1194-S1) that freed capacity to fund additional capital improvements on an annual basis. The repurposing of this additional specified funding capacity (also referred to as "GAP" funds) is used to offset project shortfalls in excess of the established award levels for program inflation funds and interest earnings. "GAP" funds are only eligible for award to remaining Proposition K specified projects that the City is required to complete prior to program completion in 2026-27.

The 2021-22 Six Year Plan that was adopted by Council in June 2021, includes an allocation of $\$ 3,702,055$ for program inflation funds and an allocation of $\$ 7,075,263$ in 2021-22 for program Additional Specified ("GAP") Funding (C.F. 20-1195). Based on project funding requirements and other current-year programming needs, the following increases to the adopted budget level for these two funding sources are recommended as part of the 2021-22 reprogramming recommendations, as follows:

- Inflation funds - \$1,975,347 increase from \$3,702,055 to a revised total of \$5,677,402.
- GAP funds - \$924,737 increase from \$7,075,263 to a revised total of \$8,000,000.

A summary of the 2021-22 inflation and GAP award recommendations is provided in the chart below, with additional details reflected in Attachments 14 and 15, respectively:

| 2021-22 Inflation and Additional Specified ("GAP") Funding Award Recommendations |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eligible Projects | Comments | Inflation <br> Awards | GAP <br> Awards |
| Angels Gate Park <br> (R1) | Reflects maximum award eligibility, which will enable the <br> implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan <br> improvements. | $\$ 1,546,226$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ |
| Southern Pacific Trails <br> -aka Slauson <br> Connect (R35) | Reflects maximum funding eligibility for project, inclusive <br> of funding capacity reprogrammed, in accordance with <br> (rior Council approvals (C.F. 20-1124). | $\$ 4,131,176$ | $\$ 6,000,000$ |
|  | Totals | $\$ 5,677,402$ | $\$ 8,000,000$ |

## d. Program Interest Monies

Proposition K interest funds are program revenues in the form of interest earnings on assessment funds and collection penalties. These funds can be used to offset shortfalls in annual collections or to address project funding shortfalls with award levels set based on an objective index (currently the Producer Price Index). For the current year, there are no eligible specified projects that qualify for additional awards of interest funds. Therefore, any program interest funds remaining after any potential cash balance adjustments required for the current year, will be retained to offset potential shortfalls in future collections. This will ensure that the City has access to the maximum annual funding level of $\$ 25$ million in order to support Proposition K program activities including the reimbursement of eligible City expenses in the upcoming year. At this time there is no intent to use these funds for current year projects but this will be reevaluated in the upcoming year to address critical project funding needs or critical shortfalls in the annual budget.

## By: Melinda Gejer <br> Senior Administrative Analyst

## APPROVED:

## Assistant City Administrative Officer

Attachments:

1. 2022-23 Five Year Plan (Program Years 26-30)
2. 2022-23 A List of Projects (Program Year 26)
3. 2022-23 B List of Projects (Program Years 27-30)
4. C List of Alternate Tenth Cycle Competitive Projects
5. Fiscal Impact - RAP Maintenance Costs
6. Fiscal Impact - RAP Operations Costs
7. 2022-23 Recommended Administrative Funding Allocations
8. Categories of Environmental Documents for 2022-23 A List
9. 2021-22 Maintenance Funding Recommendations
10. City Engineer's Report for Fiscal Year 2022-23
11. Resolution of Intention to Levy Assessment
12. Ordinance of Intention to Levy Assessment
13. BOE Reprogramming Recommendations
14. 2021-22 Inflation Awards
15. 2021-22 Additional Specified Funding (GAP) Award Recommendations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DRAFT FIVE | AR PLAN, YEAR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING | PROP K FUNDS | Year 25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | AUTHORITY |  |  | (A List) |  | (B L |  |  |
| PREDEVEL | OPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PRE-DEVELOPMENT FOR ALL PROJECTS | ALL | \$846,678 | \$846,678 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMPETIT | VE GRANTS (ACTIVE and FUTURE) |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | COMPETITIVE GRANTS YET TO BE ALLOCATED |  |  |  |  |  | \$5,697,176 | \$5,697,177 |  |  |
| C187-7 | LOS ANGELES BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB AQUATIC CENTER (7th Cycle) <br> POOL REFURBISHMENT AND NEW OUTDOOR PATIO AND GARDEN AREA | 1 | \$338,286 | \$338,286 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C188-7 | LOS ANGELES BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB GYMNASIUM (7th Cycle) <br> RENOVATE EXISTING GYMNASIUM | 1 | \$297,011 | \$297,011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C254-9 | LOS ANGELES BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB ATHLETIC FIELD AND BASKETBALL COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> 1. UPGRADE LIGHTING FOR THE ATHLETIC FIELD AND OUTDOOR BASKETBALL COURT; 2. UPGRADE THE ELECTRICAL PANELS FOR THE ATHLETIC FIELD AND OUTDOOR BASKETBALL COURT | 1 | \$449,483 | \$449,483 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C233-8 | REC \& PARKS: GLASSELL PARK SOCCER FIELD (8th Cycle; formerly CD 13) <br> INSTALLATION OF NEW SYNTHETIC SOCCERFIELD | 1 | \$625,000 | \$625,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TOTA | \$1,709,780 | \$1,709,780 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C255-9 | REC \& PARKS: NORTH HOLLYWOOD RECREATION CENTER - SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> 1. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT ONE FULL BASKETBALL COURT, AND $1 / 2$ BASKETBALL COURT WITH LEDS; <br> 2. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT FOUR TENNIS COURTS WITH LEDS | 2 | \$430,000 | \$430,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C263-9 | REC \& PARKS: WHITSETT FIELDS PARK SPORTS FIELDS LIGHTING PROJECT (9th Cycle) <br> INSTALL NEW LED LIGHTING FOR THREE SOCCER FIELDS | 2 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TOTA | \$2,430,000 | \$2,430,000 | \$0 | \$0 | S0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 | Year 25 <br> 2021-22 | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year 27 } \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Year } 29 \\ 2025-26 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| C195-7 | REC \& PARKS: GRIFFITH PARK CRYSTAL SPRINGS BASEBALL FIELDS (7th Cycle; Scope modified per C.F. 14-0588-S1) CONSTRUCT ONE NEW BASEBALL FIELD | 4 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C216-8 | REC \& PARKS: GRIFFITH PARK HORTICULTURE LEARNING CENTER <br> (8th Cycle) <br> RENOVATE A PORTION OF THE EXISTING NURSERY ON COMMONWEALTH AVENUE | 4 | \$1,650,000 | \$1,650,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C262-9 | REC \& PARKS: VAN NUYS SHERMAN OAKS RECREATION CENTER - SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> 1. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT TWO BASKETBALL COURTS WITH LEDs; 2. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT EIGHT TENNIS COURTS WITH LEDS | 4 | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 4 TOTAL |  |  | \$2,600,000 | \$2,600,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C248-9 | REC \& PARKS: CHEVIOT HILLS RECREATION CENTER - SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT FOUR BASEBALL FIELDS WITH LEDs | 5 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REC \& PARKS. SEPUVEDA RECREATION CD 5 TOTAL $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$0 | so | \$0 | 50 | \$0 |
| C259-9 | REC \& PARKS: SEPULVEDA RECREATION CENTER - SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT THREE BASEBALL FIELDS WITH LEDS | 6 | \$420,000 | \$420,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C244-8 | REC \& PARKS: STRATHERN WETLANDS PARK SYNTHETIC SOCCERFIELD (8th Cycle; Refer to Bond Section - \$728,539) <br> SYNTHETIC SOCCERFIELD | 6 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C219-8 | REC \& PARKS: CESAR CHAVEZ RECEREATION CENTER, aka SHELDON ARLETA (8th Cycle) <br> CONSTRUCT BASEBALL FIELD, PICNIC AREA AND PLAYGROUND | 6 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TOT | \$2,420,000 | \$1,420,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C198-7 | REC \& PARKS: HANSEN DAM BASEBALL FIELDS (7th Cycle) <br> REFURBISH THREE EXISTING BASEBALL FIELDS, INSTALL NEW RESTROOMS, BLEACHERS, SECURITY LIGHTING AND FENCING | 7 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Attachment 1

|  |  |  | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 |  | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| C258-9 | REC \& PARKS: RITCHIE VALENS PARK SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> 1. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT THREE BASKETBALL COURTS WITH LEDs; <br> 2. REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT TWO <br> TENNIS COURTS WITH LEDs | 7 | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C221-8 | REC \& PARKS: VERDUGO HILLS POOL (8th Cycle) <br> POOL AND BATHHOUSE UPGRADES | 7 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 7 TOTAL |  |  | \$2,450,000 | \$2,450,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C261-9 | REC \& PARKS: VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER - BATHHOUSE REPLACEMENT (9th Cycle) <br> 1. DEMOLISH EXISITING BATHHOUSE; <br> 2. REPLACE BATHHOUSE | 8 | \$3,873,853 | \$3,873,853 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C265-9 | REC \& PARKS: ALGIN SUTTON POOL AND SPLASHPAD PROJECT (9th Cycle) <br> (C-List reprogramming in PY 26) <br> 1. CONSTRUCT NEW SWIMMING POOL <br> 2. CONSTRUCT NEW SWIMMING POOL DECK <br> AND ALL SURFACE AMENITIES <br> 3. CONSTRUCT NEW SUPPORTING <br> EQUIPMENT, PLUMBING \& ELECTRICAL FOR THE POOL <br> 4. CONSTRUCT NEW SPLASH PAD | 8 | \$4,000,000 | \$2,334,814 |  | \$328,000 |  |  |  |  |
| C266-10 | REC \& PARKS: JACKIE TATUM/HARVARD RECREATION CENTER LIGHTING (10th Cycle) <br> REPLACE/UPGRADE EXISTING LIGHTING | 8 | \$1,805,923 |  |  | \$1,805,923 |  |  |  |  |
| CD 8 TOTAL |  |  | \$9,679,776 | \$3,873,853 | \$0 | \$2,133,923 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C245-5 | REC \& PARKS: SLAUSON RECREATION CENTER LIGHTING <br> (5th Cycle; See Bond Section - \$73,000) (Funded through the C-List of Eligible Projects) <br> LIGHTING FOR BASEBALL AND BASKETBALL AREAS | 9 | \$73,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C260-9 | REC \& PARKS: SOUTH PARK RECREATION CENTER - SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) <br> INSTALL NEW LIGHTING FOR PROPOSED ONE SYNTHETIC SOCCER FIELD AND LIGHTING FOR ONE EXISTING BASEBALL FIELD/MULTIPURPOSE FIELD | 9 | \$1,400,000 | \$1,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 9 TOTAL |  |  | \$1,473,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \＆SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | $\underset{\text { Years } 1-24}{\text { PROP K FUNDS }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN，YEARS 26－30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | （A List） | （BLis |  |  |  |
| C226－8 | HEART OF LOS ANGELES ENRICHMENT AND RECREATION CENTER（8th Cycle；Includes $\$ 373,663$ in reprogrammed funds from Grand Hope Park，Inc，C224－8，per C．F．16－0428； Project scope change per C．F．16－0551） <br> DEVELOPMENT OF A $24,000-32,000$ SQ．FT． ART，ENRICHMENT AND RECREATION CENTER | 10 | \＄1，361，180 | \＄1，361，180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C246－9 | REC \＆PARKS：BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER－SPORTS FIELD AND SPORTS COURT LIGHTING（9th Cycle） <br> 1．REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT THREE BASEBALL FIELDS WITH LEDs； <br> 2．REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT TWO BASKETBALL COURTS WITH LEDs | 10 | \＄450，000 | \＄450，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C227－8 | SECURITY LIGHTING AND SHADE STRUCTURES FOR TENNIS COURTS AND BASEBALL FIELDS | 10 | \＄500，000 | \＄500，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 10 TOTAL |  |  | \＄2，311，180 | \＄2，311，180 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| C228－8 | HACLA：MAR VISTA GARDENS LIGHTING（8th Cycle；formerly Rec \＆Parks） <br> OUTDOOR LIGHTING FOR BASEKTBALL COURT，HANDBALL COURT AND PICNIC AREA | 11 | \＄50，000 | \＄50，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 11 TOTAL |  |  | \＄50，000 | \＄50，000 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| C179－6 | REC \＆PARKS：CHATSWORTH PARK NORTH （6th Cycle；Includes reprogramming of \＄114，707 per C．F．12－0479） <br> REPLACE INFIELDS，LEVEL／RESEED OUTFIELD， REPLACE IRRIGATION SYSTEM，REPLACE FENCE FABRIC，NEW BLEACHERS，DRINKING FOUNTAINS | 12 | \＄705，689 | \＄705，689 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C267－10 | THE UNIVERSITY CORPORATION：ABBOTT AND LINDA BROWN WESTERN CENTER FOR ADAPTIVE AQUATIC THERAPY（10th Cycle） <br> REPAIR AND INSTALL THE MOVEABLE POOL FLOOR FOR ADAPTIVE AND THERAPEUTIC EXERCISES AND SPORTS FOR THE DISABLED | 12 | \＄172，000 |  |  | \＄172，000 |  |  |  |  |
| C268－10 | REC \＆PARK：OAKRIDGE ESTATE PARK（10th Cycle） <br> EXPANSION OF EXISTING OAKRIDGE PARK， WHICH WOULD INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW LANDSCAPING，WALKING PATHS， IRRIGATION，AND SITE AMENITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING PARK， INCLUDING NEW LED PARK LIGHTING AND SHADE STRUCTURES OVER EXISTING PICNIC AREAS AND PLAGROUND． | 12 | \＄460，000 |  |  | \＄92，000 | \＄368，000 |  |  |  |



| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \＆SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDSYears $1-24$ | Year 25 <br> 2021－22 |  | DRAFT FIVE | AR PLAN，YEAR | －30 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | （A List） | （B List） |  |  |  |
| C252－9 | HACLA：JORDAN DOWNS CENTRALPARK－ SPORTS FIELD AND BASKETBALL COURTS LIGHTING（9th Cycle） <br> 1．DESIGN AND INSTALL LIGHTING ELEMENTS FROM THE ELECTRICAL PANEL TO THE LIGHTING ELEMENTS IN THE SOCCER FIELD AND BASKETBALL COURTSÑ <br> 2．INSTALL LED LIGHTS FOR THE SOCCER FIELD； <br> 3．INSTALL LED LIGHTS FOR THE BASKETBALL COURTS． | 15 | \＄966，000 | \＄966，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C247－9 | REC \＆PARKS：BANNING RECREATION CENTER －SPORTS COURT LIGHTING （9th Cycle） <br> 1．REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT ONE BASKETBALL COURT WITH LEDS； <br> 2．REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING AT FOUR <br> TENNIS COURTS WITH LEDS | 15 | \＄450，000 | \＄450，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C241－8 | REC \＆PARKS：WATTS CULTURAL CRESCENT （8th Cycle） <br> PARK EXPANSION | 15 | \＄750，000 | \＄749，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C242－8 | WILMINGTON BOYS \＆GIRLS CLUB GYM AND SPORTFIELD，aka BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF THE LOS ANGELES HARBOR（8th Cycle） <br> RENOVATE GYMNASIUM AND INSTALL NEW MULTIPURPOSE SPORTS COURT | 15 | \＄349，426 | \＄349，426 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 15 TOTAL |  |  | \＄4，464，175 | \＄4，463，175 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| COMPETITIVE GRANTS TOTAL |  |  | \＄38，335，700 | \＄26，056，770 | \＄177，000 | \＄6，987，930 | \＄6，065，176 | \＄5，697，177 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| SPECIFIED PROJECTS：REGIONAL（ACTIVE and FUTURE） |  |  |  | \＄0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R1 | ANGELS GATE PARK <br> （Inflation YR 16－\＄516，362） <br> （GAP YR 25 －\＄2，000，000） <br> （Inflation YR 25 －\＄1，546，226） <br> IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN IMPROVEMENTS AND PERIMETER FENCING | REG | \＄2，516，362 | \＄2，516，362 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R2 | BALBOA SPORTS COMPLEX <br> CONSTRUCT NEW AQUATIC FACILITY | REG | \＄3，000，000 | \＄35，725 |  | \＄500，000 | \＄750，000 | \＄1，000，000 | \＄714，275 |  |
| R4 | BOYLE HEIGHTS SPORTS CENTER CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM | REG | \＄2，500，000 | \＄2，250，000 |  |  | \＄50，000 | \＄100，000 | \＄100，000 |  |


