

## Carey Casciola

---

**From:** Robert Schultz <attorneyinslo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 8, 2025 4:11 PM  
**To:** Carey Casciola  
**Subject:** Fwd: OCSD 1/8 Agenda Item 10 (f)

Robert Schultz

Sent from phone, please excuse typos.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Charles Varni [REDACTED]  
**Date:** January 8, 2025 at 12:08:12 PM PST  
**To:** Allene Villa <directorvilla@oceanocsd.org>, Linda Austin <directoraustin@oceanocsd.org>, Director Joyce-Suneson <directorjoyce-suneson@oceanocsd.org>, Shirley Gibson <directorgibson@oceanocsd.org>, directorrose@oceanocsd.org, Rob Schultz <attorneyinslo@gmail.com>  
**Subject: OCSD 1/8 Agenda Item 10 (f)**

TO: OCSD Directors  
FROM: Charles Varni  
SUBJECT: OCSD 1/8 Agenda Item 10 (f) Oceano Parks and Recreation Committee (OPARC) Bylaws

My first concern with this item is that OPARC was never consulted on many of the proposed changes nor have they had an opportunity to review the proposal and provide feedback to OCSD Directors. This is not standard organizational practice and is insensitive to the committee and its members, all of whom are volunteers and mostly represent important organizations in our community and County.

My second concern is that the proposed action on this item violates current by-law 2.4 which requires first and second readings of business items unless there is a clear urgency. Changes to bylaws and operations are very significant items and, in the case of OPARC, there is no urgency. This item should be for discussion only January 8.

In his staff report and recommendations Mr. Brown states, in reference to OPARC financial considerations the following:

“Unlike enterprise funds with ongoing revenue, OPARC lacks a reliable funding source for long-term activities and operations. Prior Board allocations of General Fund revenues are not recommended in the future due to loss of over 96% of property

tax revenue related to FCFA Fire Divestiture and minimal future revenues anticipated for the streetlighting system that is in need of evaluation, maintenance and capital upgrades.”

There are two problems with this statement:

1. OPARC is a standing committee of the OCSD, validated by the Local Area Formation Council. The only legal source of OCSD funding for OPARC is from the General Fund. The General Fund money comes from the 4% of Oceano property tax monies which the County allocates to OCSD annually, with the amount varying depending on the amount of property taxes. Both LAFCO and the County recognize that OPARC is a qualified and appropriate recipient of such funds.
2. Mr. Brown says “...General Fund revenues are not recommended in the future due to loss of over 96% of property tax revenue related to FCFA Fire Divestiture...” This statement is not accurate. The fact is that the County keeps 96% of Oceano’s property taxes EVERY year, year after year. Those funds go into the County’s General Fund for them to spend as they choose. **OCSD HAS NOT LOST 96% OF ITS PROPERTY TAXES TO THE COUNTY BECAUSE OF FIRE DIVESTITURE.** The County always takes that much, every year.

It would make more sense to keep by-law 2.4 as it is with OCSD General Fund money remaining as a possible source of OPARC funding. A modest 10-15% of the County’s General Fund allocation to OCSD would be sufficient for OPARC to support more community projects and activities, write grants, and seek other sources of donations and support as well.

Mr. Brown’s proposal functionally “divests” OCSD from its one Standing Committee. Keeping the OCSD General Fund as a possible source of funding for OPARC sends a much more positive message to the community and OPARC volunteers.

Mr. Brown is also recommending that the Vitality Advisory Council of Oceano (VACO) be removed as an organizational member of OPARC. My question is how did this decision come about? As far as I am aware, this topic has never been discussed at a VACO meeting where the public could provide input nor has been discussed at an OCSD or OPARC meeting, other than noting that VACO has not participated.

Finally, why is Mr. Brown seeking to eliminate one of the four community volunteer positions? These positions, for which we now have four volunteers, are critical to the ultimate success of OPARC and, if anything, should be expanded in number.