| Project ID |  | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 |  |  | DRAFT | R PLAN | -30 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| R9 | DRUM BARRACKS (Inflation YR 6 - $\$ 47,782$ ) ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR PARKING LOT | REG | \$347,782 | \$347,782 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R12 | FERRARO SOCCER FIELDS <br> (Inflation YR 9-\$193,408) <br> (YR 8: RESTROOMS) <br> IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, REST ROOMS, POTABLE \& RECLAIMED WATER, DEVELOPMENT OF PICNIC AREAS | REG | \$2,193,408 | \$2,193,408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R13 | GRIFFITH PARK <br> (Phase II Inflation YR 15 - \$1,127,687; <br> Phase III Inflation YR 16 - \$256,294; <br> Refer to Bond Section - \$200,000) <br> IMPROVEMENTS TO ROADS, TRAILS, WATER SYSTEM, REST ROOMS, PICNIC AREAS, PAVE LIVE STEAMERS PARKING LOT | REG | \$6,383,981 | \$6,383,981 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R14 | GRIFFITH PARK PERFORMING ARTS CENTER <br> CONSTRUCT A PERFORMING ARTS CENTER FOR YOUTH | REG | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R16 | HANSEN DAM <br> (PH II Inflation YR 12 - \$2,024,286; <br> PH III-A Inflation YR 15 - \$412,249; <br> Refer to Bond section - $\$ 247,883$ ) <br> (YR 4 \& 5: SOCCER COMPLEX, <br> YR 7: PREDEVELOPMENT FOR FUTURE SCOPE) <br> SOCCER COMPLEX, RV PARK, RANGER STATION/VISITOR'S CENTER, ROAD/TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS, FENCING | REG | \$12,436,535 | \$12,436,535 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R18 | LOS ANGELES RIVERFRONT PARK <br> (PH II Inflation YR 15 - \$1,640,287; <br> Refer to Bond Section - \$481,156) <br> (YR 7: PREDEVELOPMENT, YR 8: DESIGN, YRS 9-11: CONSTRUCTION) <br> LAND ACQUISITION, GREENING ALONG AREA OF ENCINO, SHERMAN OAKS, STUDIO CITY | REG | \$11,640,287 | \$11,440,287 |  | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |
| R20 | MACARTHUR PARK (Inflation-\$167,466) <br> REFURBISH BOATHOUSE, RECREATION BUILDING, SIGNAL BUILDING AND BANDSHELL, FENCING AND EDGE TREATMENT | REG | \$2,167,466 | \$2,185,454 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \＆SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1－24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN，YEARS 26－30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | （A List） | （B List） |  |  |  |
| R21 | MACARTHUR PARK LAKE <br> WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | REG | \＄600，000 | \＄150，000 |  | \＄100，000 | \＄350，000 |  |  |  |
| R26 | RIM－OF－THE－VALLEY TRAILS （YR 7：PREDEVELOPMENT） <br> CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF EQUESTRIAN／PEDESTRIAN TRAIL SYSTEM | REG | \＄2，000，000 | \＄260，000 |  | \＄348，000 | \＄696，000 | \＄696，000 |  |  |
| R27 | SOUTHEAST VALLEY ROLLER \＆SKATEBOARD RINK（Phase I：Skate Park（C．F．10－0675）；Inflation YR 14 －\＄455，000）； <br> （Phase II：Roller Rink）；Phase II：Inflation YR 23 － \＄1，636，769；GAP YR 23 －$\$ 1,576,567$ ） <br> ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ROLLER AND SKATEBOARD RINK IN S／E SAN FERNANDO VALLEY | REG | \＄7，668，336 | \＄8，091，769 |  |  | \＄800，000 |  |  |  |
| R30 | SEPULVEDA BASIN－HJELTE FIELD <br> NEW ATHLETIC FIELDS，LIGHTING，PARKING | REG | \＄1，000，000 | \＄590，000 |  |  | \＄410，000 |  |  |  |
| R31 | SEPULVEDA BASIN－LAKE BALBOA （Inflation YR 16－\＄506，659） <br> UPGRADE IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO WATER CONSERVATION STANDARDS | REG | \＄2，506，659 | \＄2，506，659 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R35 | SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRAILS aka．SLAUSON CONNECT（Includes Reprogramming from Project ID No．S76－Central Recreation Center and Project ID No．S86－Trinity Recreation Center） （Inflation YR 25 －\＄4，131，176） （GAP YR 25 －\＄6，000，000） <br> BEAUTIFICATION OF RAIL ROAD RIGHT OF WAY FROM LA RIVER TO COLISEUM， LANDSCAPING，TRAILS，IRRIGATION | REG | \＄4，000，000 | \＄335，125 | \＄2，136，679 | \＄1，693，196 |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL PROJECTS TOTAL |  |  | \＄63，960，816 | \＄54，723，087 | \＄2，136，679 | \＄2，841，196 | \＄3，056，000 | \＄1，796，000 | \＄814，275 | \＄0 |
| SPECIFIED PROJECTS：LOCAL（ACTIVE and FUTURE） |  |  |  | \＄0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S1 | ALPINE RECREATION CENTER <br> （Inflation YR 17 －\＄500，000 per C．F．13－1370） <br> PROPERTY ACQUISITION FOR PARK EXPANSION | 1 | \＄1，500，000 | \＄1，500，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 1 TOTAL |  |  | \＄1，500，000 | \＄1，500，000 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| S12 | STUDIO CITY <br> CONSTRUCT MODERN GYM, COMMUNITY CENTER, LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION | 2 | \$3,000,000 | \$1,400,000 |  |  | \$800,000 | \$800,000 |  |  |
| CD 2 TOTAL |  |  | \$3,000,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$0 | S0 | \$800,000 | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S23 | RESEDA SKATE FACILITY (Inflation YR 21 \$1,850,569 per C.F. 17-0999; GAP YR 22 \$6,797,901 per C.F. 18-0713; Inflation YR 23 \$1,056,531 per C.F. 19-1006) <br> ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ICE HOCKEY AND ROLLER BLADING FACILITY | 3 | \$13,705,001 | \$13,705,001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S24 | SERRANIA PARK (Inflation YR 23 - \$215,074 and GAP YR 23 \$291,650 per C.F. 19-1006) <br> CONSTRUCT PUBLIC RESTROOMS | 3 | \$756,724 | \$756,724 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 3 TOTAL |  |  | \$14,461,725 | \$14,461,725 | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S45 | POINSETTIA RECREATION CENTER <br> (Inflation YR 13 - \$318,011) <br> ACQUIRE LAND FOR PARKING LOT, BUILDING AND LANDSCAPE REFURBISHMENT | 5 | \$2,318,011 | \$1,188,136 |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,129,875 |
| S46 | ROBERTSON RECREATION CENTER (YR 5: DESIGN) (Inflation YR 22 - $\$ 2,033,474 ;$ GAP YR 22 - $\$ 288,726$ per C.F. 19-0117; GAP YR 22 $\$ 300,000$ per C.F. 18-0713; GAP YR 23 - $\$ 500,000$ per C.F. 19-0117) <br> CONSTRUCT MODERN GYMNASIUM, COMMUNITY CENTER, CHILD CARE CENTER, PERIMETER IMPROVEMENTS | 5 | \$6,122,200 | \$6,122,200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 5 TOTAL |  |  | \$8,440,211 | \$7,310,336 | \$0 | so | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,129,875 |
| S60 | ROGER JESSUP RECREATION CENTER <br> (Includes Reprogramming from Project ID No. S63Stetson Ranch) <br> CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | 7 | \$3,935,930 | \$1,620,000 |  | \$700,000 | \$807,965 | \$807,965 |  |  |
| S63 | STETSON RANCH <br> Infeasibility Finding (Funding Capacity Reprogrammed to Project ID No. S60-Roger Jessup Recreation Center; C.F 19-1006-S1) with $\$ 500,000$ retained for facility expansion activities. <br> LAND ACQUISITION, FACILITY EXPANSION | 7 | \$1,000,000 | \$510,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 7 TOTAL |  |  | \$4,935,930 | \$2,130,000 | \$0 | \$700,000 | \$807,965 | \$807,965 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S65 | ALGIN SUTTON RECREATION CENTER (Inflation YR 20 - \$602,805) <br> CONSTRUCTION OF NEW POOL BUILDING | 8 | \$1,402,805 | \$1,402,805 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \＆SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDSYears $1-24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN，YEARS 26－30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year 27 } \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | （A List） | （B List） |  |  |  |
| S75 | VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER <br> （Inflation YR 9－\＄40，016， <br> Inflation YR 11 －$\$ 59,988$ ； <br> GAP YR 19 －\＄961，338；Inflation YR 21 －\＄316，906； <br> GAP YR 21 －$\$ 4,321,645$ ） <br> IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS， SWIMMING POOLS，CHILDREN＇S PLAY AREA， IRRIGATION | 8 | \＄6，699，893 | \＄6，699，893 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 8 TOTAL |  |  | \＄8，102，698 | \＄8，102，698 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| S76 | CENTRAL RECREATION CENTER Infeasibility Finding（Funding Capacity Reprogrammed to Project ID No．R35－Southern Pacific Trails；C．F 20－1124） <br> ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR PARK EXPANSION | 9 | \＄1，000，000 | \＄95，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S86 | TRINITY RECREATION CENTER Infeasibility Finding（Funding Capacity Reprogrammed to Project ID No．R35－Southern Pacific Trails；C．F 20－1124） <br> ACQUISITION FOR PARK EXPANSION | 9 | \＄500，000 | \＄45，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD9 TOTAL |  |  | \＄1，500，000 | \＄140，000 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| S87 | ARDMORE RECREATION CENTER，aka SEOUL INTERNATIONAL；DODGER DREAM FIELD （Inflation YR 8 －$\$ 40,000$ ） （YR 8：DESIGN GYM IMPROVEMENTS） <br> EXPAND GYMNASIUM；INSTALL FENCING AND EDGE TREATMENT | 10 | \＄1，040，000 | \＄564，875 |  |  | \＄237，563 | \＄237，562 |  |  |
| S93 | RANCHO CIENEGA SPORTS CENTER AKA MICHELLE AND BARACK OBAMA SPORTS COMPLEX <br> （GAP YR 19 －\＄1，750，000；Inflation YR 22 － <br> \＄1，720，589） <br> CONSTRUCT FITNESS ANNEX | 10 | \＄5，470，589 | \＄5，470，589 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S94 | RANCHO CIENEGA SPORTS CENTER AKA MICHELLE AND BARACK OBAMA SPORTS COMPLEX <br> （Inflation YR 5 －\＄125，509） <br> IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS， BLEACHERS，PARKING LOT，PICNIC AREA， IRRIGATION \＆FENCING | 10 | \＄1，125，509 | \＄1，125，509 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HACLA：MAR VISTA GARDENS RECREATION CD 10 TOTAL |  |  | \＄7，636，098 | \＄7，160，973 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄237，563 | \＄237，562 | S | \＄0 |
| S97 | HACLA：MAR VISTA GARDENS RECREATION CENTER（Reprogramming of YR 17 funds authorized per C．F．14－0260； Inflation YR 17 －\＄489，726） <br> CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FORCHILDREN | 11 | \＄1，789，726 | \＄1，789，726 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project ID |  |  | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS <br> Years 1-24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & \text { 2022-23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| S99 | OAKWOOD JR. ARTS CENTER <br> REFURBISH, RETROFIT AND CONVERT VENICE LIBRARY INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | 11 | \$500,000 | \$25,000 |  | \$150,000 | \$325,000 |  |  |  |
| CD 11 TOTAL |  |  | \$2,289,726 | \$1,814,726 | \$0 | \$150,000 | \$325,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S18 | CASTLE PEAK PARK (formerly CD 3) <br> (GAP YR 25 - $\$ 364,000$ ) <br> (Inflation YR 25 - \$166,000) <br> OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT, RESTROOMS | 12 | \$730,000 | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S20 | LAZY J PARK (formerly CD 3) <br> (GAP YR 25 - \$634,000) <br> (Inflation YR 25 - \$166,000) <br> OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT, RESTROOMS | 12 | \$1,000,000 | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S25 | SHADOW RANCH (formerly CD 3; <br> Refer to Bond Section - $\$ 1,332,548$ ) <br> FACILITY RENOVATION, BALL FIELD IMPROVEMENTS, FENCING, IRRIGATION | 12 | \$1,500,000 | \$150,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 12 TOTAL |  |  | \$3,230,000 | \$550,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S121 | HOLLYWOOD RECREATION CENTER <br> (Phase I-Pool Building: Inflation YR 16-\$768,885) <br> (Phase II - Gym: YR 20 - \$1,130,259) <br> CONSTRUCT MODERN GYM AND POOL BUILDINGS | 13 | \$4,899,144 | \$4,899,144 |  | \$1,286,679 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |
| CD 13 TOTAL |  |  | \$4,899,144 | \$4,899,144 | \$0 | \$1,286,679 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S78 | ENGINE COMPANY 23 ARTS CENTER <br> (Inflation YR 19-\$1,615,596; <br> GAP YR 19 - $\$ 245,852$; GAP YR 22 - $\$ 600,000$ per C.F. 18-0713; Formerly CD 9) <br> (YR 7: PREDEVELOPMENT, <br> YR 8: RETROFIT OF FIRST FLOOR) <br> REFURBISH, RETROFIT AND CONVERT ENGINE COMPANY 23 INTO AN ARTS CENTER TO SERVE YOUTH | 14 | \$4,761,448 | \$4,761,448 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S132 | HAZARD PARK <br> (Refer to Bond Section - $\$ 377,432$ ) <br> OUTDOOR DEVELOPMENT: SOCCER FIELDS, VOLLEYBALL AREA, BAR-B-Q GRILLS \& TABLES, LIGHTING, WALKWAYS | 14 | \$600,000 | \$85,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S133 | HIGHLAND PARK JR. ARTS CENTER <br> REFURBISH, RETROFIT AND CONVERT CITY BUILDING INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | 14 | \$1,800,000 | \$895,407 |  |  | \$200,000 | \$454,593 | \$250,000 |  |
| CD 14 TOTAL |  |  | \$7,161,448 | \$5,741,855 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 | \$454,593 | \$250,000 | \$0 |
| S143 | NORMANDALE RECREATION CENTER <br> ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR PARK EXPANSION | 15 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| S145 | ROSECRANS RECREATION CENTER <br> CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | 15 | \$1,300,000 | \$730,000 |  |  | \$570,000 |  |  |  |
| CD 15 TOTAL |  |  | \$3,300,000 |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$570,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LOCAL SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$68,864,950 |  | \$0 | \$2,136,679 | \$3,940,528 | \$2,300,120 | \$250,000 | \$1,129,875 |
| REGIONAL AND LOCAL SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$132,825,766 |  | \$2,136,679 | \$4,977,875 | \$6,996,528 | \$4,096,120 | \$1,064,275 | \$1,129,875 |
| Information Technology Agency (funding set-aside for all regions) |  |  |  |  | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| TOTAL ALL PROJECTS <br> INCLUDES ALL PREDEVELOPMENT, COMPETITIVE GRANTS, REGIONAL PROJECTS AND LOCAL PROJECTS |  |  |  |  | \$2,363,679 | \$12,015,805 | \$13,111,704 | \$9,843,297 | \$1,114,275 | \$1,179,875 |
|  | OTHER COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADMN | ADMINISTRATION | NA | \$22,500,000 | \$16,892,617 | \$723,275 | \$723,275 | \$723,275 | \$723,275 | \$723,275 | \$723,276 |
| MAINT | MAINTENANCE | NA | \$112,500,000 | \$68,916,038 | \$8,235,644 | \$5,000,000 | \$4,484,575 | \$4,484,576 | \$4,484,575 | \$4,900,000 |
| SUPP | SUPPLEMENTAL MAINTENANCE | NA |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| INF | INFLATION | NA |  | \$0 | \$5,677,402 | \$3,138,351 | \$3,479,759 | \$3,241,318 | \$4,018,074 | \$4,341,697 |
| DBT1 | DEBT SERVICE FOR SHORT TERM BOND | NA |  | \$5,486,725 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| DBT2 | DEBT SERVICE FOR LONG-TERM BOND | NA |  | \$49,800,015 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| GAP | ADDITIONAL SPECIFIED FUNDING | NA |  | \$6,816,369 | \$8,000,000 | \$4,122,569 | \$3,200,687 | \$6,707,534 | \$14,659,801 | \$13,855,152 |
| OTHER COSTS TOTAL |  |  |  | \$162,188,515 | \$22,636,321 | \$12,984,195 | \$11,888,296 | \$15,156,703 | \$23,885,725 | \$23,820,125 |
| GRAND TOTAL - PROPOSITION K ASSESSMENT FUNDS |  |  | \$750,000,000 | \$542,647,449 | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1-1 | 24TH STREET THEATER (1st Cycle) | 1 | \$26,450 | \$20,200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C139-5 | LANLT: FRANCIS AVENUE COMMUNITY | 1 | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C43-2 | LAUSD: LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL (2nd Cycle) | 1 | \$165,000 | \$165,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C140-5 | LAUSD: VISTA HERMOSA PARK (5th Cycle) | 1 | \$515,481 | \$515,481 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C119-4 | LOS ANGELES BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB | 1 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C189-7 | PICO UNION HOUSING CORP OUTDOOR | 1 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C190-7 | PICO UNION HOUSING CORP OUTDOOR | 1 | \$116,065 | \$116,065 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C44-2 | PLAZA DE LA RAZA (2nd Cycle) | 1 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C141-5 | PLAZA DE LA RAZA (5th Cycle) | 1 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C211-8 | PLAZA DE LA RAZA (8th Cycle) | 1 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C191-7 | REC \& PARKS: CYPRESS PARK COMMUNITY | 1 | \$500,000 | \$20,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C163-6 | REC \& PARKS: DOWNEY POOL (6th Cycle) | 1 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C45-2 | REC \& PARKS: DOWNEY RECREATION CENTER | 1 | \$125,000 | \$125,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C213-8 | REC \& PARKS: LINCOLN PARK PATH - | 1 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C120-4 | REC \& PARKS: MACARTHUR PARK | 1 | \$540,895 | \$540,895 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2-1 | REC \& PARKS: MOUNT OLYMPUS ACQUISITION | 1 | \$796,443 | \$796,318 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C142-5 | REC \& PARKS: NORMANDIE RECREATION | 1 | \$310,000 | \$310,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C121-4 | REC \& PARKS: TAYLOR YARDS | 1 | \$2,065,129 | \$2,065,129 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C212-8 | REC \& PARKS: ALBION RIVERSIDE PARK (8th |  | \$684,355 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C251-9 | REC \& PARKS: HIGHLAND PARK RECREATION |  | \$420,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C164-6 | REC \& PARKS: LINCOLN POOL | 1 | \$500,000 | \$0 |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 $\quad \$ 0$ |  |
| CD 1 TOTAL |  |  | \$10,264,818 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |  |  |
| C3-1 | MID-VALLEY JEOPARDY FOUNDATION, INC. (1st | 2 | \$43,130 | \$42,880 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C197-7 | REC \& PARKS: DE GARMO PARK | 2 | \$600,000 | \$100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C192-7 | REC \& PARKS: LAURELGROVE (VALLEY PLAZA) | 2 | \$350,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C51-2 | REC \& PARKS: NORTH HOLLYWOOD | 2 | \$244,938 | \$244,938 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C52-2 | REC \& PARKS: NORTH HOLLYWOOD | 2 | \$85,000 | \$85,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C53-2 | REC \& PARKS: NORTH HOLLYWOOD | 2 | \$40,000 | \$40,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C243-8 | REC \& PARKS: STRATHERN PARK NORTH | 2 | \$400,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C193-7 | REC \& PARKS: VALLEY GLEN COMMUNITY | 2 | \$480,000 | \$480,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C122-4 | REC \& PARKS: VERDUGO PEAK | 2 | \$706,478 | \$706,478 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C143-5 | REC \& PARKS: VERDUGO MOUNTAIN PARK (5th | 2 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C166-6 | REC \& PARKS: VERDUGO AREA ACQUISITION | 2 | \$1,106,484 | \$1,106,484 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C214-8 | REC \& PARKS: WHITSETT SYNTHETIC SOCCER | 2 | \$720,000 | \$720,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C4-1 | TREE PEOPLE (1st Cycle; formerly CD 5) | 2 | \$1,080,250 | \$1,080,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  |  |  |  | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 |  | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| C30-1 | \|LAUSD: BIRMINGHAM HIGH SCHOOL | 12 | \$110,731 | \$110,481 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C145-5 | LAUSD: CLEVELAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL | 12 | \$101,000 | \$101,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C76-2 | LAUSD: PATRICK HENRY MIDDLE SCHOOL | 12 | \$211,270 | \$211,270 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C131-4 | REC \& PARKS: ALISO CANYON | 12 | \$658,935 | \$658,935 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C205-7 | REC \& PARKS: ALISO CANYON PARK | 12 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C230-8 | REC \& PARKS: CHATSWORTH \& DESOTO | 12 | \$1,264,844 | \$10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C180-6 | REC \& PARKS: CHATSWORTH PARK SOUTH | 12 | \$219,433 | \$219,433 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C158-5 | REC \& PARKS: MASON PARK (5th Cycle) | 12 | \$760,400 | \$760,400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C77-2 | REC \& PARKS: NORTHRIDGE POOL | 12 | \$137,122 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C231-8 | REC \& PARKS: OAKRIDGE ESTATE (8th Cycle)DE | 12 | \$1,300,000 | \$1,300,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C31-1 | REC \& PARKS: PEDLOW FIELD SKATEBOARD | 12 | \$344,741 | \$336,916 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C108-3 | REC \& PARKS: PEDLOW SKATE PARK | 12 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C32-1 | YMCA NORTH VALLEY FAMILY BRANCH | 12 | \$960,000 | \$960,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C256-9 | REC \& PARKS: NORTHRIDGE RECREATION | 12 | \$450,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 12 TOTAL |  |  | \$8,768,476 | \$6,918,435 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C109-3 | CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL LOS ANGELES CHILD | 13 | \$66,338 | \$66,338 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C181-6 | CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE, INC. | 13 | \$550,000 | \$550,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C206-7 | CHILDRENS HOSPITAL LOS ANGELES | 13 | \$800,660 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C33-1 | EL CENTRO DEL PUEBLO | 13 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C159-5 | HOLLYWOOD BEAUTIFICATION | 13 | \$0 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C34-1 | LAUSD WASHINGTON IRVING MIDDLE SCHOOL | 13 | \$1,374,700 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C182-6 | LAUSD: BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL (6th Cycle) | 13 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C207-7 | LAUSD: BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL (7th Cycle) | 13 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C132-4 | LAUSD: DAYTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | 13 | \$324,000 | \$324,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C78-2 | P.F. BRESEE FOUNDATION (2nd Cycle) | 13 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C94-3 | REC \& PARKS: ECHO PARK POOL, aka ECHO | 13 | \$3,296,400 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C79-2 | REC \& PARKS: JUNTOS PARK (2nd Cycle) | 13 | \$331,988 | \$331,988 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C234-8 | REC \& PARKS: JUNTOS PARK (8th Cycle) | 13 | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C35-1 | REC \& PARKS: LEXINGTON POCKET PARK | 13 | \$155,250 | \$155,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C36-1 | REC \& PARKS: LEXINGTON POCKET PARK | 13 | \$231,028 | \$231,028 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C81-2 | REC \& PARKS: TEMPLE-BEVERLY PARK, | 13 | \$127,788 | \$127,788 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C82-2 | REC \& PARKS: TEMPLE-BEVERLY PARK, | 13 | \$208,323 | \$208,323 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C83-2 | REC \& PARKS: TEMPLE-BEVERLY PARK, | 13 | \$97,785 | \$97,785 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C84-2 | REC \& PARKS: TEMPLE-BEVERLY PARK, | 13 | \$36,888 | \$36,888 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C133-4 | REC \& PARKS: YUCCA PARK | 13 | \$554,659 | \$554,659 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C85-2 | SEARCH TO INVOLVE PILIPINO AMERICANS | 13 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C232-8 | REC \& PARKS: ECHO PARK SKATE PARK (8th | 13 | \$500,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C253-9 | REC \& PARKS: LEMON GROVE RECREATION | 13 | \$420,000 | \$0 |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 \$0 |  |
| CD 13 TOTAL |  |  | \$10,835,807 | \$4,443,797 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |  |  |
| C37-1 | BARRIO ACTION YOUTH \& FAMILY CENTER | 14 | \$1,103,762 | \$1,097,512 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C110-3 | CAL STATE L.A. - ANNA BING ARNOLD | 14 | \$289,335 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C86-2 | HOUSING AUTHORITY: PICO ALISO | 14 | \$247,000 | \$247,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C112-3 | PARA LOS NINOS (3rd Cycle) | 14 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C87-2 | REC \& PARKS: ASCOT PARK (2nd Cycle) | 14 | \$535,250 | \$10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C88-2 | REC \& PARKS: ASCOT PARK (2nd Cycle) | 14 | \$124,486 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C160-5 | REC \& PARKS: ASCOT HILLS PARK (5th Cycle) | 14 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C236-8 | REC \& PARKS: EVERGREEN PARK ADA | 14 | \$750,000 | \$750,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C161-5 | REC \& PARKS: PECAN RECREATION CENTER | 14 | \$332,137 | \$332,137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C89-2 | REC \& PARKS: ROSE HILL PARK \& | 14 | \$211,789 | \$211,789 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C237-8 | REC \& PARKS: ROSE HILL PARK - NEW | 14 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C113-3 | SALESIAN BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF L.A. | 14 | \$118,421 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C134-4 | SALESIAN HIGH SCHOOL (4th Cycle) | 14 | \$650,000 | \$650,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C114-3 | WHITE MEMORIAL - RAINBOW CHILDREN'S | 14 | \$274,381 | \$274,381 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C135-4 | VARIETY BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB (4th Cycle) | 14 | \$400,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C183-6 | REC \& PARKS: COSTELLO POOL (6th Cycle) | 14 | \$500,000 | \$200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C184-6 | VARIETY BOYS \& GIRLS CLUB | 14 | \$376,742 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CD | TOTAL | \$7,063,303 | \$4,922,819 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C115-3 | BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF SAN PEDRO - | 15 | \$218,954 | \$218,954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C116-3 | COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY | 15 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  |  |  | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| 580 | GILBERT LINDSAY | 9 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 581 | GREEN MEADOWS RECREATION CENTER | 9 | \$3,000,000 | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 582 | HOPE AND VENICE AREA PARK (Implemented by | 9 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 583 | ROSS SNYDER | 9 | \$2,731,818 | \$2,731,818 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 584 | SLAUSON RECREATION CENTER | 9 | \$1,343,916 | \$1,343,916 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD9 TOTAL |  |  | \$1,229,874 | \$1,229,874 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 50 |
|  |  |  | \$16,556,286 | \$13,556,286 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| S70 | MANCHESTER JR. ARTS CENTER, aka Vision | 10 | \$2,332,980 | \$2,332,980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 588 | BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER | 10 | \$950,000 | \$950,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 589 | BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER | 10 | \$1,194,052 | \$1,194,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S90 | JIM GILLIAN RECREATION CENTER | 10 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 591 | LAFAYETTE PARK | 10 | \$6,719,582 | \$6,719,582 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S92 | QUEEN ANNE RECREATION CENTER | 10 | \$1,688,263 | \$1,688,263 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S95 REYIER PARK CD 10 TOTAL |  |  | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |  | S0 | \$0 |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | \$11,301,897 | \$11,301,897 | \$0 |  |  |  | \$0 \$0 |  |
| S96 | CRESTWOOD HILLS PARK | 11 | \$253,354 | \$253,354 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 598 | MAR VISTA RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$1,194,052 | \$1,194,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S100 | OAKWOOD RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$1,591,350 | \$1,591,350 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S101 | PACIFIC PALISADES RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S102 | PACIFIC PALISADES RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$817,939 | \$817,939 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S103 | RUSTIC CANYON RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S104 | STONER RECREATION CENTER | 11 | \$1,092,602 | \$1,092,602 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S105 | VISTA DEL MAR PARK | 11 | \$276,847 | \$276,847 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 11 TOTAL |  |  | \$1,242,000 | \$1,242,000 |  |  |  | \$0 |  | $50 \quad \$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | \$7,968,144 | \$7,968,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  | 0 \$0 |  |
| S107 | CHATSWORTH PARK SOUTH | 12 | \$1,215,130 | \$1,215,130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S108 | DEARBORN PARK | 12 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S109 | DEVONSHIRE HOUSE | 12 | \$817,939 | \$817,939 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S110 | GRANADA HILLS | 12 | \$3,000,000 | \$2,915,293 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S19 | KNAPP RANCH | 12 | \$231,855 | \$231,855 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S111 | MASON PARK (Inflation YR 7 - \$252,268) | 12 | \$1,552,268 | \$1,552,268 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S112 | NORTHRIDGE RECREATION CENTER | 12 | \$633,385 | \$633,385 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S114 | WINNETKA RECREATION CENTER | 12 | \$1,463,161 | \$1,463,161 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S25 SHADOW RANCH formerly CD 3; CD 12 TOTAL |  |  | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |  |  |  | \$0 |  | $50 \quad \$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | \$10,913,738 | \$9,329,031 | so | S0 | \$0 |  | 0 \$0 |  |
| S115 | BELLEVUE RECREATION CENTER | 13 | \$2,459,748 | \$2,459,748 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S116 | ECHO PARK | 13 | \$700,000 | \$700,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S117 | ECHO PARK (Inflation YR 7 - \$194,052) | 13 | \$1,194,052 | \$1,194,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S118 | ECHO PARK AREA (Inflation YR 3 - \$57,855) | 13 | \$1,007,855 | \$1,007,855 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S119 | ECHO PARK LAKE (Inflation YR 14 - \$ 381,527) | 13 | \$981,527 | \$981,527 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S122 | JUNTOS PARK | 13 | \$750,000 | \$750,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S123 | LASORDA FIELD OF DREAMS | 13 | \$1,355,424 | \$1,355,424 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S124 | LEMON GROVE | 13 | \$1,000,000 | \$553,194 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S125 VIRGIL VILLAGE (YR 6: ACQUISITION) CD 13 TTOTAL |  |  | \$2,500,000 | \$1,283,138 |  |  |  | \$0 |  | 0 \$ 0 |
|  |  |  | \$11,948,606 | \$10,284,938 | \$0 | S0 | \$0 |  | \$0 ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| S126 | ALISO PICO | 14 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S127 | ARROYO SECO (Inflation YR $13-\$ 175,747$ ) | 14 | \$925,747 | \$925,747 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S128 | EAGLE ROCK MONUMENT | 14 | \$408,969 | \$408,969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S129 | EAGLE ROCK RECREATION CENTER | 14 | \$2,985,131 | \$2,985,131 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S130 | EVERGREEN RECREATION CENTER | 14 | \$1,203,432 | \$1,203,432 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S131 | HAZARD PARK | 14 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S134 | HOLLENBECK PARK (Inflation YR 6-\$63,710) | 14 | \$463,710 | \$463,710 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S135 | PECAN PARK (Inflation YR 7 - $\$ 485,131$ ) | 14 | \$2,985,131 | \$2,985,131 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S136 | RAMON GARCIA RECREATION CENTER | 14 | \$506,708 | \$506,708 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S137 | SAN PASQUAL (Inflation YR 5 - \$50,204) | 14 | \$500,408 | \$500,408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S138 | YOSEMITE RECREATION CENTER | 14 | \$2,731,818 | \$2,731,943 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S132 | HAZARD PARK | 14 | \$600,000 |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| CD 14 TOTAL |  |  | \$15,061,054 | \$14,211,179 | so | S0 | \$0 |  |  |  |
| S139 | 109TH STREET RECREATION CENTER | 15 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  | TOTAL PROP K FUNDING AUTHORITY | PROP K FUNDS Years 1-24 |  | DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN, YEARS 26-30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE \& SCOPE | CD |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year 26 } \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (A List) | (B List) |  |  |  |
| R3 | BANNING MUSEUM (CF 09-2738) | REG | \$18,190 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R11 | ELYSIAN PARK | REG | \$714,571 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R20 | MACARTHUR PARK | REG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R27 | SOUTHEAST VALLEY ROLLER \& SKATEBOARD | REG | \$2,776,456 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R29 | SEPULVEDA BASIN (CF 09-2738) | REG | \$1,279,347 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S3 | DOWNEY RECREATION CENTER | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S7 | LINCOLN PARK (CF 09-2738) | 1 | \$24,353 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S12 | STUDIO CITY (CF 12-1670-S2) | 2 | \$3,573,300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S14 | VAN NUYS SHERMAN OAKS PARK | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S24 | SERRANIA PARK | 3 | \$500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S30 | GRIFFITH RECREATION CENTER | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S38 | WATTLES PARK (CF 10-2317) | 4 | \$25,947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S44 | PALMS RECREATION CENTER | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S45 | POINSETTIA RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$217,489 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 546 | ROBERTSON RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$3,090,099 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S47 | BLYTHE RECREATION CENTER | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S49 | BRANFORD RECREATION CENTER | 6 | \$217,489 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S51 | SEPULVEDA RECREATION CENTER | 7 | \$25,947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S52 | SUN VALLEY JR. ARTS CENTER (CF 11-1496) | 6 | \$1,624 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S62 | SEPULVEDA PARK WEST | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S65 | ALGIN SUTTON RECREATION CENTER (YR 21 - | 8 | \$3,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S70 | MANCHESTER JR. ARTS CENTER, aka Vision | 10 | \$601,020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 572 | ST. ANDREWS RECREATION CENTER | 8 | \$25,947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S73 | VAN NESS (aka JOHNNIE L. COCHRAN, JR.) | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S75 | VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S78 | ENGINE COMPANY 23 ARTS CENTER | 14 | \$5,093,430 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S79 | FRED ROBERTS RECREATION CENTER | 9 | \$561,912 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 589 | BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 593 | RANCHO CIENEGA SPORTS CENTER | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S102 | PACIFIC PALISADES RECREATION CENTER (CF | 11 | \$25,947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S109 | DEVONSHIRE HOUSE | 12 | \$25,947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S111 | MASON PARK | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S114 | WINNETKA RECREATION CENTER | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S119 | ECHO PARK LAKE (CF 10-2317) | 13 | \$31,137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S120 | GLASSELL RECREATION CENTER | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S123 | LASORDA FIELD OF DREAMS | 13 | \$243,076 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S127 | ARROYO SECO (CF 09-2738) | 14 | \$24,253 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S128 | EAGLE ROCK MONUMENT (CF 10-2317) | 14 | \$12,974 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S129 | EAGLE ROCK RECREATION CENTER | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S130 | EVERGREENRECREATION CENTER | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S133 | HIGHLAND PARK JR. ARTS CENTER | 14 | \$1,611,213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S135 | PECAN PARK | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S138 | YOSEMITE RECREATION CENTER | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S144 S146 | PECK PARK (CF 10-2317) WATTS JR. ARTS CENTER | 15 | \$51,895 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S146 | WATTS JR. ARTS CENTER | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL PROPOSITION KINTEREST | UNDING | \$23,773,563 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **k Retroactive awards of interest funds to be offset with specified funds currently reflected in 5 Year Plan in order to comply with specified funding limits. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRANT FUNDING: PROPOSITION 12-ROBERTI-Z'BERG-HARRIS FUNDING* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C94-3 | REC \& PARKS: ECHO PARK POOL, aka ECHO | 13 | \$3,296,400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C96-3 | REC \& PARKS: DELANO RECREATION CENTER | 6 | \$614,424 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C98-3 | REC \& PARKS: EPICC POOL (3rd Cycle) | 8 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C102-3 | REC AND PARKS: SOUTH SEAS HOUSE (3rd | 10 | \$661,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C111-3 | CDD BOYLE HEIGHTS YOUTH OPPORTUNITY | 14 | \$630,000 | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PROPOSITION 12 FUNDING |  |  | \$5,451,824 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM
FINAL FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEARS 26-30


PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM
FINAL A LIST OF PROJECTS (PROGRAM YEAR 26)



| PROJECT TITLE | CD | REGION | PROJECT SCOPE | total Eligible PROP K FUNDING REQUEST | REMAINING＇C LIST＇ FUNDING ELIGIBILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BARNSDALL PARK RESIDENCE A RESTORATION PHASE II | 13 | CENTRAL | Interior renovation of historic facility，landscaping and ADA improvements． | \＄680，000 | \＄680，000 |
| CD 13 Total |  |  |  | \＄680，000 | \＄680，000 |
| RAMONA GARDENS | 14 | CENTRAL | Outdoor lighting | \＄471，400 | \＄471，400 |
| CD 14 Total |  |  |  | \＄471，400 | \＄471，400 |
| GRAND TOTAL： |  |  |  | \＄13，346，400 | \＄11，540，477 |

[^0]Fiscal Impact：RAP Maintenance Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTALPROP KALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One－Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| COMPETITIVE PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C212－8 | REC \＆PARKS：ALBION RIVERSIDE PARK（8th Cycle） | 1 | \＄684，355 | \＄208，616 | \＄10，000 | \＄20，000 | \＄10，000 | \＄0 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 | \＄248，616 |
| C233－8 | REC \＆PARKS：GLASSELL PARK SOCCER FIELD（8th Cycle；formerly CD 13） | 1 | \＄625，000 | \＄27，150 | \＄5，000 | \＄10，000 |  |  | \＄42，150 | \＄21，075 | \＄42，150 | \＄42，150 | \＄42，150 | \＄42，150 | \＄42，150 |
| C251－9 | REC \＆PARKS：HIGHLAND PARK RECREATION CENTER－ SPORTS COURT LIGHTING （9th Cycle） | 1 | \＄420，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄1，500 |  |  |  | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 |
| C164－6 | REC \＆PARKS：LINCOLN POOL （6th Cycle） | 1 | \＄500，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 1 TOTAL |  |  | \＄2，229，355 | \＄239，761 | \＄16，500 | \＄30，000 | \＄10，000 | \＄0 | \＄296，261 | \＄275，186 | \＄296，261 | \＄296，261 | \＄296，261 | \＄296，261 | \＄296，261 |
| C255－9 | REC \＆PARKS：NORTH HOLLYWOOD RECREATION CENTER－SPORTS COURT LIGHTING（9th Cycle） | 2 | \＄430，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄3，000 |  |  |  | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 |
| C263－9 | REC \＆PARKS：WHITSETT FIELDS PARK－SPORTS FIELDS LIGHTING PROJECT （9th Cycle） | 2 | \＄2，000，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄3，250 |  |  |  | \＄7，245 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 2 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \＄2，430，000 | \＄7，989 | \＄6，250 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄14，239 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 | \＄6，995 |
| C257－9 | REC \＆PARKS：RESEDA PARK SPORTS COURT LIGHTING （9th Cycle） | 3 | \＄450，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄1，500 |  |  |  | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 |
| CD 3 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \＄450，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄1，500 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 | \＄5，495 |
| C195－7 | REC \＆PARKS：GRIFFITH PARK CRYSTAL SPRINGS BASEBALL FIELDS（7th Cycle） | 4 | \＄500，000 | \＄109，933 | \＄6，000 | \＄8，000 | \＄27，000 | \＄0 | \＄150，933 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C216－8 | REC \＆PARKS：GRIFFITH PARK HORTICULTURE LEARNING CENTER（8th Cycle） | 4 | \＄1，650，000 | \＄55，633 | \＄15，000 | \＄15，000 | \＄2，500 | \＄0 | \＄88，133 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄80，789 | \＄88，133 | \＄88，133 | \＄88，133 |
| C262－9 | REC \＆PARKS：VAN NUYS SHERMAN OAKS RECREATION CENTER－ SPORTS COURT LIGHTING （9th Cycle） | 4 | \＄450，000 | \＄3，995 | \＄1，500 |  |  |  | \＄5，495 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 4 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \＄2，600，000 | \＄169，561 | \＄22，500 | \＄23，000 | \＄29，500 | \＄0 | \＄244，561 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄80，789 | \＄88，133 | \＄88，133 | \＄88，133 |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & \text { 2025-26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| C248-9 | REC \& PARKS: CHEVIOT HILLS RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 5 | \$400,000 | \$3,995 | \$2,500 |  |  |  | \$6,495 | \$0 | \$5,953 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 |
| CD 5 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$400,000 | \$3,995 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,495 | \$0 | \$5,953 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 | \$6,495 |
| C259-9 | REC \& PARKS: SEPULVEDA RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 6 | \$420,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,750 |  |  |  | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 |
| C125-4 | REC \& PARKS: SHELDON ARLETA, aka CESAR CHAVEZ RECREATION COMPLEX | 6 | \$803,878 | \$138,416 | \$10,000 | \$21,500 | \$0 | \$17,055 | \$186,971 | \$186,971 | \$169,916 | \$169,916 | \$169,916 | \$169,916 | \$169,916 |
| C244-8 | REC \& PARKS: STRATHERN WETLANDS PARK SYNTHETIC SOCCERFIELD | 6 | \$1,000,000 | \$27,150 | \$5,000 | \$10,000 |  |  | \$42,150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C219-8 | REC \& PARKS: CESAR CHAVEZ RECEREATION CENTER, a.k.a Sheldon Arleta (8th Cycle) | 6 | \$1,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,500 | \$5,000 |  |  | \$91,283 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 6 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$3,223,878 | \$252,344 | \$20,250 | \$36,500 | \$0 | \$17,055 | \$326,149 | \$192,716 | \$175,661 | \$175,661 | \$175,661 | \$175,661 | \$175,661 |
| C198-7 | REC \& PARKS: HANSEN DAM BASEBALL FIELDS (7th Cycle) | 7 | \$1,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 | \$86,783 |
| C258-9 | REC \& PARKS: RITCHIE VALENS PARK - SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 7 | \$450,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,750 |  |  |  | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 |
| C221-8 | REC \& PARKS: VERDUGO HILLS POOL (8th Cycle) | 7 | \$1,000,000 | \$21,242 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$1,300 | \$0 | \$28,542 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 7 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$2,450,000 | \$108,019 | \$11,750 | \$0 | \$1,300 | \$0 | \$121,069 | \$92,528 | \$92,528 | \$92,528 | \$92,528 | \$92,528 | \$92,528 |
| C261-9 | REC \& PARKS: VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER BATHHOUSE REPLACEMENT (9th Cycle) | 8 | \$3,873,853 | \$97,104 |  |  |  |  | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 |
| C265-9 | REC \& PARKS: ALGIN SUTTON POOL AND SPLASHPAD PROJECT (9th Cycle) | 8 | \$2,128,513 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fiscal Impact: RAP Maintenance Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTALPROP KALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & \text { 2025-26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| CD 8 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$6,002,366 | \$97,104 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 | \$97,104 |
| C245-5 | REC \& PARKS: SLAUSON RECREATION CENTER LIGHTING | 9 | \$73,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C260-9 | REC \& PARKS: SOUTH PARK RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 9 | \$1,400,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 9 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$1,473,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| C246-9 | REC \& PARKS: BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD AND SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 10 | \$450,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,750 |  |  |  | \$5,745 | \$0 | \$5,266 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 | \$5,745 |
| C227-8 | REC \& PARKS: RANCHO CIENEGA (8th Cycle) | 10 | \$500,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,000 |  |  |  | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 |
| CD 10 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$950,000 | \$7,989 | \$2,750 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,739 | \$4,995 | \$10,261 | \$10,739 | \$10,739 | \$10,739 | \$10,739 |
| C229-8 | REC \& PARKS: VENICE BEACH RESTROOMS (8th Cycle) | 11 | \$750,000 | \$93,281 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 |
| CD 11 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$750,000 | \$93,281 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 | \$97,281 |
| C179-6 | REC \& PARKS: CHATSWORTH PARK NORTH (6th Cycle) (6th Cycle; Includes reprogramming of $\$ 114,707$ per C.F. 12-0479) | 12 | \$362,990 | \$82,783 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$85,283 | \$0 | \$39,088 | \$85,283 | \$85,283 | \$85,283 | \$85,283 |
| C256-9 | REC \& PARKS: NORTHRIDGE RECREATION CENTER SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 12 | \$450,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,250 |  |  |  | \$5,245 | \$5,245 | \$5,245 | \$5,245 | \$5,245 | \$5,245 | \$5,245 |
| CD 12 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$812,990 | \$86,778 | \$3,750 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$90,528 | \$5,245 | \$44,333 | \$90,528 | \$90,528 | \$90,528 | \$90,528 |
| C232-8 | REC \& PARKS: ECHO PARK SKATE PARK (8th Cycle) | 13 | \$500,000 | \$27,150 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 | \$44,150 |
| C253-9 | REC \& PARKS: LEMON GROVE RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD AND COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 13 | \$420,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,500 |  |  |  | \$5,495 | \$5,495 | \$5,495 | \$5,495 | \$5,495 | \$5,495 | \$5,495 |
| CD 13 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$920,000 | \$31,145 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 | \$49,645 |

Attachment 5

## Fiscal Impact: RAP Maintenance Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { PROP K } \\ \text { ALLOCATION } \end{gathered}$ | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Year 25 <br> 2021-22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
| C249-9 | REC \& PARKS: EAST PARK SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$2,000,000 | \$347,032 | \$5,000 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$358,032 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C250-9 | REC \& PARKS: EL SERENO ARROYO PLAYGROUND ACQUISITION (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$1,025,100 | \$54,300 | \$2,000 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$71,300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C264-9 | REC \& PARKS: YOSEMITE RECREATON CENTER SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$450,000 | \$3,995 | \$750 |  |  |  | \$4,745 | \$0 | \$4,349 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 |
| CD 14 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$3,475,100 | \$405,327 | \$7,750 | \$16,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$434,077 | \$0 | \$4,349 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 | \$4,745 |
| C247-9 | REC \& PARKS: BANNING RECREATION CENTER SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 15 | \$450,000 | \$3,995 | \$1,000 |  |  |  | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 |
| C241-8 | REC \& PARKS: WATTS CULTURAL CRESCENT (8th Cycle) | 15 | \$750,000 | \$82,783 | \$1,500 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$89,283 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 15 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$1,200,000 | \$86,778 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$94,278 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 | \$4,995 |
| COMPETITIVE GRANTS TOTAL |  |  | \$29,366,689 | \$1,594,064 | \$108,500 | \$108,000 | \$57,800 | \$19,555 | \$1,887,919 | \$832,182 | \$890,859 | \$1,019,257 | \$1,026,602 | \$1,026,602 | \$1,026,602 |


| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
| REGIONAL SPECIFIED PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R1 | ANGELS GATE PARK | REG | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R4 | BOYLE HEIGHTS SPORTS CENTER | REG | \$2,500,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,600 | \$2,500 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$91,883 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R9 | DRUM BARRACKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R12 | FERRARO SOCCER FIELDS (Inflation YR 9 - \$193,408) | REG | \$2,193,408 | \$109,933 | \$21,500 | \$30,000 | \$27,000 | \$0 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 | \$188,433 |
| R13 | GRIFFITH PARK | REG | \$5,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,500 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 | \$105,283 |
| R14 | GRIFFITH PARK PERFORMING ARTS CENTER | REG | \$3,000,000 | \$37,648 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$47,648 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R16 | HANSEN DAM | REG | \$12,024,286 | \$165,566 | \$6,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 | \$176,566 |
| R18 | LOS ANGELES RIVERFRONT PARK | REG | \$10,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 | \$93,983 |
| R20 | MACARTHUR PARK | REG | \$2,167,466 | \$137,083 |  |  |  |  | \$137,083 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R21 | MACARTHUR PARK LAKE | REG | \$600,000 | \$55,633 | \$5,000 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$64,133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R27 | SOUTHEAST VALLEY ROLLER \& SKATEBOARD RINK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R31 | SEPULVEDA BASIN - LAKE BALBOA | REG | \$2,000,000 | \$111,266 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$113,266 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL SPECIFIED PROJECT TOTAL |  |  | \$41,485,160 | \$865,478 | \$50,600 | \$68,500 | \$31,200 | \$5,000 | \$1,020,778 | \$564,265 | \$564,265 | \$564,265 | \$564,265 | \$564,265 | \$564,265 |

Prepared: May 4, 2022

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & \text { 2021-22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & \text { 2023-24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| LOCAL SPECIFIED PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S1 | ALPINE RECREATION CENTER | 1 | \$1,000,000 | \$54,300 | \$4,000 | \$2,500 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 |
| CD 1 Subtotal |  |  | \$1,000,000 | \$54,300 | \$4,000 | \$2,500 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 | \$62,800 |
| S12 | STUDIO CITY | 2 | \$3,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,783 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 2 Subtotal |  |  | \$3,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,783 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S23 | RESEDA SKATE FACILITY | 3 | \$4,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$6,000 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$91,783 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S24 | SERRANIA PARK | 3 | \$250,000 | \$54,300 | \$4,000 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$61,300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 3 Subtotal |  |  | \$4,250,000 | \$137,083 | \$10,000 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$153,083 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S45 | POINSETTIA RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$2,000,000 | \$37,648 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,500 | \$7,500 | \$50,648 | \$50,648 | \$43,148 | \$43,148 | \$43,148 | \$43,148 | \$43,148 |
| S46 | ROBERTSON RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$3,000,000 | \$109,933 | \$1,500 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 | \$113,933 |
| CD 5 Subtotal |  |  | \$5,000,000 | \$147,581 | \$3,500 | \$4,500 | \$1,500 | \$7,500 | \$164,581 | \$164,581 | \$157,081 | \$157,081 | \$157,081 | \$157,081 | \$157,081 |
| S58 | MID VALLEY MULTI-PURPOSE CENTER | 6 | \$2,525,961 | \$54,300 |  |  |  |  | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 |
|  | CD 6 Subtotal |  | \$2,525,961 | \$54,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 | \$54,300 |
| S51 | SEPULVEDA RECREATION CENTER (formerly CD 6) | 7 | \$500,000 | \$27,150 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 |
| CD 7 Subtotal |  |  | \$500,000 | \$27,150 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 | \$37,150 |
| S65 | ALGIN SUTTON RECREATION CENTER | 8 | \$800,000 | \$27,817 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 | \$31,317 |
| S75 | VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER | 8 | \$6,699,893 | \$55,633 | \$3,500 | \$5,000 |  |  | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 |
| CD 8 Subtotal |  |  | \$7,499,893 | \$83,450 | \$7,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 | \$95,450 |
| S87 | ARDMORE (AKA: SEOUL INTERNATIONAL; DODGER DREAM FIELD) RECREATION CENTER (Inflation YR 8 \$40,000) | 10 | \$1,040,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$88,283 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S93 | RANCHO CIENEGA SPORTS CENTER | 10 | \$2,000,000 | \$54,300 | \$3,000 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$59,300 | \$0 | \$59,300 | \$59,300 | \$59,300 | \$59,300 | \$59,300 |
| S94 | RANCHO CIENEGA SPORTS CENTER | 10 | \$1,125,509 | \$55,633 | \$3,500 | \$5,000 |  |  | \$64,133 | \$0 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$64,133 | \$37,411 |

Fiscal Impact: RAP Maintenance Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Maintenance Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | Year 25 <br> 2021-22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & \text { 2022-23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & \text { 2025-26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| CD 10 Subtotal |  |  | \$4,165,509 | \$192,716 | \$8,500 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$211,716 | \$0 | \$123,433 | \$123,433 | \$123,433 | \$123,433 | \$96,711 |
| S25 | SHADOW RANCH | 12 | \$200,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 |
| CD 12 Subtotal |  |  | \$200,000 | \$82,783 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 | \$84,783 |
| S121 | HOLLYWOOD RECREATION CENTER | 13 | \$3,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 |
| CD 13 Subtotal |  |  | \$3,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 | \$85,783 |
| S132 | HAZARD PARK | 14 | \$600,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,500 | \$5,000 |  |  | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 |
| CD 14 Subtotal |  |  | \$600,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,500 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 | \$91,283 |
| S143 | NORMANDALE RECREATION CENTER | 15 | \$2,000,000 | \$82,783 | \$3,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 | \$78,110 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 |
| S145 | ROSECRANS RECREATION CENTER | 15 | \$1,300,000 | \$54,300 | \$2,000 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$58,800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CD 15 Subtotal |  | \$3,300,000 | \$137,083 | \$5,000 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$149,583 | \$90,783 | \$78,110 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 | \$90,783 |
| LOCAL SPECIFIED PROJECT TOTAL |  |  | \$35,041,363 | \$1,164,795 | \$53,500 | \$47,500 | \$3,500 | \$9,000 | \$1,278,295 | \$766,913 | \$870,173 | \$882,846 | \$882,846 | \$882,846 | \$856,123 |
| REGIONAL AND LOCAL PROJECT total |  |  | \$76,526,523 | \$2,030,273 | \$104,100 | \$116,000 | \$34,700 | \$14,000 | \$2,299,073 | \$1,331,178 | \$1,434,438 | \$1,447,111 | \$1,447,111 | \$1,447,111 | \$1,420,388 |
| GRAND TOTALS - ALL PROJECTS |  |  | \$105,893,212 | \$3,624,336 | \$212,600 | \$224,000 | \$92,500 | \$33,555 | \$4,186,991 | \$2,163,359 | \$2,325,296 | \$2,466,368 | \$2,473,712 | \$2,473,712 | \$2,446,990 |
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##  <br> Fiscal Impact: RAP Operations Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Operations Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & 2026-27 \end{aligned}$ |
| C253-9 | REC \& PARKS: LEMON GROVE RECREATION CENTER SPORTS FIELD AND COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 13 | \$420,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
|  | CD 13 SUBTOTAL |  | \$920,000 | \$151,590 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 | \$170,590 | \$170,590 | \$155,590 | \$155,590 | \$155,590 | \$155,590 | \$155,590 |
| C249-9 | REC \& PARKS: EAST PARK SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$2,000,000 | \$329,685 | \$24,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$353,685 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C250-9 | REC \& PARKS: EL SERENO ARROYO PLAYGROUND ACQUISITION (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$1,025,100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C264-9 | REC \& PARKS: YOSEMITE RECREATON CENTER SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 14 | \$450,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$36,799 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
|  | CD 14 SUBTOTAL |  | \$3,475,100 | \$369,829 | \$24,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$393,829 | \$0 | \$36,799 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| C247-9 | REC \& PARKS: BANNING RECREATION CENTER SPORTS COURT LIGHTING (9th Cycle) | 15 | \$450,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| C241-8 | REC \& PARKS: WATTS CULTURAL CRESCENT (8th Cycle) | 15 | \$750,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CD 15 SUBTOTAL |  | \$1,200,000 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
|  | COMPETITIVE GRANTS TOTAL |  | \$29,366,689 | \$2,719,529 | \$175,700 | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$107,000 | \$3,012,229 | \$1,588,189 | \$1,669,198 | \$1,761,105 | \$1,761,130 | \$1,761,130 | \$1,761,130 |
| REGIONAL SPECIFIED PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R1 | ANGELS GATE PARK | REG | \$2,000,000 | \$40,144 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$80,144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R4 | BOYLE HEIGHTS SPORTS CENTER | REG | \$2,500,000 | \$147,215 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$167,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R9 | DRUM BARRACKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R12 | FERRARO SOCCER FIELDS (Inflation YR 9-\$193,408) | REG | \$2,193,408 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| R13 | GRIFFITH PARK | REG | \$5,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## W甘yפOצd Saly צO- " <br> Fiscal Impact: RAP Operations Cost Estimates for Active Projects

| Project ID | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Operations Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & 2022-23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & 2024-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| R14 | GRIFFITH PARK PERFORMING ARTS CENTER | REG | \$3,000,000 | \$588 |  |  |  |  | \$588 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R16 | HANSEN DAM (Ranger's Station: Inflation Yr 12-\$2,024,286) | REG | \$12,024,286 | \$573,407 | \$0 | \$0 | \$109,032 | \$0 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 | \$682,439 |
| R18 | LOS ANGELES RIVERFRONT PARK | REG | \$10,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R20 | MACARTHUR PARK | REG | \$2,167,466 | \$60,216 |  |  |  |  | \$60,216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R21 | MACARTHUR PARK LAKE | REG | \$600,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R27 | SOUTHEAST VALLEY ROLLER \& SKATEBOARD RINK |  |  | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| R31 | SEPULVEDA BASIN - LAKE BALBOA | REG | \$2,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL SPECIFIED PROJECT TOTAL |  |  | \$41,485,160 | \$901,857 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$129,032 | \$0 | \$1,070,889 | \$762,727 | \$762,727 | \$762,727 | \$762,727 | \$762,727 | \$762,727 |
| LOCAL SPECIFIED PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S1 | ALPINE RECREATION CENTER | 1 | \$1,000,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| CD 1 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$1,000,000 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| S12 | STUDIO CITY | 2 | \$3,000,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 2 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$3,000,000 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S23 | RESEDA SKATE FACILITY | 3 | \$4,000,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S24 | SERRANIA PARK | 3 | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD 3 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$4,250,000 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| S45 | POINSETTIA RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$2,000,000 | \$40,144 |  |  |  |  | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 | \$40,144 |
| S46 | ROBERTSON RECREATION CENTER | 5 | \$3,000,000 | \$173,214 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 | \$189,214 |
| CD 5 SUBTOTAL |  |  | \$5,000,000 | \$213,358 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 | \$229,358 |

Attachment 6

## PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM <br> Fiscal Impact: RAP Operations Cost Estimates for Active Projects



| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Project } \\ \text { ID } \end{array}$ | PROJECT TITLE | CD | TOTAL PROP K ALLOCATION | Annual Estimate of RAP Operations Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Salaries | Materials | Contractor | Other Costs | One-Time Costs | Annual Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 25 \\ & 2021-22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 26 \\ & \text { 2022-23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 27 \\ & 2023-24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 28 \\ & \text { 2024-25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 29 \\ & 2025-26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 30 \\ & \text { 2026-27 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | SPECIFIED PROJECT TOTAL |  | \$35,041,363 | \$1,264,459 | \$35,000 | \$20,000 | \$21,000 | \$5,000 | \$1,345,459 | \$1,225,027 | \$1,220,027 | \$1,220,027 | \$1,220,027 | \$1,220,027 | \$1,220,027 |
|  | REGIONAL AND LOCAL PROJECT TOTAL |  | \$76,526,523 | \$2,166,316 | \$55,000 | \$40,000 | \$150,032 | \$5,000 | \$2,416,348 | \$1,987,754 | \$1,982,754 | \$1,982,754 | \$1,982,754 | \$1,982,754 | \$1,982,754 |
|  | GRAND TOTAL - ALL PROJECTS |  | \$105,893,212 | \$4,885,845 | \$230,700 | \$40,000 | \$160,032 | \$112,000 | \$5,428,577 | \$3,575,943 | \$3,651,952 | \$3,743,859 | \$3,743,884 | \$3,743,884 | \$3,743,884 |

PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING FOR PROGRAM YEAR 26


# PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT DOCUMENT LIST* 

LIST 1: PROJECTS FOR WHICH A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION HAS BEEN PREPARED AND REQUIRE COUNCIL ACTION

1. None

LIST 2: PROJECTS FOR WHICH COUNCIL ACTION IS NOT SUBJECT TO CEQA

1. None

## LIST 3: PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY EVALUATED AND PROCESSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA

1. $\quad$ Hollywood Recreation Center Phase II (S121) - (Phased project) Construct modern gym
2. Rec \& Parks: East Park - Sports Field Lighting Aka 6th Street Bridge Park (9th Cycle) (C249-9)
3. Southern Pacific Trails (aka Slauson Connect): Beautification of Rail Road Right of Way from LA River to Coliseum, Landscaping, Trails, Irrigation

LIST 4: PROJECTS FOR WHICH A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OR MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED AND REQUIRE COUNCIL ACTION

1. Los Angeles Riverfront Park (R18) - (Phased project) Greening along area of Encino

|  | ROJECTS FOR WHICH AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, NEGATIVE DECLARATION, MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OR NOTICE OF EXEMPTION WILL BE PREPARED PRIOR TO PROJECT INITIATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Balboa Sports Complex (R2) - Construct new aquatic facility |
| 2. | Rec \& Parks: El Sereno Arroyo Playground Acquisition (9th Cycle) (C250-10) - Acquisition of Open Space To Expand The El Sereno Play Area |
| 3. | Oakwood Jr. Arts Center (S99) - Refurbish, retrofit and convert Venice Library into a Jr. arts center |
| 4. | Rim-Of-The-Valley Trails (R26) - Construction and repair of equestrian/pedestrian trail system |
| 5. | Roger Jessup Recreation Center (S60) - Construction of childcare center to enhance recreational opportunities for children |
| 6. | Southern Pacific Trails (R35) - Beautification of rail road right of way from LA River to Coliseum, landscaping, trails, irrigation |
| 7. | Rec \& Parks: Jackie Tatum/Harvard Recreation Center Lighting (10th Cycle) (C266-10) - Replace/Upgrade Existing Lighting |
| 8. | MacArthur Park Lake (R21) - Water Quality and Filtration improvements at Lake |
| 9. | Rec \& Parks: Oakridge Estate Park (10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Cycle) (C268-10) - Expansion of existing park, landscaping, walking paths, irrigation, new LED lighting, and shade structure over existing picnic areas and playground |
| 10. | Rec \& Parks: El Sereno Arroyo Community Garden Acquisition (10th Cycle) (C269-10) - Acquisition of the El Sereno Community Garden property from Caltrans |

## NON-CITY AGENCY PROJECTS TO BE FUNDED IN FY 2022-23

Note: The non-City agencies who are implementing each of these projects are responsible for complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Each project will not proceed to implementation until the non-City agencies obtain all discretionary approvals that may be necessary from the City's Planning Department and the Department of Building and Safety and any other applicable governmental entities. There is no action at this time that would require City Council approval of any CEQA compliance document.
1.

The University Corporation (C267-10) - Remove and install the moveable pool floor for adaptive and therapeutic exercises and sports for the disabled
*Note: Project scopes listed herein are for active projects receiving funding in the Fiscal Year 2022-23.
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# ENGINEER'S REPORT 

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. 96-1
(Voters Approved Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program)


## PART A introduction and definitions

On May 14, 1996, the Los Angeles City Council (the "Council") adopted an Ordinance of Intention, subject to voters' approval, to order the formation of an assessment district, "City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1" in accordance with the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code. The measure was placed on the November 5, 1996, ballot as Proposition K.

On November 5, 1996, voters in the City of Los Angeles ("City") approved Proposition K, which authorizes the formation of the City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1 and approves the levy and collection of an annual assessment of $\$ 25$ million within the District for a period of thirty years.

The District will provide funding for the acquisition, development, improvements, restoration and maintenance of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities throughout the District. Over the 30 -year funding period, a total of $\$ 615$ million is designated for capital projects in 1996 dollars. Of this amount, $\$ 298.85$ million is for projects that were specified in the ballot measure, and $\$ 143.65$ million is for competitive grants. The remaining balance of $\$ 172.5$ million is programmed for debt service on bonded projects and for award of inflation funds to eligible projects entering construction. Council must pass an ordinance by June 30th each year levying the assessment for the ensuing fiscal year. This Engineer's Report ("Report") is prepared in compliance with the requirements of Article 4 of Chapter 1 of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, Part 2 of Division 15 of the California Streets and Highways Code.

## A. 1 Five Parts of This Report:

## PART A. INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

## PART B. PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

A general description of the proposed Improvements for the 2021-22 Fiscal Year including the general nature, location, and extent of the Improvements.

## PART C. ESTIMATE OF THE COSTS OF THE IMPROVEMENTS

An estimate of the cost of the proposed Improvements and of any proposed incidental expenses to be incurred in connection with the Improvements.

## PART D. BOUNDARIES OF DISTRICT AND ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

A reduced scale copy of the assessment diagram is included.
PART E. BENEFIT ASSESSMENT FORMULA AND METHOD
A statement of the method by which the benefit to each property is determined and explained.

## A. 2 Definitions

As used in this Report, the following terms have the indicated meanings:
"Assessment" means the levy to be collected within the City upon real property on the basis of special benefits received rather than by ad valorem tax.
"Assessment District" or "District" means City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District 961, the boundaries of which are coterminous with the boundaries of the City and which was adopted by Referendum Ordinance K that was approved by the voters on November 5, 1996.
"Ballot Measure" means the Referendum Ordinance K that was approved by the City voters on November 5, 1996.
"Benefit Point" or "BP" means a unit used in calculating the proportion of the special benefit received by the land and the improvements on the land.
"CCYF" or "Commission" means the Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families, unless otherwise noted.
"City Engineer" means the Los Angeles City Engineer.
"Code" means the Streets and Highways Code of California.
"Land Use Code" means the Code that the Los Angeles County Assessor assigns to each parcel based on the zoning and the use or improvement on the parcel.
"LVNOCs" means the Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees.
"Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program" or "L.A. for Kids Program" or "Proposition K" or "Proposition K Program" means the LA. for Kids program which was established by the Ballot Measure.
"RVNOCs" means the Valley, Central, and Southern Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees.
"Steering Committee" means the Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program Steering Committee.

## A. 3 Benefit Assessment and Collections

## A.3.1 Benefit Assessment Governing Laws

Because the assessments proposed received approval of a majority of the voters prior to the passage of Proposition 218, they are exempt from the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4 of Proposition 218, but the assessment proceedings are required to follow the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972.

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 ("Act") provides for assessments for park acquisition, development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance costs against the benefited properties within the assessment district. The Act states that:
"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 Highway Code)."

The application of this method in the assessment of the various lots or parcels is shown in detail in Part E - Benefit Assessment Formula and Method.

## A.3.2 Assessment Collections

The amounts to be assessed for the expense of such acquisition, development, improvements, restoration and maintenance of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities will be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner and by the same officers as Los Angeles County ("County") property taxes are levied and collected.

All laws providing for the collection and enforcement of County taxes will be applied to the collection and enforcement of the assessments. All assessments collected will be disbursed and expended for land acquisition, capital improvements, maintenance, and servicing of the improvements in the district.

## A.3.3 Public Properties

Properties owned by public agencies such as the City, the County, the State or the federal government will not be assessed, except when such property is not devoted to a public use. Rights-of-way owned by utilities and railroad operating rights-of-way are also exempt from assessment.

## A. 4 L.A. for Kids Program Organization

## A.4.1 L.A. for Kids Steering Committee

SECTION 9 of the Ballot Measure states that:
The expenditure of assessment funds and the overall management of the program projects, which together shall be known as the L.A. FOR KIDS Program, shall be administered by the City Council or by a City entity designated by the City Council by ordinance, which shall report to the City Council annually on the status of the L.A. FOR KIDS Program and shall provide for public distribution of the annual report.

Based on this Section, the Council adopted an Ordinance on April 4, 1997, designating an entity to administer the expenditure of assessment funds and provide overall management of the L.A. for Kids Program. This entity, named the "L.A. for Kids Steering Committee", is comprised of the Mayor, the City Administrative Officer, and the Chief Legislative Analyst. The Steering Committee is chaired by the City Administrative Officer. Also designated as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Steering Committee are: the General Manager of the Department of Recreation and Parks; the General Manager of the Department of Cultural Affairs; the General Manager of the Library Department; a City Council staff person appointed by the President of the City Council; and the City Engineer. The April 4, 1997 Ordinance was subsequently amended to designate the Steering Committee as the entity to oversee all matters relative to the State Proposition 12 and Proposition 40, and County Proposition A and Measure A measures, which were previously approved by the electorate. Each of the Steering Committee members and the ex-officio members may designate someone to act on that member's behalf.

The Steering Committee shall have the following duties and responsibilities and such others as the City Council may add:
(a) Administer the expenditure of assessment funds and be responsible for the overall management of the L.A. for Kids Program;
(b) Submit an annual plan of projects to Council for approval, which will include, but not be limited to, identification of the general nature, location, and extent of acquisition and improvements for all projects to be funded in the year and priorities for the long-term;
(c) Submit recommendations on the composition of Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees for projects in Regional Parks;
(d) Develop financing alternatives;
(e) Submit an annual report to the Council on the status of the L.A. for Kids Program and provide for public distribution of the annual report; and
(f) Oversee the following activities:
(1) Monitoring of the status of projects, costs and schedules of Proposition K funded projects in the participating City departments and commissions;
(2) Preparation of the annual City Engineer assessment report by the Bureau of Engineering ("BOE"); and
(3) Development of computer tapes to be sent to the County Assessor each year by the Information Technology Agency.

The Steering Committee will administer all trust or special funds in which Proposition K assessment funds are deposited. Staffing for the work of the Steering Committee will be provided by the City Administrative Officer ("CAO").

## A.4.2 Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees

The Ballot Measure envisioned that community participation and oversight would be vital to the success of the L.A. for Kids Program. Section 10 of the Measure states,
"The City Council shall establish Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees in various areas of the City to advise the City on setting priorities for when projects will be done, advise on the design of projects and prepare annual reports to the City Council on the status of projects."

Two tiers of Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees have been approved:

1. Regional committees to advise the Steering Committee on when projects will be done.
2. Local committees to advise on the design of projects and to prepare annual reports to Council on the status of the projects.

## A.4.3 Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees (RVNOCs)

The Council established three regional committees: Valley, Central, and Southern regions. It is important that community members on the regional committees, also known as Regional Volunteer

Neighborhood Oversight Committees ("RVNOCs") have a regional perspective when advising on priorities. The RVNOCs have the following key elements:

- There are 3 RVNOCs with approximately 10 members each;
- The RVNOC members are appointees of Council offices. Each Council Office has 2 appointees who live, operate a business, or own property within their Council District;
- The CAO is responsible for coordinating and convening the RVNOCs.
- Boundaries of the three regions closely follow Council District boundaries and the numbers of RVNOC committee members in each region are composed as follows:

Composition of Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees

|  | Valley Regional <br> Volunteer Neighborhood <br> Oversight Committee | Central Regional <br> Volunteer Neighborhood <br> Oversight Committee | Southern Regional <br> Volunteer Neighborhood <br> Oversight Committee |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CD $2=$ | 2 members | CD $1=$ | 2 members | CD $8=$ | 2 members |
| CD 3 $=$ | 2 members | CD $4=$ | 2 members | CD $9=$ | 2 members |
| CD $5=$ | 1 member | CD $5=$ | 1 member | CD $10=$ | 2 members |
| CD $6=$ | 2 members | CD $11=$ | 1 member | CD $11=$ | 1 member |
| CD $7=$ | 2 members | CD $13=$ | 2 members | CD $15=$ | 2 members |
| CD $12=$ | 2 members | CD $14=$ | 2 members |  |  |
| TOTAL $=\mathbf{1 1}$ members | TOTAL $=\mathbf{1 0}$ members | TOTAL $=\mathbf{9}$ members |  |  |  |

## A.4.4 Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees (LVNOCs)

## A.4.4.1 LVNOCs for Specified Projects

The City Council took action on April 4, 1997, to create Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees ("LVNOCs") at each park and Junior Arts Center upon Council approval of each project as part of the annual expenditure plan. The Department of Recreation and Parks ("RAP") and the Department of Cultural Affairs ("Cultural Affairs") are instructed to coordinate and to convene the LVNOCs for the projects within their respective areas of responsibilities. These Departments appoint members to the LVNOCs.

Before selecting the membership to serve on the LVNOCs, the Departments are instructed to confer with the relevant Council Offices for recommendation of potential appointees from key stakeholder groups to ensure that, to the extent feasible, the entire community is represented in the process.

## A.4.4.2 LVNOCs for Competitive Grant Projects

The Council approved the formation of one LVNOC in each Council District for those projects awarded funds through the competitive grant process, upon Council approval of each project as part of the annual expenditure plan. As noted in the chart below, these LVNOCs are comprised of seven voting members and three ex officio members. Five of the seven voting members are appointed by each Council Office (four neighborhood representatives and one youth representative). The five Council Office appointees have to live, operate a business, or own property within the Council District.

These LVNOCs are responsible for monitoring the progress of funded projects and for preparation of annual status reports to Council.

## Composition of Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees

| Type of <br> Members | Type of Representative | Appointed By | Number of <br> Members |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Voting <br> Members | Neighborhood <br> Representatives | Council Member | 4 |
|  | Youth Representative* | Council Member | 1 |
| Neighborhood <br> Representatives | RAP, Cultural Affairs, or <br> BOE for Competitive <br> Projects under BOE <br> purview | 2 |  |
|  | Council Staff <br> Representative | Council Member | $\mathbf{7}$ |
|  | Mayor's Representative | Mayor | 1 |
|  | BOE | 1 |  |

## A. 5 The Annual and Five Year or Six Year Plan Process

## 1. Departmental Annual and Six Year Plans

Each year, the City Engineer submits a list of projects for the annual expenditure plan and the Five Year Plan to the Steering Committee. From the inception of the Proposition K Program, a Five Year Plan was prepared annually. Starting with FY 2020-21, a Seven Year Plan was prepared to adequately plan for the remaining years the Proposition K Program will be in effect. For FY 2021-2022, a Six Year Plan was prepared. Being that the Proposition K program ends in year 30, for FY 2022-23, a Five Year Plan has been prepared. Based on input from RAP, Cultural Affairs and Council Offices, the Steering Committee submits a draft to the RVNOCs around September/October of each year. The annual expenditure plan in this Report is the A LIST (Attachment 2).
2. The Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees Review

The RVNOCs will each review the plan and submit their recommendations to the Steering Committee.
3. The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee Review

The Steering Committee then reviews the RVNOCs recommendations and submits the Steering Committee's recommendations to Council.

## 4. City Council Review and Approval

Council reviews and adopts the annual expenditure plan and the Five Year Plan. In the case of competitive grants, no contract can be awarded until final Council approval of the project as part of an annual expenditure plan and funds are available.

## A. 6 Competitive Grant Process

The Commission for Children, Youth and Their Families (CCYF) was designated by ordinance to administer the competitive grant process. The City Council retains the right to amend this ordinance and designate a different agency to administer that process. At its meeting of May 15, 2003, the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee recommended that responsibility for the competitive grant process be transferred from CCYF to the City Engineer. The recommendation was approved by Council (Council File 03-0515-S2), and a new ordinance was adopted. Thereafter, CCYF was no longer directly involved in the administration of the Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program.

The Ballot Measure established eight categories of competitive projects and limited the amount of funds that can be expended in these categories. Grants are available in the following eight categories, subject to availability of funding in each category:

1. Regional Recreation/Educational Facilities
2. Neighborhood At-Risk Youth Recreation Facilities
3. Youth Schools/Recreation Projects
4. Aquatic Upgrades
5. Athletic Fields
6. Lighting at Athletic Fields
7. Urban Greening
8. Acquisition of Parks and Natural Lands

## A.6.1 The $10^{\text {th }}$ COMPETITIVE GRANT PROCESS

The Request for Proposals for the Proposition K Competitive Grants - 10th Funding Cycle (10th Cycle RFP) for the award of Proposition K, HATS, and Parks First funds was originally released on February 27, 2020, with proposals due on May 28, 2020. However, due to the impact of the COVID19 pandemic, the City Council (C.F. \#20-0138) on May 26, 2020 approved the Steering Committee's recommendation to withdraw the 10th Cycle RFP for Proposition K and HATS funding and to
extend the deadline to submit proposals for the Parks First funding from May 28, 2020 to August 27, 2020.

## Parks First Trust Fund

Three (3) proposals for Parks First funding were received on August 27, 2020 from the Department of Recreation and parks (RAP), the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA), and the Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust (LANLT), as summarized in the table below:

| Council <br> District | Agency <br> Name | Project <br> Name | Project <br> Scope | Amount <br> Requested |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 13 | RAP | Barnsdall Park - <br> Restroom and Park <br> Improvements | Install a new restroom, and <br> additional park improvements which <br> may include security features, <br> lighting, and accessibility. | $\$ 3,100,000$ |
| 13 | DCA | Barnsdall Park - <br> Residence A <br> Restoration - <br> Phase II | Restoration work including interior <br> finishes, detailing, furnishings, <br> infrastructure, landscaping, ADA- <br> commensurate hardscaping for <br> public access. | $\$ 1,500,000$ |
| 13 | LANLT | Lockwood <br> Elementary <br> Community <br> School Park | New green park space at schoolyard <br> with new shade trees, grassy area, <br> running track, handball courts, <br> basketball court, benches, shaded <br> playground. | $\$ 498,600$ |

The total available Parks First funding is $\$ 3,150,010$. BOE conducted the initial eligibility review of the proposals and determined that the proposals submitted by RAP and LANLT have met the eligibility requirements and are responsive, while the proposal submitted by DCA was found to be non-responsive. DCA was notified of the proposal's non-responsiveness on September 30, 2020. DCA submitted an appeal to the Steering Committee on October 30, 2020. The Steering Committee considered the appeal at its meeting on November 19, 2020 and agreed with BOE's determination that DCA's proposal was non-responsive.

Subsequently, on February 3, 2021 Council authorized the release of the 10th Cycle RFP to award Proposition K and HATS funding on February 25, 2021 with proposals due on May 27, 2021. The total funding available for award is: $\$ 16,145,276$ (Proposition K Competitive) and $\$ 1,230,933$ (HATS).

The L.A. for Kids Program Request for Proposals ("RFP") for the $10^{\text {th }}$ Funding Cycle for Proposition K and Health Alternatives to Smoking (HATS) Trust Fund covers Fiscal Years 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25. It was released on February 25, 2021. The deadline to submit proposals for this RFP was May 27, 2021, by 3:00 p.m.

Funding included in this RFP will be available from two (2) different sources as follows:

1. Proposition K - A total of approximately $\$ 16,145,276$ in Proposition K competitive grant funds are available in the Restricted funding category and Unrestricted funding category. In the Restricted funding categories, funding is available for projects in the following categories: (1) Youth Schools/Recreation Projects, (2) Aquatic Upgrades (3) Urban Greening and (4) Acquisition of Parks/Natural Lands. There is also $\$ 2,070,100$ in unrestricted Proposition K funds that are available to award for projects in all eight categories.
2. Health Alternatives to Smoking Trust Fund (HATS) - A total of approximately $\$ 1,230,933$ is available from the Health Alternatives to Smoking (HATS) Trust Fund. These funds are to be used for the acquisition of park land and recreation improvements in under-served areas that are within eligible census tracts as defined in the Los Angeles Administrative Code Section 5.512.

Seventeen (17) proposals were received, of which sixteen (16) proposals, totaling $\$ 18,413,400$, are requesting Proposition K funding, and one (1) proposal is requesting HATS funding in the amount of $\$ 750,000$. No proposals were submitted under the "Youth Schools/Recreation Projects" Funding Category.

After completing the first part of the two-part initial eligibility review, BOE reported to the Steering Committee on July 29, 2021 that fifteen (15) proposals have met the eligibility requirements and are
responsive with complete submission of all the required documentations, and two (2) proposals were deemed non-responsive and ineligible for the $10^{\text {th }}$ Cycle funding.

The second part of BOE's initial eligibility review would typically involve in-person site visits of the proposed projects. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, BOE notified the agencies that submitted the 15 responsive proposals on July 23, 2021 to provide a short video clip that would best describe the proposed project scope and the project site, in lieu of the in-person site visit. All video clips were received on or before the deadline of August 6, 2021.

BOE's initial eligibility review would typically involve an in-person site visit of the proposed projects. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, BOE notified the agencies that submitted the 2 responsive proposals on July 23, 2021 to provide a short video clip that would best describe the proposed project scope and the project site, in lieu of the in-person site visit. All video clips were received on or before the deadline of August 13, 2021.

Scoring panels were convened on September 21, 2021, to rate all 17 responsive proposals ( 14 for Proposition K funds, 1 for HATS funds, and 2 for Parks First Trust Funds), using the following criteria: (1) Project Description and Management; (2) Fiscal and Budgetary Review; (3) Project Readiness; (4) Service Capability; and (5) Bonus Points for various items indicated in the RFP. BOE enlisted assistance from City staff to serve as raters. Each rater signed a Conflict of Interest Statement certifying that they are not a representative, employee, board member, officer/trustee, etc., of the organizations that submitted proposals for the $10^{\text {th }}$ Cycle RFP. The scoring panels concluded their reviews and the scores were submitted to BOE on September 29, 2021.

BOE compiled a list of projects that were recommended for consideration by the Steering Committee for Proposition K and HATS funding. BOE was tasked with recommending approximately $\$ 7,902,327$ for the Central Region, $\$ 6,501,878$ for the Southern Region, and $\$ 1,741,072$ for the Valley Region. This distribution reflects the regional distribution of funds approved by the Steering Committee at its meeting on January 30, 2020, to achieve an equitable distribution of Proposition K Competitive funds throughout the City.

BOE's recommendations are formulated based on the following criteria (in no particular order):

- Project readiness
- Project description and management
- Agency received Proposition K funding in previous cycle(s)
- Project's ability to enhance the City's recreational and cultural facilities for the City's residents, especially youth and their families
- Project's score from the Scoring Panels
- Council District where the project is located
- Region of the project (Central, Southern, Valley)

Considering the funding limits of each Region, BOE staff attempted to equitably distribute funding in the best interest of the City. Staff also tried to achieve a mixture of big and small projects and projects proposed by government agencies and non-profit organizations.

The table below summarizes BOE's recommendations for the Proposition K funding for each Region and Funding Category:

| BOE Recommended Funding for Proposition K Funds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | CD | Target Distribution per Region | Category 3 | Category 4 | Category 7 | Category 8 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Youth Schools/ Recreation | Aquatic Upgrades | Urban Greening | Acquisition of Parks/ Natural Lands | Unrestricted | Total <br> Funding Capacity |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \$ 10,650,619 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \$ 500,000 \end{aligned}$ | Capacity \$195,823 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \$ 2,728,734 \end{gathered}$ | Capacity $\$ 2,070,100$ | \$16,145,276 |
| Central | 14 | \$7,902,237 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,985,000 | \$0 | \$1,985,000 |
| Southern | 8 | \$6,501,878 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,805,923 | \$1,805,923 |
| Valley | 12 | \$1,741,072 | \$0 | \$172,000 | \$195,823 | \$0 | \$264,177 | \$632,000 |
| Total Recommended Funding per Category |  |  | \$0 | \$172,000 | \$195,823 | \$1,985,000 | \$2,070,100 | \$4,422,923 |
| Remaining Funding Capacity per Category |  |  | \$10,650,619 | \$328,000 | \$0 | \$743,734 | \$0 | \$11,722,353 |

BOE's recommendations for Parks First Trust Funds was provided to the Parks First Selection Panel for their consideration in making their own recommendations for funding of projects. The Vermont/Western SNAP area falls within the boundaries of Council Districts 4, 10, and 13. The

Selection Panel is comprised of appointees from each of the Council Districts within the SNAP area. However, since a large majority of the SNAP area falls within Council District 13, Council Districts 4 and 10 agreed to allow Council District 13 to appoint all the members to the Selection Panel. The Parks First Selection Panel is comprised of five members appointed by Council District 13.

## A. 7 Administration of Contracts with Competitive Grant Awardees

There are several components to the contracts with competitive grant awardees: design, construction, and services/maintenance. With the transfer of the CCYF competitive grant process to the City Engineer, BOE now administers all components of the contracts. Grants awarded to RAP, or any other City agency, are not part of this contracting process. Instead, City departments are responsible for conducting their own project design, construction, and maintenance as required. Nonetheless, in March 2002, the Council designated the City Engineer to be the Program Manager to oversee project and construction management for all RAP Proposition K projects.


## PART B PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

## B. 1 Five Year Plan

While a five year plan is not a requirement of Proposition K, it is an important planning tool to help City departments know when to begin the project development process. The Five Year Plan also helps to ensure that funds are distributed equitably citywide over the life of the L.A. for Kids Program. The Five Year Plan also helps to ensure that projects comply with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") prior to being approved for funding in a particular fiscal year, or as otherwise required by law. The Five Year Plan includes projects that were specified in the Ballot Measure and projects that were awarded funding in prior competitive grant cycles. The Steering Committee will submit a plan to Council each year to reflect any changes in project schedules or community needs.

The annual assessment report that is transmitted to Council for approval includes the annual expenditure plan (contained in the A LIST)(Attachment 2), the Five Year Plan (Attachment 1), the B LIST (Attachment 3), and C LIST (Attachment 4) of projects recommended for funding, all of which collectively specify in detail those acquisitions and improvements that are to be funded by the Proposition K Program. The Five Year Plan for Program Years 26 through 30 is included in this Report as Attachment 1. The A LIST (Attachment 2, also referred to as the annual expenditure plan) represents the projects and program expenditures recommended for funding in Fiscal Year 2022-2023. The A LIST includes projects that require environmental analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and for which the environmental process will be completed prior to adoption of the Ordinance Ordering Confirmation, Levy and Collection of Annual Assessment or as otherwise required by law. A Categorical Exemption, Environmental Impact Report, or Negative Declaration has been or is being prepared and a Notice of Determination has been or will be filed when applicable.

The B LIST (Attachment 3) includes specified and competitive projects in program years 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 (i.e. Fiscal Years 2022-23 through 2027-28) that may be substituted for projects in the A

LIST during Fiscal Year 2022-23 in the event it is determined by the Council that any project on the A LIST will not be implemented in the 2022-23 Fiscal Year. The C LIST (Attachment 4) contains the competitive grant projects on the alternate list recommended by the RVNOCs and approved by the Council. Similar to the B LIST, projects on the C LIST are eligible to receive funding reprogrammed from 10th Cycle competitive projects that are withdrawn, rescinded, or determined to be infeasible. The substituting of the projects on the A LIST with projects on the B LIST or the C LIST will not change the benefit analysis of the special benefit received by the assessed parcels in the City. Compliance with CEQA must be completed for projects on the B LIST and the C LIST prior to City Council approving the substitution of any of these projects for projects on the A LIST during Fiscal Year 2022-23.

## B. 2 FY 2022-23 Improvement Project List Review Process

## B.2.1 The Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees Meetings

The Regional Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees' meetings are publicly noticed and are staffed by City departments. For the Assessment for Fiscal Year 2022-23, the RVNOCs reviewed the projects specified in the Ballot Measure. The RVNOCs also assigned priority levels to each project based on information provided on the specified projects and the RVNOC members' knowledge of community needs to help the Steering Committee determine when the recommended projects should be implemented within the next six years.

## B.2.2 The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee Review Process

After receiving the recommendations from the RVNOCs, the Steering Committee conducted public hearings on the specified projects to be included in the Five Year Plan. The final Five Year Plan recommended by the Steering Committee was based on the recommendations from the RVNOCs. In accordance with Code Sections 22567 and 22568, the description of the general nature, location and extent of the items to be acquired and/or constructed is as shown in ATTACHMENTS 1, 2, 3, and 4, titled as follows:

ATTACHMENT 1: FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEARS 26-30
ATTACHMENT 2: A LIST OF PROJECTS (PROGRAM YEAR 26)
ATTACHMENT 3: B LIST OF PROJECTS FOR PROGRAM YEARS 27-30
ATTACHMENT 4: C LIST: $10{ }^{\text {th }}$ CYCLE ALTERNATIVE COMPETITIVE PROJECTS

## \$

## PART C ESTIMATE OF THE COSTS OF THE IMPROVEMENTS

## C. 1 Pre-development Costs

The Department of Recreation and Parks is responsible for conducting the environmental review required for all of their own specified projects in the Five Year Plan prior to confirmation of the Assessment for FY 2022-23, or as otherwise required by law, and may also receive assistance from the City Engineer. The City Engineer will also assist Cultural Affairs and other departments in preparation of their environmental documentation. For the competitive grants, proposers were required to submit a completed environmental review, or if they need a Negative Decoration or Environmental Impact Report, they could apply for environmental funds.

The FY 2022-23 expenditure plan provides specific predevelopment cost allocations for specified projects. Pre-development costs may include but not be limited to costs associated with initial site investigation for hazardous materials, lead paint studies, asbestos and other studies required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and appraisals for acquisition projects.

## C. 2 Maintenance Costs

Proposition K requires that funding of the capital projects authorized by the Ballot Measure be contingent upon a showing that the entity administering the project has the financial ability to provide the programming and staff for which the facilities are intended to be used. Although the Ballot Measure provides funding for the maintenance of facilities that will be constructed or improved with assessment funds, there are limited funds available for maintenance, and the remainder will have to be funded by the grantees, the General Fund, or other funding sources.

Proposition K requires that a minimum of $15 \%$ of the total funds over the life of the assessment be used for maintenance of completed projects. Maintenance funding is available for completed

Proposition K projects that were specified in the Ballot Measure as well as projects that were awarded competitive grants.

Maintenance funds for FY 2022-23 will be allocated as recommended by the Steering Committee and approved by Council prior to June 30, 2023.

## C. 3 Bonding and Bonding Costs

The Ballot Measure allowed bonds to be issued for construction and acquisition costs of any of the projects contemplated in the Proposition K Program. The advantages of bonding were:

1. More projects could be undertaken in the early years of the Proposition K Program;
2. Large projects could be funded without taking up a large portion of the Assessment in a given year; and
3. Land could be acquired during years that it is relatively low in price.

In October 1999, Council adopted procedures for issuing bonds under the Proposition K Program through adoption of City Ordinance No. 172856 (C.F.97-0031-S12). Subsequently, a total of three Proposition K bond series were issued in FYs 1999-00, 2000-01 and 2001-02 for cumulative funding of $\$ 44.29$ million. Of this amount, $\$ 43.23$ million was used to fund a total of 16 Proposition K projects, with the remaining balance of bond monies used to fund the cost of issuance and related expenses. In total, the 16 original Proposition $K$ bond projects received overall funding of $\$ 177$ million that includes funding from the following sources:

| Proposition K Bond Projects - Summary of Funding Sources (Attachment 4) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K <br> Bond Funds | Prop K <br> Assessment <br> Funds * | Prop K <br> Match <br> Deposit | Other <br> Matching <br> Funds | Other <br> Funding <br> Sources | Est. Total <br> Project Costs |
| $\$ 51,113,357$ | $\$ 4,778,964$ | $\$ 4,281,749$ | $\$ 2,798,167$ | $\$ 79,188,555$ | $\$ 142,160,792$ |

* This balance reflects the appropriation level. The actual expenditure totals \$4,586,447.

In Fiscal Year 2011-12, a Prop K financial review identified $\$ 7.93 \mathrm{M}$ as available for programming. This funding was comprised of $\$ 1.83 \mathrm{M}$ in unspent bond funds, and $\$ 6.13$ in bond interest earnings. These bond funds were made available under the Bond Ordinance to previously non-bonded

Proposition K projects. At its meeting held on February 29, 2012, the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee approved the following three priorities for use of these funds, that were subsequently approved by Council in April 2012 (C.F. 12-0479): 1) Complete minor improvements remaining under the bond program $(\$ 639,396)$; 2) Commit $\$ 5$ million on phase two of the Children's Museum/Environmental Awareness Center (CMLA/EAC) project; and, 3) Reserve $\$ 2.3$ million to address funding shortfalls on eligible Proposition K projects. In addition, in FY 2012-13, City Council added the Sheldon Arleta project to the bond program.(C.F. 12-0479-S1)

## C.3.1 LIST OF PROJECTS AND COSTS APPROVED FOR BONDING

| Project <br> (Prop K Project ID) | CD | Proposition K Funding Limit | Proposition K Bond Allocation* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. SHORT-TERM PROPOSITION K BONDS ISSUED IN 1999-00 (2000 BOND SERIES) |  |  |  |
| Rec \& Parks: Point Fermin Park (R24) | Regional | \$2,000,000 | \$1,258,505 |
| Rec \& Parks: Lincoln Park Lake (S8) | 1 | 600,000 | 532,896 |
| Rec \& Parks: Shadow Ranch (S25) | 12 | 1,500,000 | 1,332,548 |
| Rec \& Parks: Lemon Grove (S124) | 13 | 1,000,000 | 441,030 |
| Rec \& Parks: Hazard Park (S131 \& S132) | 14 | 850,000 | 754,864 |
| Subtotal |  | \$5,950,000 | \$4,319,843 |
| 2. LONG-TERM PROPOSITION K BONDS ISSUED IN 1999-00 (2000 BOND SERIES) |  |  |  |
| Rec \& Parks: South L. A Sports Activity Center (R34) | Regional | 2,192,036 | 2,192,036 |
| Victory Vineland Childcare (C5-1) | 2 | 2,100,000 | 1,687,987 |
| Rancho Cienega Childcare (C24-1) | 10 | 2,246,013 | 1,687,987 |
| Project <br> (Prop K Project ID) | CD | Proposition K Funding Limit | Proposition K Bond Allocation* |
| Santa Monica Mountains <br> Mandeville Canyon (C26-1) | 11 | \$3,000,000 | \$2,441,410 |
| LAUSD: Washington Irving Middle School (C34-1) | 13 | 1,374,700 | 1,104,988 |
|  | Subtotal | \$10,912,749 | \$9,114,408 |
| 3. LONG-TERM PROPOSITION K BONDS ISSUED IN 2000-01 (2001 BOND SERIES) |  |  |  |
| Cabrillo Aquarium (R6) | Regional | \$4,089,013 | \$4,089,013 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zoo - Children's Discovery Center } \\ & \text { (R36) } \end{aligned}$ | Regional | 11,000,000 | 4,094,143 |


| Children's Museum (C41-1) | Regional | 9,567,800 | 1,129,044 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| El Centro Del Pueblo (C33-1) | 13 | 943,240 | 763,637 |
|  | Subtotal | \$25,600,053 | \$10,075,837 |
| 4. LONG-TERM PROPOSITION K BONDS ISSUED IN 2001-02 (2002 BOND SERIES) |  |  |  |
| Children's Museum (C41-1) | Regional | (as stated above) | \$6,876,383 |
| (Griffith) Observatory (R22) | Regional | \$6,114,685 | 6,114,685 |
| Zoo - Children's Discovery Center (R36) | Regional | (as stated above) | 4,131,544 |
| Green Meadows (S81) | 8 | 3,000,000 | 2,472,506 |
| Subtotal |  | \$9,114,685 | \$19,595,118 |
| Total - Original Bond Projects |  | \$51,577,487 | \$43,105,206 |
| 5. PROJECTS ADDED TO BOND FUNDING PROGRAM IN <br> FY 2011-12 (C.F. 12-0479), FY 2012-13 (C.F. 12-0479-S1), FY 2013-14 (C.F. 12-0479-S3) |  |  |  |
| Elysian Park (R11) | Regional | \$6,439,605 | \$300,000 |
| Griffith Park (R13) | Regional | 6,383,981 | 200,000 |
| Hansen Dam (R16) | Regional | 12,436,535 | 247,883 |
| L.A. Riverfront Park (R18) | Regional | 11,640,287 | 481,156 |
| Rec \& Parks: Cypress Park Community Center (C191-7) | 1 | 500,000 | 480,000 |
| Rec \& Parks: Lincoln Pool (C164-6) | 1 | 500,000 | 210,490 |
| Rec \& Parks: Laurelgrove Park (C192-7) | 2 | 350,000 | 350,000 |
| Rec \& Parks: De Garmo Park (C197-7) | 2 | 600,000 | 500,000 |
| Project <br> (Prop K Project ID) | CD | Proposition K Funding Limit | Proposition K Bond Allocation* |
| Rec \& Parks: Strathern Park Baseball Fields (C243-8) | 2 | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| Rec \& Parks: Sheldon Arleta (C125-4) | 6 | 803,878 | 1,196,122 |
| Rec \& Parks: Strathern Wetlands Park (C244-8) | 6 | 728,539 | 728,539 |
| Andreas Pico Adobe (S55) | 7 | 1,058,813 | 680,000 |
| Sepulveda Rec. Center (S51) | 7 | 817,939 | 817,939 |


| Rec \& Parks: Harvard Rec. Center <br> (C173-6) | 8 | 712,000 | 487,000 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rec \& Parks: M.L.K. Therapeutic <br> Center Soccer Field (C199-7) | 8 | 476,022 | 856,022 |  |  |  |
| Rec \& Parks: Slauson Recreation <br> Center Lighting (C245-5) | 9 | 73,000 | 73,000 |  |  |  |
| Grand Total - All Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 3 , 9 2 0 , 5 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 0 0 8 , 1 5 1}$ |
| * Original bond allocations have been reduced to actual expenditures levels for completed bond projects listed in Sections 1 through 4 <br> of the chart above, with excess funds reprogrammed to projects listed in Section 5, as approved by Council in April 2012 and the public <br> hearing held on May 1, 2012 (C.F.12-0479). |  |  |  |  |  |  |

On June 23, 2015, Council approved the early defeasance of the three Proposition K bond series issued in 2000, 2001, and 2002 (C.F. 14-1194-S1). These funds from the City were transferred to the Trustee and Escrow Bank on June 26, 2015. Bond Counsel has deemed these bonds legally defeased. Bond funds previously authorized will be utilized to complete projects that received those funds.

## C. 4 Administration Costs

For FY 2022-23, program administration costs are funded in the amount of $\$ 723,275$. This amount will fund the collection fee paid to the County Assessor and partially reimburse certain City Departments, and the General Fund for those activities supporting the Proposition K: L.A. for Kids Program. Additional one-time funds for 2022-23 are available from prior year funds available for programming. Historically, Departments have performed various tasks that are described in Section C.5.

## C. 5 Administrative Costs for the District for FY 2022-2023

County Assessor / Auditor-Controller
\$261,172

- assess and collect Proposition $K$ funds on behalf of the City
(County charges $\$ 0.25$ per parcel $\times 781,213$ parcels + fees $)$


## Reimbursable Costs in Support of Assessment District

Dept. of Public Works - Office of Accounting
\$136,457

- process payments for competitive and specified projects under the direction of the City Engineer


## Dept. of Public Works - Bureau of Engineering

\$214,290

- perform general program management responsibilities
- attend and support Steering Committee
- attend and support Regional/Local Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees
- prepare Engineer's Report and Assessment diagrams
- provide Assessment support (response to Assessment complaints and appeals)
- prepare, negotiate, administer and monitor competitive grant agreements and maintenance funding agreements
- monitor and assist with competitive grant project construction and management
- monitor grantee compliance with services and maintenance requirements of competitive grant agreements

Chief Legislative Analyst<br>\$33,356<br>- participate and staff the Steering Committee, staff RVNOCs

## City Administrative Officer <br> \$78,000 <br> - chair and staff the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee, staff RVNOCs, administer Proposition K funds

## City Attorney

- review legal documents and advise on legal matters
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Information Technology Agency } & \mathbf{- 0} \text { - } \\ \text { - place yearly Assessment on tax roll, programming activities } & \end{array}$


## Unreimbursed Costs in Support of Assessment District

City Clerk -0-

- publish notices, schedule hearings, file construction contracts and grant agreements
Cultural Affairs Department -0 -
- oversee projects in the L.A. for Kids Program, convene LVNOCs
Department of Recreation and Parks -0 -
- provide construction management, provide information for the project management team, staff LVNOCs for RAP projects
TOTAL


## C. 6 Allocation of Accumulated Interest and Inflation Funds

Revenues for the Proposition K Program consist of the annual Assessment plus penalties and interest. The primary use of this interest is to make up shortfalls, due to taxpayer delinquencies, in the $\$ 25$ million assessed each year for program costs. A portion of the program costs is an "inflation pool" to provide for increased costs to the capital projects as a result of inflation over
the 30-year life of the Proposition K Program. The assumed inflation factor has been consistently identified as three percent (3\%) per year beginning from Year 2 of the program, with funding awards made on a current-year basis. The FY 2022-23 expenditure plan anticipated $\$ 3,982,686$ in inflation funds that would be awarded to projects prior to June 30, 2023, to fill funding shortfalls for specified projects. However, based on current award rates and project funding needs, the inflation funds awarded to projects was reduced to $\$ 2,691,245$. The FY 2022-23 budget sets aside $\$ 3,702,055$ in inflation funds that will be awarded to specified projects with shortfalls by June 30, 2023.

Excess interest can be applied to provide funding for projects with increased costs above the three percent (3\%) inflationary factor, but within some other objective inflation index, such as the Producer Price Index. Excess interest funds are distributed on a priority basis to: (1) non-bonded specified projects that have a need and have not yet received the full three percent inflation allocation of inflation pool funds, (2) non-bonded specified projects that have a need and have received the three percent allocation but may receive additional inflation funds based on an objective index, and (3) bond funded projects for the time prior to their receipt of debt service (inflation) funds.

Proposition K Program interest is awarded to projects on a current-year basis, using the above criteria. For FY 2022-23 no program interest funds were awarded to projects due to the availability of sufficient program inflation funds to offset funding gaps for projects entering construction prior to the close of FY 2022-23. Any program interest funds remaining after any potential cash adjustments required for the current year, will be retained to offset potential shortfalls in future collections that may occur as a result of the current economic downturn. This will ensure the City has access to the maximum annual funding level of $\$ 25$ million in order to support Proposition K activities including the reimbursement of eligible City expenses in the upcoming year.

## C. 7 Summary of Improvement Cost Estimate

| ITEMS | FY 2021-2022 Obligation Anticipated | FY 2022-23 Estimated Improvement Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Development | \$0 | \$0 |
| Competitive Grants | \$177,000 | \$6,987,930 |
| Regional Parks | \$2,136,679 | \$2,841,196 |
| Local Parks | \$0 | \$2,136,679 |
| Information Tech Agency for projects | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| A LIST Projects Subtotal | \$2,363,679 | \$12,015,805 |
| Administrative Cost | \$723,275 | \$723,275 |
| Maintenance Projects Cost | \$8,235,644 | \$5,000,000 |
| Supplemental Maintenance Projects Cost | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflation | \$5,677,402 | \$3,138,351 |
| Additional Specified Funding | \$8,000,000 | \$4,122,569 |
| Debt Service for Long Term Bond | \$0 | \$0 |
| Debt Service for Short Term Bond | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL ASSESSMENT ALLOCATION | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 |
| Interest allocated to projects | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL ALLOCATION | \$25,000,000 | \$25,000,000 |
| Assessment Funds Received for FY 2022-23 |  |  |
| 12/20/2022 | \$9,787,807.00 |  |
| 01/19/2023 | \$2,495,993.51 |  |
| 02/20/2023 | \$1,626,000.75 |  |
| 03/20/2023 | \$1.47 |  |
| Subtotal | \$13,909,802.70 |  |
| Balance due from County <br> $(\$ 25,000,000-\$ 13,909,802.70)$ <br> Svple | \$11,090,197.30 |  |
| Surplus or Deficit Carried over from previous year | \$0.0 |  |
| Net Assessment for FY 2022-23 |  | \$25,000,000 |
| Estimated District Total Benefit Points |  | 1,867,375 |
| Estimated Assessment Rate (\$ per Benefit Point) |  | \$13.39 |



## PART D BOUNDARIES OF DISTRICT AND ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

The boundaries of the District are coterminous with the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles. The diagram showing the exterior boundaries of the District and the lines and dimensions of each lot or parcel of land within the District has been submitted to the Clerk of the City of Los Angeles. A reduced scale copy is included in this Report. The lines and dimensions of each lot or parcel within the District are those lines and dimensions shown on the maps of the Assessor of the County of Los Angeles that support the secured tax roll for Fiscal Year 2021-22 and the available updates. The Assessor's maps and records are incorporated by reference herein and made part of this Report. In all cases, the Assessor's map shall govern for all details concerning the lines and dimensions of the parcels.

| $\$ 9,787,807.00$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ 2,495,993.51$ |
| $\$ 1,626,000.73$ |
| $\$ 1.47$ |
|  |
| $\$ 13,909,802.70$ |
| $\$ 11,090,197.30$ |




## PART E BENEFIT ASSESSMENT FORMULA AND METHOD

## E. 1 General

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 provides that assessments may be apportioned by any formula or method which fairly distributes that assessment among all assessable lots or parcels in proportion to the estimated benefits from the improvements to be received by each lot or parcel. The substituting of projects in the A LIST with projects in the B LIST or C LIST will not change the benefit analysis of the special benefit received by the assessed parcels in the City, as the full benefits are assumed to accrue over the 30 year life of the Assessment, over which time frame the benefits shall be equitably distributed citywide.

## E. 2 Improvement Benefits

## E.2.1 Benefit to Property from Park and Recreation Facilities

Studies in a number of communities, including counties and cities throughout the United States, have indicated that recreation areas and facilities, if well maintained and wisely administered, have caused a marked increase in property values of parcels in the community. Consequently, such recreation and park facilities have proved a potent factor in maintaining a sound economic condition and a high standard of livability in the community. These studies confirm the opinion long held by planning authorities as to the economic value of open spaces in a community.
"The recreation value is realized as a rise in the value of land and other property in or near the recreation area, is of both private interest to the landowner and others holding an economic stake in the area, and of public interest to the taxpayers, who have a stake in a maximum of total assessed value." (National Recreation and Park Association, June, 1985)

The benefit of parks and other recreational facilities to residential and commercial/industrial properties has been summarized by a number of studies. The United States Department of the Interior, National Park Services, in a June 1984 publication, concluded that:

- "Parks and recreation stimulate business and generate tax revenues."
- "Parks and recreation create direct and indirect job opportunities."
- "Parks and recreation help conserve land, energy, and resources."
- "An investment in parks and recreation helps reduce pollution and noise, makes communities more livable, and increases property values."
- "Public recreation benefits all employers by providing continuing opportunities to maintain a level of fitness throughout one's working life, and through helping individuals cope with the stress of a fast-paced and demanding life."

In addition, a publication of the National Recreation and Parks Association states: "Industry is demanding recreation services" and in exploring site selection is increasingly taking into account " ...the educational and recreational opportunities..." available.

Property values in a community are increased when public infrastructure such as parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities are in place, improved, operable, safe, clean and maintained. Facilities that are unsafe or destroyed by the elements or vandalism decrease surrounding property values. Park and recreation facilities are less likely to attract crime if they are well lit, clean and maintained. Clean and safe parks increase public safety, help to reduce crime and enhance the overall quality of life and desirability of an area. Property values in an area also increase when there is an increase in the number of parks, recreation centers, trail systems, sport facilities and open space areas. Conversely, property values decrease when park and recreation facilities are in disrepair, old, unsafe, unclean and unusable.

## E.2.2 Benefit to property in the District from the Improvements

Assessment law provides that the benefit must be related to the land since it is the land which must bear the Assessment. The park, open spaces, and recreational improvements proposed for the District will
specifically benefit the properties to be assessed by increasing the property value of each parcel in one or more of the following respects:

1) Increased economic value of improved property due to increased capacity to draw business, home buyers, tourists and others to the District;
2) Expanded employment opportunities and increased economic activity due to increased capacity to attract business;
3) Increased economic health of the region due to stimulation and generation of additional tax revenues;
4) Increased attractiveness of the District for development or redevelopment as a result of the preservation of mountains, foothills and canyons, and increased public access to these lands;
5) Improved environmental quality by protecting restoring and improving the District's irreplaceable beaches, wildlife parks, mountains and open space lands, and improved public access to these lands;
6) Improved air and water quality, capacity of roads, transportation and other public infrastructure systems as a result of more evenly dispersing recreational facilities throughout the District;
7) Increased attractiveness of the District as a place to work and live;
8) Improved recreational opportunities and expanded access to recreational facilities for all properties within the District, through improvements such as beaches, parks, trails and other public recreational facilities;
9) Increased safety and usability of park and recreational facilities and a corresponding decrease in crime throughout the District.

The improvements to be funded by the District are acquisition, development, improvement and restoration projects for park, recreation, beach and open space purposes. These improvement projects include: regional facilities which benefit the entire District; regional facilities which benefit large areas of the District; and neighborhood facilities which benefit smaller, local areas of the District. The improvements are distributed among these different categories of regional and local use to ensure that all areas of the District will benefit; funds for improvements are also distributed throughout all geographic areas of the District.

Regional projects, by their definition, are of area-wide benefit; therefore, the regional facilities in the City cumulatively benefit all properties within the District. As described above, the local projects are distributed throughout the proposed District and are of regional significance. The acquisition, improvement, and restoration of both local and regional parks, beaches and open space lands and recreation facilities are distributed throughout the District and therefore are of direct and specific benefit
to all parcels within the District. All areas benefit equally from the proposed improvements with benefit to parcels with varying land uses.

## E. 3 Benefit Points

To establish the benefit to the individual parcels with varying land uses, a benefit point system is used. Each land parcel and each improvement on a land parcel is assigned benefit points in proportion to the benefit the land and the improvements (as reflected in land use) receive. The total number of points is then divided into the annual revenue requirement necessary to fund the proposed improvements to determine the benefit obligation for each point. Once the number of benefit points for each parcel has been established, the benefit obligation for each parcel is established and thus the amount of Assessment for each parcel is established.

## E.3.1 Land Size Benefit

In order to fairly allocate benefit from the proposed improvements to parcels throughout the District, it is necessary to address the benefits to land and to land use. The benefit received by land varies as land varies in size. It is our finding that larger parcels benefit more than smaller parcels. To use the benefit point system, it is necessary to establish separately the benefit for each of the two elements, land size benefit and improvement benefit. To facilitate this procedure, the median single-family home is used as a standard to which all other properties are related. The median single-family home in Los Angeles City is located on a lot of approximately $1 / 7$ of an acre in area with the relative valuation between the home and lot being $75 \%$ and $25 \%$ respectively. This relative valuation is based upon the opinion of professional appraisers, appraising current market property values for real estate in Southern California. The land value portion typically ranges from 20 to 30 percent; for this Report we are using 25 percent. This valuation is based upon current market conditions, not on assessed values, which have been skewed by the impact of Proposition 13.

The lot, therefore, has $1 / 3$ the weight of the improvement (.25/.75). Assigning one benefit point to a house as the standard and using the $1 / 3$ ratio, the lot would then represent $1 / 3$ of a benefit point. See the discussion on "Land Use (Improvement) Benefits" below where one benefit point is assigned to a singlefamily house. As stated above, the median single-family home is located on a lot of approximately $1 / 7$ of an acre; therefore, the median density for single-family residential property in the City is 7 units per
acre; thus the benefit point for the typical acre occupied by single-family homes would be $7 \times 1 / 3$, or 2.33 benefit points per acre. This 2.33 benefit points per acre is used as the basis for assessing the land size benefit to all assessable parcels within the District.

## E.3.2 Land Use (Improvement)Benefit

That portion of the benefit that inures to land use or improvement value will, of course, vary with the type of land use. This benefit for land use is condensed and segregated into three categories below, and each category is assigned portions of a benefit point (BP) relative to the percentage of improvement value it provides (see discussion under "Benefit to Property from Park and Recreation Facilities" above).

| Improvement <br> Benefit | Description | Assigned <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. Economic <br> Value <br> (Econ Val) | The increase to improved property value due to increased <br> economic activity and health, expanded employment <br> opportunities and increased capacity to draw business, home <br> buyers, renters, tourists, etc. to the District. | .50 BP |
| 2. Environmental <br> Quality <br> (Envir Qual) | The increase to improved property value due to the improved <br> quality of air, water, visual aesthetics, attractiveness of the | .25 BP |
| District as a place to live and work, etc. |  |  |
| Enecreation <br> Enhancement <br> (Recr Enh) | The increase to improved property value due to the <br> availability of useable and safe parks, beaches, and recreation <br> facilities. | .25 BP |

Benefits to land uses vary; therefore, the above factors have been assigned to each land use classification as shown in Table 1 that follows later in this Report.

## E. 4 Benefit Points for Different Types of Properties

## E.4.1 Single-Family Residence

A single-family residence receives all three of the above benefits, therefore 1.0 BP is assigned to each single-family residence. The land upon which the home is located receives a separate benefit, which is 2.33 times the acreage of the lot upon which the home is situated. The benefit to a typical single-family residence is the summation of these two: i.e., one plus 2.33 times the area of the parcel in acres.

To assess land use benefit equitably, it is necessary to relate the different parcel classifications to each other. Using one benefit point for a single-family residential unit, all other uses are related to this.

## E.4.2 Multiple-Residential and Mobile Home

Multiple-residential and mobile home land use equivalents are reduced by multiplying the number of home units on each parcel by .75 and .5 , respectively, due to the relative population density of these types of dwelling units compared to the typical density of single-family units. Studies have consistently shown that an apartment unit impacts infrastructure approximately $75 \%$ as much as a single family residence, and mobile homes impact infrastructure approximately $50 \%$ as much (Sources: Institute of Transportation Engineers Informational Report Trip Generation, Fifth Edition, 1991; Metcalf and Eddy, Wastewater Engineering Treatment Disposal Reuse. Third Edition, 1991). The reduced impact on park and recreational facility use by residents of multiple-residential and mobile homes results in a lesser enhancement per unit to property values. Therefore, the Economic Value, Environmental Quality, and Recreation Enhancement benefit points for multiple-residential and mobile homes have been uniformly reduced to $75 \%$ and $50 \%$, respectively. (See Table 1 that follows later in this report)

The benefit points assigned to a multiple-residential or a mobile home parcel for the Land Use (Improvement) portion of the Assessment are calculated based on the number of housing units and the appropriate benefit point per housing unit. The benefit points for multi-residential (.75) are multiplied by the number of dwelling units ("DU") on the parcel to determine the total Land Use (Improvement) benefit points for the parcel. The total Land Use (Improvement) benefit points for a mobile home parcel are calculated by multiplying the benefit point per home unit (.50) by the number of units on the parcel. The benefit points for the land size portion of the Assessment are calculated by multiplying the land area in acres by 2.33 benefit points per acre. These two amounts are then added together to obtain the total number of benefit points for the parcel.

## E.4.3 Commercial/Industrial-Other

For determining the land use benefit points to be assigned for properties in commercial/industrial use, these properties are first related to the basic single-family unit. The median home in the District has a lot size of approximately $1 / 7$ of an acre, therefore the typical single-family residential density is seven dwelling units per acre. All properties that are developed for commercial/industrial are thus assigned seven benefit points per acre for the land use portion of the parcel. Each land use category of
commercial/industrial property is then evaluated as to whether or not the three components of the land use benefit point (i.e., Economic Value, Environmental Quality and Recreation Enhancement) apply to the particular land use category.

Commercial/industrial properties that have been found to receive the same benefits as residential properties from increased economic activity and health, expanded employment opportunities and increased capacity to attract business as residential properties receive . 50 BP for Economic Value, as do residential properties. Certain commercial/industrial properties, such as warehouses, storage facilities and mineral processing, mining and petroleum facilities, receive no economic benefit because these properties are not affected in any way by park and recreation improvements. All commercial/industrial properties benefit from increased environmental quality as a result of the improvements; therefore, all commercial/industrial properties are assigned a factor of .25 BP for Environmental Quality. Those properties, which are used by or which serve people, are benefited by improved and increased park and recreational facilities; they are assigned a factor of .25 BP for Recreational Enhancement. The assignments of these various benefit points are set forth in Table 1 that follows later in this Report.

Additionally, a higher level of use for a commercial/industrial property is identified when an improvement has multiple stories or occupies a greater percentage of the parcel than that which is the norm. To account for this, the benefit point for the property use is multiplied by a number which is proportional to the intensity of the structures and improvements contained on the property.

The typical coverage of a commercial/industrial parcel with a structure is $33 \%$. Using this as the standard, the square footage of an improvement on a parcel, as this value is set forth in the Los Angeles County Assessor's records, is divided by one-third of the area of the parcel in square feet. The number then becomes proportional to the intensity of development on the parcel and represents an equivalent number of stories that may be found on a parcel. For the purpose of identifying this factor, it is set forth as "equivalent stories" in the benefit point equation. A minimum of one "equivalent story" will be applied to any improved commercial/industrial property. When the coverage information of a commercial/industrial parcel is not available from the County Assessor's Office, the actual number of structure stories is used instead of the "equivalent stories".

## E.4.4 Vacant Property

Vacant property has no Land Use Benefits associated with it. Even if a vacant parcel is designated as commercial/industrial or residential, it receives no additional benefits because of its designation, as there are no improvements constructed upon it; therefore, vacant property receives only a Land Size Benefit of 2.33 benefit points per acre.

## E.4.5 Exempt Properties

Several land uses have been determined to be exempt from the Assessment because they either do not benefit from the proposed improvements or they have restricted uses that would not be in the public interest to acquire in the event of foreclosure. Examples are common areas, open spaces, green belts, sliver parcels, etc. Also exempt are public properties, all lands designated as agricultural, lands that have physical or legal restrictions preventing development thereon, and that portion of vacant parcels in excess of five acres. Also exempt is that portion of any partially improved single parcel that is in excess of five acres of which no use is being made. Such parcels that are partially improved will often appear on the County of Los Angeles Assessor's roll as improved.

Those parcels that are found to be so classified after field review will have their Assessments revised per this Report. This is because vacant land greater than five acres functionally serves as open space.

## E. 5 Modifications

It is recognized, that when dealing with the hundreds of thousands of parcels that will be part of this Assessment District, using the secondary information on the Los Angeles County Assessor's tapes as the primary source for the Assessment formula may lead to some errors and some circumstances that do not precisely fit the intent of this program.

Where such circumstances are discovered in data used for Assessments in the last five property tax years, either by the persons administrating this program, or by the owners of the properties affected, such circumstances will be reported to BOE (Proposition K Group, Recreational and Cultural Facilities Division). The function and the authority of BOE's Proposition K Group will be to recommend such corrections or adjustments for data used in the last five property tax years, with such proposed changes being consistent with the concept, intent and parameters of the programs set forth herein. Unless such
proposed changes are appealed to the Council, they will be incorporated into the Assessment Roll. There will be no modifications made in the data used for Assessments beyond the last five property tax years.

## E. 6 Individual Assessments

In accordance with Section 22565 et seq., of the Code, the net amount of the Assessment to each parcel, as shown on the County of Los Angeles Assessment Roll, will be computed in the following steps:

1. Classify each parcel by land use as shown on the County of Los Angeles Assessor's Roll.
2. Assign benefit points (BPs) to each parcel based on the following formulas:

## For Residential Properties:

```
Residential BPs
= Improvements BPs + Land Size BPs
=(Economic Value BP + Environmental Quality BP + Recreation Enhance BP)
* No Units + (2.33 BPs/acre) * Parcel Acreage
```


## For Commercial Properties:

## Commercial BPs

$=$ Improvement BPs + Land Size BPs
$=[($ Econ Val BP + Envir Qual BP + Recr Enh BP $) /$ acre * 7 BP * Parcel Acreage * No. Equivalent Stories (1) $]+[(2.33 \mathrm{BPs} /$ acre $) ~ * ~ P a r c e l ~ A c r e a g e ~] ~$
${ }^{(1)}$ No. Equivalent Stories is the number of stories measured by dividing the parcel's improved square feet by one-third of the parcel area (Improved Square feet/ 1/3x Parcel Square Feet).
3. Divide the annual amount to be collected by the sum of all benefit points to determine the Assessment per benefit point. For example, $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 . 4 5}$ per benefit point, a median single-family residence would have an annual Assessment of $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 . 9 3}$ (1.3329 benefit points times $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 . 4 5}=$ \$17.93).

The total assessment to be levied on each parcel will be the sum of the annual Assessment per parcel over 30 years. The Benefit Points for the annual Assessment for each parcel will remain in effect unless and until the property is reclassified into another land use category, at which time the Benefit Points for the Assessment for that parcel will be recalculated.

# ENGINEER'S REPORT <br> CITY OF LOS ANGELES <br> LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. 96-1 

(Pursuant to the Landscaping and Lighting act of 1972)
The undersigned respectfully submit the report as directed by the City Council.
DATE: $\qquad$

By
Gary Lee Moore, PE, ENV SP
City Engineer
I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Engineer's Report, together with Assessment and Assessment Diagram thereto attached, was filed with me on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022.

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk
By $\qquad$
I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Engineer's Report, together with Assessment and Assessment Diagram thereof attached, was approved and confirmed by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, California, on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022.

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk
By $\qquad$
I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Engineer's Report, together with Assessment and Assessment Diagram thereto attached, will be filed with the County Auditor of the County of Los Angeles no later than August 10, 2022.

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk
By $\qquad$
Date: $\qquad$

## TABLE 1

## City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1

Improvement Benefit Points

| County Property Tax | Economic B. P. | Environ- <br> mental <br> B. P. | Recre- <br> ation <br> B. P. | Total Improv <br> B. P. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use Code | Land Use Description |  |  |  |

## Residential

| 01 | Single Family Residential <br> $(1$ DU $=1 \mathrm{BP})$ | 0.5000 | 0.2500 | 0.2500 | 1.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $02-06$ | Multi-family residential <br> $(1$ DU $=.75 \mathrm{BP})$ | 0.3750 | 0.1875 | 0.1875 | 0.75 |
| 07,09 | Mobile Homes <br> $(1$ DU $=.5 \mathrm{BP})$ | 0.2500 | 0.1250 | 0.1250 | 0.50 |

## Commercial/Industrial

$[1$ Acre $=($ Econ Val + Envir Qual + Rec Enh $) \times 7$ BP x No. of Equivalent Stories $]$

| 17 | Office Buildings | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Hotel/Motel | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| 08 | Rooming Houses | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| 19 | Professional Buildings | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| 64 | Club, Lodge Halls, and Fraternal | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| $10,11,14-16$ | Stores, Markets, Shopping Centers | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| 12 | Store Combos | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| 13 | Department Stores | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| $20-26$ | Restaurants, Sales, Service | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| $30-32,34-36$ | Misc. Industrial | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| $61-63$ | Theaters, Bowling Alleys | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| $70-73$ | Private Schools and Churches | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 |
| $74-76$ | Hospitals, Home for the aged | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 |
| 27,38 | Parking Lots | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| 28 | Animal Kennels | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| 29 | Nurseries | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| 33,39 | Warehousing, Storage | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| $37,78,80,82,83$ | Mineral Processing, Mining, Petroleum | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| $60,65-69$ | Misc. Recreational Facilities | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |

Vacant Property (Assessed for land value only)

| V |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Exempt Property (Not Assessed for land or improved value)

| $40-59$ | Agricultural | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 77 | Cemeteries | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| $81,84-89$ | Misc. and Utilities | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## APPENDICES

## A. Sample Benefit Point (BP) Calculations:

## 1. Residential Properties:

```
Residential BPs
= [ Improvements BPs ]+ [Land Size BPs]
= [(Economic Value BP + Environmental Quality BP + Recreation Enhance BP)
* No Units ] + [(2.33 BPs/acre) * Parcel Acreage]
```

The following are examples of Residential Assessments:
Median Single Family Residence (SFR) (1 home on $1 / 7$ acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(. \mathbf{5}+\mathbf{2 5}+. \mathbf{2 5}) B P \text { funit } * 1 \text { home }]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} * \mathbf{1} / 7 \mathrm{ac}) \mathrm{BPs} \\
& =\mathbf{1} \text { Improvement } B P+\mathbf{0 . 3 3 2 9} \text { Land Size BP } \\
& =\mathbf{1 . 3 3 2 9} \mathrm{BPs}
\end{aligned}
$$

SFR (1 home on 1/4 acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(. \mathbf{5}+\mathbf{. 2 5}+\mathbf{2 5}) B P / \text { Unit } * 1 \text { home }]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} \text { BP/acre * } \mathbf{1} / \mathbf{4} \text { ac }) \\
& =\mathbf{1} \text { Improvement } B P+\mathbf{0 . 5 8 2 5} \text { Land Size } B P \\
& =\mathbf{1 . 5 8 2 5} \text { BPs }
\end{aligned}
$$

Multi-Family (MF) (25 units on $1 / 3$ acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(\mathbf{3 7 5}+\mathbf{. 1 8 7 5}+\mathbf{. 1 8 7 5}) \text { BP/unit } * \mathbf{2 5} \text { MF units }]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} \text { BP/acre } * \mathbf{1} / \mathbf{3} \text { ac }) \\
& =\mathbf{1 8 . 7 5} \text { Improvement BPs }+. \mathbf{7 7 7 7} \text { Land Size BP } \\
& =\mathbf{1 9 . 5 2 7 7} \text { BPs }
\end{aligned}
$$

Mobile Homes ( 100 units on $1 / 2$ acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(. \mathbf{2 5}+\mathbf{. 1 2 5}+\mathbf{. 1 2 5}) \text { BP/unit } * \mathbf{1 0 0} \text { homes }]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} \text { BP/ac } * \mathbf{1} / \mathbf{2} \text { acre }) \\
& =\mathbf{5 0} \text { Improvement BPs }+\mathbf{1 . 1 6 5} \text { Land Size BPS } \\
& =\mathbf{5 1 . 1 6 5} \mathrm{BPs}
\end{aligned}
$$

## 2. Commercial Properties:

## Commercial BPs

= Improvement BPs + Land Size BPs
$=[($ Econ Val BP + Envir Qual BP + Recr Enh BP)/acre * 7 BP * Parcel Acreage

* No. Equivalent Stories (1)] + [(2.33 BPs/acre) * Parcel Acreage]
${ }^{(1)}$ No. Equivalent Stories is the number of stories measured by dividing the parcel's improved square feet by one-third of the parcel area (Improved Square Feet/ 1/3 x Parcel Square Feet).

The following are examples of varying commercial or industrial Assessment calculations:
Office (3 stories, $1 / 2$ acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(.5+\mathbf{2 5}+. \mathbf{2 5}) \mathrm{BP} / \mathrm{acre} * \mathbf{3} \text { stories * } \mathbf{7} \mathrm{BP} / \mathrm{ac} * \mathbf{1} / \mathbf{2} \mathrm{ac}]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} \mathrm{BP} / \mathrm{ac} * \mathbf{1} / \mathbf{2} \mathrm{ac}) \\
& =\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \text { Improvement BPs }+\mathbf{1 . 1 6 5 0} \text { Land Size BPs } \\
& =\mathbf{1 1 . 6 6 5 0} \mathrm{BPs}
\end{aligned}
$$

Parking Lot (1 acre) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =[(\mathbf{0}+\mathbf{2 5}+\mathbf{0}) B P / a c * \mathbf{1} \text { story } * \mathbf{7} B P / a c * a c]+(\mathbf{2 . 3 3} B P / a c * \mathbf{1} a c) \\
& =\mathbf{1 . 7 5} \text { Improvement BPs }+\mathbf{2 . 3 3} \text { Land Size BPs } \\
& =\mathbf{4 . 0 8} \text { BPs }
\end{aligned}
$$

Vacant Land
$=$ Improvement BPs + Land Size BPs
$=($ Zero Improvement BPs $)+(\mathbf{2} \mathbf{3 3}$ BPs/acre $) *$ Parcel Acreage
An example of a vacant parcel's Assessment computation follows:
Vacant Land (10 Acres) BPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0 \mathrm{BP}+(2.33 \mathrm{BP} / \mathrm{acre} * 10 \mathrm{ac}) \\
& =\mathbf{0} \text { Improvement BPs }+\mathbf{2 3 . 3} \text { Land Size BPs } \\
& =\mathbf{2 3 . 3 0 0 0} \mathrm{BPs}
\end{aligned}
$$

## B. Sample Assessment Calculations:



# REFERENDUM ORDINANCE K PROPOSED REFERENDUM ORDINANCE FOR CITY-WIDE PARKS, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES ASSESSMENT 

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING FORMATION OF AN ASSESSMENT DISTRICT PURSUANT TO PROVISIONS OF<br>THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972<br>(DIVISION 15, PART 2, STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

WHEREAS, parks, recreation and community facilities in the City of Los Angeles comprise the City's youth infrastructure and are an important part of providing positive alternatives for youth; and

WHEREAS, the City's youth infrastructure is inadequate or decaying in many places, resulting in serious unmet needs for park, recreation and community facilities; and

WHEREAS, the current condition of the City's youth infrastructure is detrimental to the residential and business climate and value of real property; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the residents, business owners and operators and property owners of the City that an assessment district be formed, which is coterminous with the City, to fund the purposes of the assessment district consistent with the plan of expenditures set forth in the City Engineer's Report referred to below; and

WHEREAS, the City Council on May 14, 1996, adopted an Ordinance of Intention to order the formation of an assessment district for park and recreation improvement purposes pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and

WHEREAS, the City Council gave notice in the manner required by law of the time and place for a public meeting and a public hearing on the question of formation of the District and levy of the proposed assessment; and

WHEREAS, a public meeting was held on June 4, 1996, and a public hearing was held on July 9, 1996, and the City Council has heard protests, testimony, evidence and public comment and the City Clerk has determined that a majority protest does not exist; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance shall not take effect unless and until the question of approval of the matters set forth herein shall have been submitted to the electorate of the City and approved by a majority of voters voting on the question;

NOW THEREFORE, the People of the City of Los Angeles do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. This ordinance is adopted pursuant to Section 22594 of the California Streets and Highways Code. The City Council orders the formation of an assessment district, pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, to be known as City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District 96-1.

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby adopts, approves and confirms the final City Engineer's report filed with the City Clerk, including the diagram for the Assessment District and the Assessment. The Assessment is levied within the City in accordance with the City Engineer's Report and this Ordinance at a rate not to exceed the amount set forth in the City Engineer's Report. The City Engineer's Report describes the boundaries of the Assessment District, the locations of certain of the improvements to be funded by the District, the method and rationale for spreading the proposed assessment in proportion to the benefit received by each lot or parcel of land within the District. Each of the protests to the Assessment has been considered and is hereby denied. The City Engineer's Report is by this reference incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

SECTION 3. The City Council finds, determines and declares that:
(a) The acquisition, development, improvement, restoration and maintenance of parks, recreation and community facilities confers a direct and special benefit to all parcels in the City by improving economic, environmental, and recreational conditions and by improving the availability and utility of and access to parks, recreation and community facilities for each parcel, all resulting in maintained or enhanced property values; and
(b) The properties referred to in the City Engineer's Report which are proposed to be assessed are benefitted by the acquisitions and improvements provided for and the Assessment is spread in proportion to the benefits; and
(c) The written protests filed and not withdrawn prior to the conclusion of the public hearing do not represent property owners owning more than 50 percent of the assessable lands within the proposed district; and
(d) The public interest, convenience and necessity require the creation of the City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District 96-1 to acquire, improve and maintain parks, recreation and community facilities City-wide.

SECTION 4. As used in this Ordinance the following terms have the indicated meanings:
"Assessment" means the assessment levied within the City pursuant to this Ordinance.
"Assessment District" or "District" means City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District 96-1, the boundaries of which shall be coterminous with the boundaries of the City.
"Code" means the Streets and Highways Code of California.
"Nonprofit Organization" means any charitable organization described in Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, which has among its purposes the provision of park, recreation or community services or facilities, providing services to youth, or providing gang prevention and intervention services.
"Park" means a tract, lot or parcel of land with scenic, natural, open-space or recreational values, set apart to conserve natural, scenic, cultural, historical or ecological resources for present and future generation, and to be used by the public as a place for rest, recreation, education, exercise, inspiration or enjoyment.

SECTION 5. Funds shall be used for the purposes set forth in Attachment A hereto. Should any project become infeasible for any reason determined by the City Council or there are project savings, the City Council may reprogram the applicable funds during the process described in Section 13.

SECTION 6. In order to receive any funds pursuant to Section 5, nonprofit organizations, government entities and City departments must demonstrate the financial ability to provide programming and programming staff once the capital improvements are completed. The City Council by ordinance will establish an open and competitive process to allocate funds designated in Section 5 for competitive grants, which will be available to nonprofit organizations, governmental entities and City departments for projects within the boundaries of the City. All funds for competitive grants shall be expended equitably city-wide. Priority for competitive grants will be given to projects which address one or more of the following criteria:
(a) Include an at-risk youth component, either by including training and employment of at-risk youth to implement the project or by providing facilities to serve at-risk youth;
(b) Serve an area without similar services or facilities;
(c) Permit expansion of an established, successful program to serve a larger population or to provide an increase in services;
(d) Demonstrate community support;
(e) Demonstrate high cost-effectiveness;
(f) Demonstrate readiness of project;
(g) Demonstrate sustainability of project;
(h) Meet such other criteria as may be established by the City Council.

Regulations to administer these competitive grants shall be promulgated by an administering entity designated by the City Council by ordinance as specified in Section 9.

SECTION 7. Any park or facility acquired, developed, rehabilitated or restored with funds derived under this Ordinance shall be open and accessible to the public without discrimination as to race, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, religious belief, national origin, marital status, physical or medical handicap or medical condition.

SECTION 8. Reasonable public access to lands and facilities acquired with funds made available pursuant to this Ordinance shall be provided except where that access may interfere with resources protection. "Reasonable public access" includes, but is not limited to, parking and public restrooms.

SECTION 9. The expenditure of assessment funds and the overall management of the program projects, which together shall be known as the L.A. FOR KIDS Program, shall be administered by the City Council or by a City entity designated by the City Council by ordinance, which shall report to the City Council annually on the status of the L.A. FOR KIDS Program and shall provide for public distribution of the annual report.

SECTION 10. The City Council shall establish Volunteer Neighborhood Oversight Committees in various areas of the City to advise the City on setting priorities for when projects will be done, advise on the design of projects and prepare annual reports to the City Council on the status of the projects.

SECTION 11. The Assessment is hereby levied for a period of 30 years at the rate set forth in the City Engineer's Report to fund the acquisitions, capital improvements, and maintenance and servicing of those improvements as set forth in Section 5.

SECTION 12. For the 30 years during which the Assessment is levied and collected:
(a) $82 \%$ shall be used for acquisitions and capital improvements, as set forth in Section 5, inflationary increases over 30 years and debt service, if bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued. All funds collected through interest or penalties shall be available to cover inflationary increases in acquisition and capital improvement costs over 30 years and debt service, if bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued;
(b) 3\% of the total assessment over 30 years shall be designated for incidental costs which shall include administrative costs of the City; and
(c) $15 \%$ of the total assessment over 30 years shall be designated for maintenance of completed acquisitions and improvements.

SECTION 13. Pursuant to Code Sections 22620 through 22631, proceedings shall be taken for each year in which the annual assessment is to be levied. A plan shall be submitted to the City Council by the administering entity specified in Section 9 each year the annual assessment is to be levied specifying in detail which acquisitions and improvements are planned for that year, any proposed new acquisitions and improvements, or any substantial changes in existing improvements. The City Council
shall then order the City Engineer to prepare a report for consideration by City Council. The City Council shall then adopt an ordinance of intention pursuant to Code Section 22624 and provide notice of a public hearing pursuant to Code Section 22626. The City Council shall then adopt an ordinance confirming the diagram of the assessment and the assessment by June 30 of each fiscal year the assessment is to be levied.

SECTION 14. The City Council shall have the authority to issue bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness to fund all or a portion of the costs of the projects listed in Section 5 of this Ordinance. Such bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness may be issued in one or more series at such times and in such principal amounts as the City Council may determine in its sole discretion.

SECTION 15. (a) The Assessment for each parcel shall be collected by and be payable to the Los Angeles County Tax Collector with the general taxes levied for City and County purposes and shall be subject to the same penalties and enforcement provisions relating to general taxes or as provided in Code Section 22646.
(b) If any portion of the levy, collection or expenditure of the Assessment provided for herein is declared invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining levy, collection or expenditure shall not be affected but remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 16. There is hereby established a special fund in the City Treasury entitled Parks Assessment Fund (the "Fund"). All Assessments collected shall be deposited into the Fund and shall not be subject to reversion to the Reserve Fund. Interest, which accrues in the Fund, shall remain in the Fund. Monies deposited into the Fund shall be expended only for park, recreation and community facilities, incidental expenses, and maintenance and servicing for the improvements. Expenditures shall be made from the Fund as provided in the General City Budget or by Council resolution unless provided otherwise by ordinance.

SECTION 17. In case any provision of this Ordinance shall be found or declared invalid, illegal or unenforceable, the validity, legality and enforceability of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance shall not be affected or impaired thereby.

SECTION 18. This Ordinance shall not take effect unless approved by a majority of the voters of the City voting on the matter at a general or special election called by the City Council for such purpose. If so approved by the voters the District and the Assessment shall be deemed approved as of the date of the election, without regard to the date of certification of the election results.

## ATTACHMENT A: Proposed Project List

| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGIONAL PARKS |  |  |  |
| ANGELS GATE PARK | REG | IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN IMPROVMTS AND PERIMETER FENCING | \$2,000,000 |
| BALBOA SPORTS COMPLEX | REG | CONSTRUCT NEW AQUATIC FACILITY | \$3,000,000 |
| BANNING MUSEUM | REG | REFURBISHMENT OF BUILDING AND GARDEN IMPROVEMENTS | \$2,000,000 |
| BOYLE HEIGHTS SPORTS CENTER | REG | CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM | \$2,500,000 |
| BOYLE HEIGHTS SPORTS CENTER | REG | CREATE SOCCER STADIUM AND ENHANCE LANDSCAPING | \$1,500,000 |
| CABRILLO AQUARIUM | REG | EXPAND AND ENHANCE EDUCATION WING TO IINCLUDE MORE | \$5,000,000 |
|  |  | TEACHING LABS, DISCOVERY LAB, COLLECTION STORAGE \& H20 SYSTEM |  |
|  |  | IMPROVEMENTS |  |
| CHANDLER-BURBANK BIKEWAY | REG | BIKEWAY ALONG CHANDLER-BURBANK LINE FROM WHITEOAK | \$1,000,000 |
|  |  | AND OXNARD TO VANOWEN AND DE SOTO |  |
| DEBS PARK | REG | CREATION OF NATIVE AMERICAN "TERRACED GARDENS," | \$2,000,000 |
|  |  | MASTER PLAN PREPARATION \& IMPLEMENTATION |  |
| DRUM BARRACKS | REG | ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR PARKING LOT | \$300,000 |
| DRUM BARRACKS | REG | REMOVAL OF LEAD PAINT AND REFURBISHMENT OF BUILDING | \$500,000 |
| ELYSIAN PARK | REG | ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND, IMPROVEMENTS TO | \$5,000,000 |
|  |  | ATHLETIC FIELDS \& TRAILS, ROAD REFURBISHMENT, LIGHTING, RESTROOMS |  |
| FERRARO SOCCER FIELDS | REG | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, REST ROOMS, POTABLE \& RECLAIMED | \$2,000,000 |
|  |  | WATER, DEVELOPMENT OF PICNIC AREAS |  |
| GRIFFITH PARK | REG | IMPROVEMENTS TO ROADS, TRAILS, WATER SYSTEM, REST ROOMS, | \$5,000,000 |
|  |  | PICNIC AREAS, PAVE LIVE STEAMERS PARKING LOT |  |
| GRIFFITH PARK PERFORMING | REG | CONSTRUCT A PERFORMING ARTS CENTER FOR YOUTH | \$3,000,000 |
| ARTS CENTER |  |  |  |
| HANSEN DAM | REG | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS CENTER | \$2,500,000 |
| HANSEN DAM | REG | SOCCER COMPLEX, RV PARK, RANGER STATION/VISITOR'S CENTER, | \$10,000,000 |
|  |  | ROAD/TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS, FENCING |  |
| KEN MALLOY HARBOR REGIONAL | REG | WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | \$1,000,000 |
| PARK-LAKE |  |  |  |
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| CD | PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REG | LAND ACQUISITION, GREENING ALONG AREA OF ENCINO, SHERMAN OAKS, STUDIO CITY | \$10,000,000 |
| REG | CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA AND EQUIPMENT | \$2,000,000 |
| REG | REFURBISH BOATHOUSE, RECREATION BUILDING, SIGNAL BUILDING | \$2,000,000 |
|  | AND BANDDSHELL, FENCING AND EDGE TREATMENT |  |
| REG | WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | \$600,000 |
| REG | IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN IMPROVMTS | \$10,000,000 |
| REG | REFURBISH BUILDING AND GROUNDS, ADA ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS | \$2,000,000 |
| REG | BLOCK WALL REPAIR ON PERIMETER, RETAINING WALL, | \$2,000,000 |
|  | LIGHTHOUSE IMPROVEMENTS AND IRRIGATION UPGRADE |  |
| REG | STABILIZATION AND GRADING OF HILLSIDE AND CANYON, OUTDOOR PARK | \$5,000,000 |
|  | DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING LANDSCAPING \& IRRIGATION OF SUMMIT |  |
| REG | CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIN OF EQUESTRIAN/PEDESTRIAL TRAIL SYSTEM | \$2,000,000 |
| REG | ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ROLLER AND | \$4,000,000 |
|  | SKATEBOARD RINK IN SE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY |  |
| REG | PROPERTY ACQUISITION FOR OPEN SPACE AND REC. IN SANTA MONICA | \$5,000,000 |
|  | MOUNTAINS BETWEEN LAUREL CANYON VLBD AND 405 FREEWAY |  |
| REG | BIKEPATH; PARKING; PICNIC AND RESTROOM FACILITIES; SOCCER FIELD | \$5,000,000 |
|  | DEVELOPMENT |  |
| REG | NEW ATHLETIC FIELDS, LIGHTING, PARKING | \$1,000,000 |
| REG | UPGRADE IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO WATER CONSERVATION STANDARDS | \$2,00,000 |
| REG | CONSTRUCT MODERN FACILITY | \$1,000,000 |
| REG | PARK DEVELOPMENT | \$1,500,000 |
| REG | BEAUTIFICATION OF RAIL ROAD RIGHT OF WAY FROM LA RIVER TO | \$2,500,000 |
|  | COLISEUM, LANDSCAPING, TRAILS, IRRIGATION |  |
| REG | ACQUISITION OF BUILDING \& DEVELOPMENT | \$2,750,000 |
| REG | CONSTRUCT AND DEVELOP CHILDREN'S DISCOVERY AREA | \$11,000,000 |


| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALPINE RECREATION CENTER | 1 | PROPERTY ACQUISITION FOR PARK EXPANSION | \$1,000,000 |
| BOXING GYMNASIUM | 1 | CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BOXING GYM | \$2,000,000 |
| ECHO PARK | 1 | BUILDING REFURBISHMENT, ADA IMPROVEMENTS, OUTDOOR RESTROOMS, ROADWAYS \& PATHWAYS | \$1,000,000 |
| LINCOLN HEIGHTS JR. ARTS CENTER | 1 | REFURBISH, RETOFIT AND CONVERT CITY BUILDING INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| LINCOLN HEIGHTS YOUTH CENTER | 1 | REHABILITATE CITY BUILDING TO SERVE AS YOUTH CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| NORTHEAST ROLLER HOCKEY RINK | 1 | ACQUIRE \& CONSTRUCT NEW ROLLER HOCKEY RINK | \$3,000,000 |
| MID VALLEY MULTI-PURPOSE CENTER | 2 | ACQUIRE LAND AND CONSTRUCT NEW SENIOR CENTER | \$2,500,000 |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD | 2 | SENIOR CITIZEN CENTER, ADMINISTRATION \& SERVICE CENTER, RANGER | \$2,000,000 |
| MULTI-PURPOSE CENTER |  | SUBSTATION |  |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD SKATE FACILITY | 2 | DEVELOP ROLLER HOCKEY, SKATEBOARD, BMX FACILITY, WITH PARKING | \$1,000,000 |
| STONEHURST RECREATION CENTER | 2 | FACILITY UPGRADES | \$500,000 |
| CANOGA PARK JR. ARTS CENTER | 3 | REFURBISH, RETOFIT AND CONVERT CITY BUILDING INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$1,800,000 |
| RESEDA RECREATION CENTER | 3 | POOL BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS | \$1,000,000 |
| RESEDA SKATE FACILITY | 3 | ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ICE HOCKEY AND ROLLER BLADING FACILITY | \$4,000,000 |
| SHADOW RANCH | 3 | FACILITY RENOVATION, BALLFIELD IMPROVEMENTS, FENCING, IRRIGATION | \$1,500,000 |
| WESTHILLS PARK | 3 | PARKING LOT AND RESTROOM IMPROVEMENTS; PARK EXPANSION | \$500,000 |
| CAMPO DE CAHUENGA | 4 | FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD PARK | 4 | REFURBISHMENT OF PARKING LOT, IRRIGATION, GYM FLOOR, POOL UPGRADES, RESTROOM | \$1,000,000 |
| PAN PACIFIC PARK | 4 | GYM \& PERIMETER FENCING, IRRIGATION, SPORTSFIELD IMPROVEMENTS, WALK AND JOG PATHS, CHILD PLAY AREA | \$3,000,000 |
| ROBERT BURNS PARK | 4 | FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| RUNYON CANYON PARK | 4 | PROPERTY ACQUISITION FOR PARK EXPANSION | \$2,500,000 |
| SOUTH WEDDINGTON PARK | 4 | FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| WOODBRIDGE PARK | 4 | FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| POINSETTIA RECREATION CENTER | 5 | ACQUIRE LAND FOR PARKING LOT, BUILDING AND LANDSCAPE REFURBISHMENTS | \$2,000,000 |


| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROBERTSON RECREATION CENTER | 5 | CONSTRUCT MODERN GYMNASIUM, COMMUNITY CENTER, CHILD CARE CENTER, PERIMETER IMPROVEMENTS | \$3,000,000 |
| STUDIO CITY | 5 | CONSTRUCT MODERN GYM, COMMUNITY CENTER, LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION | \$3,000,000 |
| VAN NUYS SHERMAN OAKS PARK | 5 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION BUILDING | \$2,000,000 |
| OAKWOOD JR. ARTS CENTER | 6 | REFURBISH, RETOFIT AND CONVERT VENICE LIBRARY INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$500,000 |
| VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER | 6 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION BUILDING | \$2,000,000 |
| WESTCHESTER RECREATION CENTER | 6 | FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$1,000,000 |
| BLYTHE ST. RECREATION CENTER | 7 | ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR NEW RECREATION CENTER | \$250,000 |
| BLYTHE ST. RECREATION CENTER | 7 | CONSTRUCT RECREATION CENTER | \$2,000,000 |
| SEPULVEDA PARK WEST | 7 | ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR NEW RECREATION FACILITIES | \$1,000,000 |
| SEPULVEDA PARK WEST | 7 | CONSTRUCT NEW RECREATION FACILITIES | \$2,500,000 |
| SUN VALLEY JR. ARTS CENTER | 7 | ACQUIRE, REFURBISH, RETROFIT AND CONVERT BUILDING IN SUN VALLEY INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$1,800,000 |
| SUN VALLEY RECREATION CENTER | 7 | BUILDING REFURBISHMENTS | \$200,000 |
| ALGIN SUTTON RECREATION | 8 | CONSTRUCTION OF NEW POOL BUILDING | \$800,000 |
| CENTER |  |  |  |
| DENKER PARK | 8 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION FACILITY | \$2,500,000 |
| GREEN MEADOWS | 8 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER, SPORTS FIELD | \$3,000,000 |
| RECREATION CENTER |  | IMPROVEMENTS, FENCING |  |
| JIM GILLIAN RECREATION CENTER | 8 | BUILDING SECURITY, SECURITY FENCING, PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS, LIGHTING | \$500,000 |
| MANCHESTER JR. ARTS CENTER | 8 | REFURBISH, RETOFIT AND CONVERT CITY BUILDING INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$1,800,000 |
| CENTRAL RECREATION CENTER | 9 | BUILDING REFURBISHMENT AND PARK DEVELOPMENT | \$1,000,000 |
| CENTRAL RECREATION CENTER | 9 | ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR PARK EXPANSION | \$1,000,000 |
| ENGINE COMPANY 23 ARTS CENTER | 9 | REFURBISH, RETOFIT AND CONVERT ENGINE COMPANY 23 INTO AN ARTS CENTER TO SERVE YOUTH | \$2,300,000 |
| FORT MOORE PARK | 9 | RESTORATION OF HISTORIC FOUNTAIN THROUGH ACQUISITION OR JOINT-USE AGREEMENT WITH LAUSD | \$500,000 |
| FRED ROBERTS RECREATION CENTER | 9 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER | \$2,500,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CD = Council District } \\ & \text { REG = Regional } \\ & \text { CW = City Wide } \end{aligned}$ |  | 4 |  |



| PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: |
| ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION BLDG/GYM, PARKING LOT IMPROVMTS, SECURITY LIGHTING | \$2,500,000 |
| ACQUISITION FOR PARK EXPANSION | \$500,000 |
| EXPAND GYMNASIUM; INSTALL FENCING AND EDGE TREATMENT | \$1,000,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN, MULTI-STORY RECREATION BLDG; OUTDOOR PARK | \$5,000,000 |
| DEVELOPMENT AND RESTROOMS |  |
| ACQUISITION FOR PARK AND FACILITY EXPANSION | \$1,500,000 |
| CONSTRUCT FITNESS ANNEX | \$2,000,000 |
| FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS, LIGHTING | \$250,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS, IRRIGATION | \$500,000 |
| CONSTRUCT PUBLIC RESTROOMS | \$250,000 |
| CONSTRUCT PUBLIC RESTROOMS, IRRIGATION | \$500,000 |
| RENOVATE BUILDING, OUTDOOR LANDSCAPING | \$500,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER, REFURBISH SPORTSFIELDS | \$3,000,000 |
| FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS, SPORTSFIELD IMPROVEMENTS | \$500,000 |
| FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$200,000 |
| LAND ACQUISITION, FACILITY EXPANSION | \$1,000,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN GYM AND POOL BUILDINGS | \$3,000,000 |
| ACQUISITION FOR DEVELOPMENT INTO PARK WITH LANDSCAPING, PICNIC | \$750,000 |
| TABLES, PLAYGROUND AND RESTROOMS |  |
| ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR SOCCER FIELD | \$2,500,000 |
| CONSTRUCT YOUTH RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| CONSTRUCT MODERN GYMNASIUM FOR INDOOR SPORTS | \$1,500,000 |
| REFURBISH INTERIOR OF GYM | \$250,000 |
| REFURBISH, REFROFIT AND CONVERT CITY BUILDING INTO A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$1,800,000 |


| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PECAN PARK | 14 | CONSTRUCT A GYMNASIUM FOR INDOOR SPORTS | \$2,500,000 |  |
| YOSEMITE RECREATION CENTER | 14 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER, OUTDOOR PARK DEVELOPMENT, IRRIGATION | \$2,500,000 |  |
| EAST WILMINGTON | 15 | CONSTRUCT MODERN RECREATION CENTER | \$2,000,000 |  |
| NORMANDALE RECREATION CENTER | 15 | ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR PARK EXPANSION | \$2,000,000 |  |
| WATTS JR. ARTS CENTER | 15 | ACQUIRE AND CONSTRUCT A JR. ARTS CENTER | \$3,000,000 |  |
| WILMINGTON RECREATION CENTER | 15 | RENOVATE GYM, NEW BASEBALL FIELD AND LIGHTS, IRRIGATION, PARKING LOT | \$1,500,000 |  |
|  |  | SUBTOTAL |  | \$113,950,000 |
| COMPETITIVE GRANTS* |  |  |  |  |
| *THE CITY COUNCIL BY ORDINANCE W | TABL |  |  |  |
| AN OPEN AND COMPETITIVE PROCESS | OCAT |  |  |  |
| THESE GRANT TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZA | NS, |  |  |  |
| GOVERNMENT ENTITIES, AND CITY DE | ENTS |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL REC/EDUCATIONAL | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR THE CITY AND NONPROFITS TO DO CAPITAL | \$20,000,000 |  |
| FACILITIES |  | IMPROVEMENTS AT REGIONAL RECREATION/EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES |  |  |
| NEIGHBORHOOD AT-RISK YOUTH REC | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANT FOR THE CITY AND NONPROFITS TO DO CAPITAL | \$20,000,000 |  |
| FACILITIES |  | IMPROVEMENTS AT NEIGHBORHOOD AT-RISK YOUTH REC FACILITIES |  |  |
| YOUTH SCHOOLS/RECREATIONAL | CW | FUND RECREATIONAL IMPROVEMNTS AT SCHOOLS UNDER JOINT-USE | \$20,000,000 |  |
| PROJECTS |  | AGREEMTS WITH DEPARTMENTT OF RECREATION AND PARKS |  |  |
| AQUATICS UPGRADES | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR THE CITY AND NONPROFITS TO UPGRADE \& EXPAND POOL FACIL, WATER PLAYGROUNDS AND SLIDES | \$16,000,000 |  |
| ATHLETIC FIELDS | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR THE CITY AND NONPROFITS TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS AND COURTS | \$16,650,000 |  |
| LIGHTING | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR CITY AND NONPROFITS FOR LIGHTING OF SPORTSFIELDS, TENNIS COMPLEX AND BASEBALL DIAMONDS | \$16,000,000 |  |
| URBAN GREENING | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR CITY AND NONPROFITS FOR GREENERY FOR GRAFITTI PREVENTION, TREE PLANTING AND COMMUNITY GARDENS | \$15,000,000 |  |
| ACQUISITION OF PARKS/NATURAL | CW | COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR CITY OR CITY/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP TO ACQUIRE | \$20,000,000 |  |
| LANDS |  | LAND TO BE OWNED BY THE CITY |  |  |

## CHILD RECREATION FACILITIES

| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWNEY RECREATION CENTER | 1 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| ECHO PARK AREA | 1 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| BRANFORD RECREATION CENTER | 2 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| TARZANA RECREATION CENTER | 3 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| MAR VISTA GARDENS | 6 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL | \$1,300,000 |
| RECREATION CENTER |  | OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN |  |
| PALMS RECREATION CENTER | 6 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| VAN NESS RECREATION CENTER | 6 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| HUBERT HUMPHREY RECREATION | 7 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL | \$2,000,000 |
| CENTER |  | OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN |  |
| ROGER JESSUP RECREATION CENTER | 7 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| ALGIN SUTTON RECREATION CENTER | 8 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| EXPOSITION RECREATION CENTER | 8 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| LOREN MILLER RECREATION CENTER | 8 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| BALDWIN HILLS RECREATION CENTER | 10 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |
| MASON PARK | 12 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| WINNETKA RECREATION CENTER | 12 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| GLASSELL RECREATION CENTER | 13 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |
| EAGLE ROCK RECREATION CENTER | 14 | CONSTRUCT CHILDCARE CENTER; RENOVATION OF WALKWAYS, SLOPES, OUTDOOR STAGE, GYM, AIR CONDITIONING, IRRIGATION | \$2,500,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CD}=\text { Council District } \\ & \text { REG }=\text { Regional } \\ & \text { CW }=\text { City Wide } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |


| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVERGREEN RECREATION CENTER | 14 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$950,000 |  |
| ROSECRANS RECREATION CENTER | 15 | CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDCARE CENTER TO ENHANCE RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN | \$1,300,000 |  |
|  |  | SUBTOTAL |  | \$23,800,000 |
| ATHLETIC FIELDS/OUTDOOR DEV |  |  |  |  |
| ECHO PARK | 1 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS | \$700,000 |  |
| LINCOLN PARK | 1 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT INCLUDING ATHLETIC AND PICNIC FACILITIES, ROADWAYS, RESTROOMS, EROSION CONTROL IRRIGATION | \$2,000,000 |  |
| LINCOLN PARK LAKE | 1 | WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | \$600,000 |  |
| BRADFORD RECREATION CENTER | 2 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT; BALL DIAMONDS, PAVING, IRRIGATION, GYM FLOOR | \$1,000,000 |  |
| LITTLE LANDERS/BOLTON HALL | 2 | REFURBISH GROUNDS AND ACCESS PATHS, CONSTRUCT NEW RESTROOMS | \$1,000,000 |  |
| SEPULVEDA RECREATION CENTER | 2 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT; IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, SWIMMING POOL | \$500,000 |  |
| SUNLAND RECREATION CENTER | 2 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS; NEW FIELD RESTROOMS, PARKING IMPROVEMENTS | \$2,500,000 |  |
| CASTLE PEAK PARK | 3 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT, RESTROOMS | \$200,000 |  |
| KNAPP RANCH | 3 | SPORTSFIELD LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS | \$200,000 |  |
| LAZY J PARK | 3 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT, RESTROOMS | \$200,000 |  |
| RESEDA PARK LAKE | 3 | WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | \$600,000 |  |
| GRIFFITH RECREATION CENTER | 4 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, SWIMMING POOLS, OR RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |  |
| WATTLES PARK | 4 | EROSION AND DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS | \$500,000 |  |
| WEST WILSHIRE | 4 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, SWIMMING POOLS, OR RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |  |
| VAN NUYS SHERMAN OAKS PARK | 5 | NEW SOCCER FIELDS, REFURBISH BASEBALL FIELDS, LADSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS, IRRIGATION SYSTEM | \$2,000,000 |  |
| CHEVIOT HILLS | 6 | PERIMITER FENCING, PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS, IRRIGATION | \$1,000,000 |  |
| CHEVIOT HILLS | 6 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, SWIMMING POOLS, OR RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CD = Council District } \\ & \text { REG = Regional } \\ & \text { CW = City Wide } \end{aligned}$ |  | 8 |  |  |



| PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: |
| FENCING, SPORTSFIELDS, FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS | \$1,500,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, SWIMMING POOLS, CHILDREN'S PLAY | \$1,000,000 |
| AREA, IRRIGATION |  |
| INSTALL NEW PLAY EQUIPMENT, PICNIC AREAS | \$200,000 |
| REFURBISHMENT OF MEMORY GARDENS AND RESTROOMS | \$500,000 |
| SPORTFIELD LIGHTING | \$250,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS; NEW FIELD RESTROOMS | \$500,000 |
| ARCHITECTURAL LANDSCAPING AND BENCHES | \$500,000 |
| PARK DEVELOPMENT | \$200,000 |
| OUTDOOR SPORTS DEVELOPMENT | \$500,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO SPORTS FIELDS, FENCING, OUTDOOR RESTROOMS, | \$1,000,000 |
| BUILDING RENOVATION |  |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS OR RECREATION CENTER | \$1,000,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS; BANDSHELL IMPROVEMENTS | \$1,000,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS \& RECREATION CENTER; NEW | \$1,000,000 |
| PLAYGROUND |  |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, BLEACHERS, PARKING LOT, PICNIC | \$1,000,000 |
| AREA, IRRIGATION \& FENCING |  |
| OUTDOOR PARK DEVELOPMENT | \$250,000 |
| OUTDOOR SPORTS FIELD IMPROVEMENTS \& FENCING; PERIMETER FENCING | \$1000,000 |
| SPORTSFIELD, IRRIGATION, ASPHALT WALKWAY IMPROVEMENTS | \$500,000 |
| OUTDOOR SPORTS FIELD IMPROVEMENTS \& FENCING; PERIMETER FENCING | \$1,000,000 |
| RENOVATE OUTDOOR AREAS, RESTROOMS, LIGHTING | \$700,000 |
| OUTDOOR PARK DEVELOPMENT, PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS | \$700,000 |
| OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT | \$2,000,000 |
| OUTDOOR DEVELOPMENT, PLAY EQUIPMENT, LIGHTING, FENCING | \$250,000 |
| WATER QUALITY AND FILTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AT LAKE | \$600,000 |
| IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, FIELDHOUSE, \& RESTROOMS | \$1,000,000 |


| FACILITY | CD | PROJECT | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEMON GROVE | 13 | OUTDOOR SPORTS FIELD DEVELOPMENT | \$1,000,000 |
| ARROYO SECO | 14 | OUTDOOR REFURBISHMENT TO INCLUDE LIGHTING, NEW PLAY EQUIPMENT IN AREA CLOSE TO RESISDENTS, IRRIGATION | \$750,000 |
| EAGLE ROCK MONUMENT | 14 | IRRIGATION AND NEW LANDSCAPING | \$250,000 |
| HAZARD PARK | 14 | OUTDOOR DEVELOPMENT; SOCCER FIELDS, VOLLEYBALL AREA, BAR-B-Q GRILLS \& TABLES, LIGHTING, WALKWAYS | \$600,000 |
| HOLLENBECK PARK | 14 | IMPROVE PARKING FACILITIES, WALKWAYS,\& LIGHTING, DRINKING FOUNTAINS, WATER SYSTEM, BANDSHELL | \$400,000 |
| RAMON GARCIA REC CENTER | 14 | OUTDOOR PARK DEVELOPMENT, PARKING | \$400,000 |
| SAN PASQUAL | 14 | OUTDOOR PARK DEVELOPMENT, IRRIGATION | \$400,000 |
| 109TH STREET RECREATION CENTER | 15 | OUTDOOR SPORTS DEVELOPMENT, FIELD LIGHTING | \$500,000 |
| BANNING PARK | 15 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, RECREATION CENTER AND WALKING PATHS | \$1,000,000 |
| GAFFEY STREET POOL | 15 | RENOVATION OF SWIMMING POOL | \$1,000,000 |
| PECK PARK | 15 | IMPROVEMENTS TO ATHLETIC FIELDS, POOLS, OR RECREATION CENTER, PARKING LOT, WALKWAYS, IRRIGATION, PICNIC AREAS | \$1,000,000 |
|  |  | SUBTOTAL | \$41,450,00 |

## ATTACHMENTS:

## ATTACHMENT 1: FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEARS 26-30

ATTACHMENT 2: A LIST OF PROJECTS (YEAR 26)
ATTACHMENT 3: B LIST OF PROJECTS FOR PROGRAM YEARS 27-30

## ATTACHMENT 4: C LIST: $10^{\text {th }}$ CYCLE ALTERNATIVE COMPETITIVE PROJECTS

NOTE: For purposes of the 2022-23 Proposition K Assessment Report, the above-listed attachments are presented as attachments to the Assessment Report, with the same attachment number as listed above. Once those attachments are approved by the City Council, the final approved attachment documents will be incorporated into the final Engineer's Report that will be filed with the City Clerk and the County Clerk and will be submitted to the County Assessor and the County Auditor-Controller as part of the documentation required to process collection of the 2022-23 Proposition K assessment through the property tax bills sent to affected property owners.

## RESOLUTION

A Resolution of Intention to Levy and Collect Annual Assessments for the fiscal year 2022-23 for City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1, pursuant to provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Division 15, Part 2, Streets and Highways Code, State of California).

WHEREAS, on November 5, 1996, voters in the City of Los Angeles approved Proposition K (also known as the L.A. for Kids Program), which authorizes the formation of City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1 (District) and approves the levy and collection of an annual assessment of $\$ 25$ million within the District for a period of thirty years for the purpose of funding the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities; and

WHEREAS, the assessments proposed received approval of a majority of the voters prior to the passage of Proposition 218, therefore are exempt from the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4 of Proposition 218; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles City Council on October 20, 2021, adopted a Resolution instructing the City Engineer to prepare a report and Ordinance of Intention pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and

WHEREAS, the total net amount to be assessed to the whole District proposed for the 2022-23 fiscal year is not an increase from the amount authorized by Proposition K.

## NOW, THEREFORE,

## THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council hereby declares its intention to determine that the public interest, convenience and necessity require the levy and collection of assessments for the 2022-23 fiscal year for City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. $96-1$, to provide funding for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities in the District.

Sec. 2. The City Council hereby adopts, approves and confirms the Engineer's Report, which includes the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee FIVE YEAR PLAN, and the A LIST, B LIST, and C LIST of the improvement projects, and the diagram for the District and the Assessment, and orders the Report be filed with the City Clerk, and sets the matter for public hearing as specified in Section 8. The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee FIVE YEAR PLAN (Plan) specifies in detail which acquisitions and improvements are planned for the fiscal years 2022-23 through 2026-27, and describes the locations of the improvements to be funded by the District. The A LIST of the Plan includes projects planned for fiscal year

2022-23. The B LIST of the Plan includes projects that may be substituted for projects on the A LIST during the fiscal year in the event it is determined by the City Council that any project on the A LIST will not be implemented in the 2022-23 fiscal year. The C LIST of the Plan includes competitive grant alternate projects that may be substituted for projects on the A LIST during the fiscal year in the event it is determined by the City Council that any project on the A LIST will not be implemented in the 2022-23 fiscal year. All projects on the A LIST are subject to environmental analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the environmental analysis process has already been completed, or will be completed prior to adoption of the Ordinance Ordering Confirmation, Levy and Collection of Annual Assessment or as required by law. A Categorical Exemption, Environmental Impact Report, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Negative Declaration has been or is being prepared and a Notice of Exemption or Notice of Determination has been or will be filed when applicable. For projects on the B LIST and the C LIST, compliance with CEQA must be completed prior to the City Council approving during the 2022-23 fiscal year, the substitution of any of those projects for projects on the A LIST. The Engineer's Report also describes the boundaries of the Assessment District, and the method and rationale for spreading the proposed assessment in proportion to the benefit received by each lot or parcel of land within the District. The Engineer's Report is by this reference incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

Sec. 3. The Council hereby reaffirms that the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1 shall be coterminous with the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles. Every lot or each parcel of land within the City boundaries shall be included in the District.

Sec. 4. The Council hereby declares that the public interest, convenience, and necessity require, and that it is the intention of said Council to order, that the expense necessary for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities including repairs, replacement, utilities, care, supervision and all other items necessary for proper maintenance and operation of the Assessment District improvements shall be assessed upon each lot or parcel of land lying within the District in proportion to the estimated benefits received from the improvements.

Sec. 5. The Council hereby declares that the amounts to be assessed for the expense of such acquisition of land or land and improvements, and of the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner and by the same officers as County property taxes are levied and collected, all laws providing for the collection and enforcement of County property taxes shall be applied to the collection and enforcement of the assessments, and all assessments collected shall be disbursed and expended for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, for parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities in the District, all as described in the Engineer's Report.

Sec. 6. The Council hereby declares that properties owned by public agencies such as cities, the County, the State or the federal government, will not be assessed except when such property is not devoted to a public use. Rights-of-way that are owned by utilities and railroad operating rights-of-way are also exempt from assessment.

Sec. 7. The Council hereby declares that the proceedings for the levy and collection of assessments of the aforesaid District shall be taken under and in accordance with an act of the Legislature of the State of California known and designated as the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Division 15, Part 2 of the Streets and Highways Code).

Sec. 8. The "Public Hearing": The day of June 7, 2022 at the hour of 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as Council business permits, and on any hours and days for continued hearing as ordered by the Council, in the John Ferraro Council Chamber, Room 340, City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, is the time and place when and where any and all persons having any objections to the levy and collection of the assessments for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities for the District may appear before the Council and show cause why the expense of the acquisition of any land or land and improvements, developing, improving, restoring, and maintaining these improvements, and the installation and construction of any facilities necessary or convenient to the District, should not be assessed against the District as described and proposed herein.

Sec. 9. Written Protest; Grounds; Withdrawal: Any interested person may, prior to the conclusion of the hearing, file a written protest with the City Clerk or, having previously filed a protest, may file a written withdrawal of that protest. A written protest shall state all grounds of objection. Protest by a property owner shall contain a description sufficient to identify the property owned by that person.

Sec. 10. The City Clerk shall cause the notice of the public hearing, in the form and manner specified in Section 6061 of the Government Code, to be published in a newspaper published at least once a week and circulated in the City of Los Angeles, which is hereby designated for that purpose. The publication of notice shall be completed at least ten days before the public hearing date.

Sec. 11. This resolution shall take effect upon its passage.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was approved by the Council of the City of Los Angeles at its meeting of

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk

By
Deputy

File No. 21-1145

ORDINANCE NO. $\qquad$
An Ordinance of Intention to Levy and Collect Annual Assessments for fiscal year 2022-23 for City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1, pursuant to provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Division 15, Part 2, Streets and Highways Code, State of California).

WHEREAS, on November 5, 1996, voters in the City of Los Angeles approved Proposition K (also known as the L.A. for Kids Program), which authorizes the formation of City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1 (District) and approves the levy and collection of an annual assessment of $\$ 25$ million within the District for a period of thirty years for the purpose of funding the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities; and

WHEREAS, the assessments proposed received approval of a majority of the voters prior to the passage of Proposition 218, therefore are exempt from the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4 of Proposition 218; and

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles City Council on October 20, 2021, adopted a Resolution instructing the City Engineer to prepare a report and Ordinance of Intention pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and

WHEREAS, the total net amount to be assessed to the whole District proposed for the 2022-23 fiscal year is not an increase from the amount authorized by Proposition K.

## NOW, THEREFORE,

## THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council hereby declares its intention to determine that the public interest, convenience and necessity require the levy and collection of assessments for the 2022-23 fiscal year for City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. $96-1$, to provide funding for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities in the District.

Sec. 2. The City Council hereby adopts, approves and confirms the Engineer's Report, which includes the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee FIVE YEAR PLAN, and the A LIST, B LIST, and C LIST of the improvement projects, and the diagram for the District and the Assessment, and orders the Report be filed with the City Clerk, and sets the matter for public hearing as specified in Section 8. The L.A. for Kids Steering Committee FIVE YEAR PLAN (Plan) specifies in detail which acquisitions and improvements are planned for the fiscal years 2022-23 through 2026-27, and describes the locations of the improvements to be funded by the District. The A LIST of the Plan includes projects planned for fiscal year

2022-23. The B LIST of the Plan includes projects that may be substituted for projects on the A LIST during the fiscal year in the event it is determined by the City Council that any project on the LIST A will not be implemented in the 2022-23 fiscal year. The C LIST of the Plan includes competitive grant alternate projects that may be substituted for projects on the A LIST during the fiscal year in the event it is determined by the City Council that any project on the A LIST will not be implemented in the 2022-23 fiscal year. All projects on the A LIST are subject to environmental analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the environmental analysis process has already been completed, or will be completed prior to adoption of the Ordinance Ordering Confirmation, Levy and Collection of Annual Assessment or as required by law. A Categorical Exemption, Environmental Impact Report, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Negative Declaration has been or is being prepared and a Notice of Exemption or Notice of Determination has been or will be filed when applicable. For projects on the B LIST and the C LIST, compliance with CEQA must be completed prior to the City Council approving during the 2022-23 fiscal year, the substitution of any of those projects for projects on the A LIST. The Engineer's Report also describes the boundaries of the Assessment District, and the method and rationale for spreading the proposed assessment in proportion to the benefit received by each lot or parcel of land within the District. The Engineer's Report is by this reference incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

Sec. 3. The Council hereby reaffirms that the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles Landscaping and Lighting District No. 96-1 shall be coterminous with the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles. Every lot or each parcel of land within the City boundaries shall be included in the District.

Sec. 4. The Council hereby declares that the public interest, convenience, and necessity require, and that it is the intention of said Council to order, that the expense necessary for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities including repairs, replacement, utilities, care, supervision and all other items necessary for proper maintenance and operation of the Assessment District improvements shall be assessed upon each lot or parcel of land lying within the District in proportion to the estimated benefits received from the improvements.

Sec. 5. The Council hereby declares that the amounts to be assessed for the expense of such acquisition of land or land and improvements, and of the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner and by the same officers as County property taxes are levied and collected, all laws providing for the collection and enforcement of County property taxes shall be applied to the collection and enforcement of the assessments, and all assessments collected shall be disbursed and expended for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, for parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities in the District, all as described in the Engineer's Report.

Sec. 6. The Council hereby declares that properties owned by public agencies such as cities, the County, the State or the federal government, will not be assessed except when such property is not devoted to a public use. Rights-of-way that are owned by utilities and railroad operating rights-of-way are also exempt from assessment.

Sec. 7. The Council hereby declares that the proceedings for the levy and collection of assessments of the aforesaid District shall be taken under and in accordance with an act of the Legislature of the State of California known and designated as the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 (Division 15, Part 2 of the Streets and Highways Code).

Sec. 8. The "Public Hearing": The day of June 7, 2022 at the hour of 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as Council business permits, and on any hours and days for continued hearing as ordered by the Council, in the John Ferraro Council Chamber, Room 340, City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, is the time and place when and where any and all persons having any objections to the levy and collection of the assessments for the acquisition of land or land and improvements, and for the development, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of improvements funded by the District, of parks, open spaces, recreation and community facilities for the District may appear before the Council and show cause why the expense of the acquisition of any land or land and improvements, developing, improving, restoring, and maintaining these improvements, and the installation and construction of any facilities necessary or convenient to the District, should not be assessed against the District as described and proposed herein.

Sec. 9. Written Protest; Grounds; Withdrawal: Any interested person may, prior to the conclusion of the hearing, file a written protest with the City Clerk or, having previously filed a protest, may file a written withdrawal of that protest. A written protest shall state all grounds of objection. Protest by a property owner shall contain a description sufficient to identify the property owned by that person.

Sec. 10. The City Clerk shall cause the notice of the public hearing, in the form and manner specified in Section 6061 of the Government Code, to be published in a newspaper published at least once a week and circulated in the City of Los Angeles, which is hereby designated for that purpose. The publication of notice shall be completed at least ten days before the public hearing date.

Sec. 11. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles at its meeting of $\qquad$ .

# HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, City Clerk 

By $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Approved

## Mayor

Approved as to Form and Legality:

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney

By
STEVEN H. HONG
Deputy City Attorney
Date $\qquad$
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## PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM 2021-22 PROGRAM INFLATION AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS



PROPOSITION K: 2022-23 L.A. FOR KIDS PROGRAM 2021-22 PROGRAM ADDITIONAL (GAP) SPECIFIED FUNDING AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

| 2021-22 Adopted Budget Level: |  | \$ | 7,075,263 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recommended Reprogramming: |  | \$ | 924,737 |
| Final Available 2021-22 GAP Funds: |  | \$ | 8,000,000 |
| 2021-22 GAP Award Recommendations |  |  |  |
| Angels Gate Park (R1) | REG | \$ | 2,000,000 |
| Southern Pacific Trails (R35) | REG |  | 6,000,000 |
| Recommended GAP Awards Total: |  | \$ | 8,000,000 |
| Unprogrammed Balance: |  | \$ | -- |


[^0]:    ＊Project C266－10 was awarded $\$ 1,805,923$ in the 10th Competative Cycle．

[^1]:    CD $=$ Council District

