



Fulton-El Camino Recreation and Park District

Chapter 8

Implementation

Chapter 8 – Section 1

Implementation

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This section identifies strategies for funding park and facility improvements. These strategies identify specific actions that should occur as well as potential sources of funding.

8.2 PROJECT PRIORITIES

The following guidelines have been utilized in setting the project priorities in this Capital Improvement Plan:

1. Infrastructure needs
2. Community recommendations
3. District identified priorities

The implementation timeline will depend largely on available funding and the will of the community as it pertains to:

1. Their perceived value of the projects
2. The amount the community is willing to invest in the projects
3. How long the community is willing to wait for projects to be completed

8.3 FUNDING SOURCES

The following are possible funding sources for the planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of parks, open space, and recreational areas. Some funding sources have strict limitations on what types of projects can be funded and many require matching funds. A project manager is often needed to keep up with the mandatory reporting requirements included in some grants. The following list is current at this time but is not a complete list of available grants. Other grants and funding opportunities will become available in time. The prioritized project list will be used to match grants and other funding opportunities with the projects that most closely match the intent of the funding programs.

8.3.1 GENERAL FUND

This fund accounts for revenues and expenditures that result from ongoing operations of District functions. Major revenue sources include, property taxes, program fees, user fees and charges to individuals and groups who use specific areas and facilities. These fees are usually used to help offset the cost of operation and maintenance of the services.

8.3.2 ASSESSMENTS TAXES AND BONDS

8.3.2.1 Landscape and Lighting Act, Benefit Assessment Districts

The District has two Assessment Districts. Both have automatic cost-of-living adjustment clauses to help keep pace with inflation. Neither has a sunset clause and both provide consistent funding for the District. The assessment revenues may be used for park land acquisition, development and/or maintenance. The agency can choose to use the revenue generated on a pay as you go basis or can sell bonds in order to receive a lump sum payment. The bonds are then paid back from the annual revenue generated from the assessment.

8.3.2.2 Parcel Tax

This is a property tax that is assessed at a rate based on the characteristics of a "parcel," rather than on the assessed value of the property. Generally, the tax is charged on a parcel of property based on either a flat per parcel rate or a variable rate depending on the size, use and/or number of units on the parcel.

8.3.2.3 Special Serial Levy: This is a property tax that can be assessed for the construction and/or operation of parks and services. This type of levy is established at a given rate for 1-5 years and requires a simple majority of voter approval with 50% voter turnout. The advantage of this type of levy is that there are no interest charges.

8.3.2.4 General Obligation Bond

These are voter-approved bonds with the assessment placed on real property. The money can only be used for capital improvements and not maintenance. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 20-30 years). Passage requires a two-thirds approval by the voters. One disadvantage of this type of levy is the interest costs.

8.3.2.5 Revenue Bonds: These bonds are sold and paid from the revenue produced from the operation of a facility. In California, this requires voter approval.

8.3.2.6 Certificates of Participation: This is a lease-purchase approach where the District sells Certificates of Participation (COP's) to a lending institution. The District then pays the loan off from revenue produced by the facility or from its general operating budget. The lending institution holds title to the property until the COP's are repaid. This procedure does not require a vote of the public.

8.3.3 GRANTS

8.3.3.1 STATE GRANTS

The following list of state grants identifies the major known grants available to the District. It is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all state grants. This list will change with time and legislation. See Appendix XYZ for a list of State grants received to date.

A. Proposition 68 Park Bond, 2018

The voters of California approved Proposition 68, a bond act that provides funds for a variety of environmental projects, park maintenance and park improvements being the primary focus of the initiative. Proposition 68 is similar to past bond acts. It has a per capita funding component as well as competitive grant provision. These grants reimburse the recipient and require the recipient to be able to fund the project up front, often times requiring bridge loans, depending on the size of the grant. Progress payments are usually available, lessening the need for financing.

Per Capita Funding

The per capita funding for our District is estimated to be \$200,000, possibly more if our District is categorized as economically disadvantaged.

Competitive Grants

The competitive grants are not guaranteed funds. Projects from the entire state compete for the funds and the projects are graded based upon a set of criteria established by the Office of Grants and Local Services. The quality of the project and how it meets the specific criteria established for the grant determines the potential for success. Only projects that most completely meet the intent of the grant have a chance for funding. It is important to choose projects carefully before deciding to invest the considerable amount of time necessary to apply for the grant.

B. Housing Related Park Program

The State of California developed a Housing Related Parks Program (HRPP) incentive that encouraged counties to develop low income housing. The HRPP expired in 2016 and, as of January 2019, has not been extended. Efforts continue to reestablish and fund the HRPP. This program has funded significant District park improvements in the past. Several items identified in this master plan will be addressed with funds from the 2016-2017 grant of \$330,000.

C. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

CDFW may provide technical assistance and administer funding for projects that enhance water quality, including debris removal, flood mitigation, and enhancements to water crossings.

D. California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)

CNRA presently offers an Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation grant as well as an Urban Greening grant.

Urban Greening Grant

This grant is funded by Cap-and-Trade revenues, also known as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. The grants support projects that aim to reduce greenhouse gases by sequestering carbon, decreasing energy consumption and reducing vehicle miles traveled. The projects also convert built environments into green spaces that improve air quality and water quality. These projects enhance our urban areas by creating and expanding green spaces that are more sustainable. Urban Greening projects help reduce greenhouse gas emissions to combat the effects of climate change while contributing to healthy and vibrant communities.

Environmental Enhancement Mitigation Program

The legislature is authorized to allocate up to \$7 million each fiscal year from the Highway Users Tax Account (Motor Vehicle Revenues, Section 2100) for projects that contribute to mitigation of the environmental effects of transportation facilities as follows: 1) urban forestry projects designed to offset vehicular emissions of carbon dioxide; 2) resource land projects that provide for the acquisition or enhancement of resource lands to mitigate the loss of, or the detriment to, resource lands lying within or near the right-of-way acquired for transportation improvements; and 3) mitigation projects beyond the scope of the lead agency responsible for assessing the environmental impact of the proposed transportation improvements.

8.3.3.2 FEDERAL GRANTS

The following list of Federal Grants identifies the major known grants available to the District. It is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all Federal Grants. This list will change with time and legislation. See Appendix XYZ for a list of Federal grants received to date.

A. HUD Block Grants

Grants from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development are available for a wide variety of projects. These would most likely be administered by the City of Sacramento or Sacramento County and be

utilized in economically disadvantaged communities. Grants can fund up to 100% of project costs.

B. Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Authority Grant Program

The District has received several grants from SHRA for park rehabilitation. SHRA has a yearly competitive grant program. The program usually focuses on a particular need in the County. Occasionally, funds for general needs become available.

C. Land and Water Conservation Fund

The District has received several LWCF grants in the past. This has been a major source of funding for park acquisition and improvements. At this time funding for the LWCF has expired. It is anticipated that this fund will be renewed in the near future. This fund requires a 50% match from the recipient.

D. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW)

USFW may provide technical assistance and administer funding for projects related to water wetland, riparian and upland habitat restoration, enhancement and protection, wetland/moist-soil management, invasive species control, and soil and water quality improvement.

E. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP)

This program helps protect lives and property threatened by natural disasters. It provides technical and financial assistance to preserve life and property threatened by excessive creek bank erosion and flooding. The renovation and rehabilitation of Strong Ranch Slough might be eligible under this program.

The NRCS administers grant assistance programs including: funding for flood mitigation, upstream flooding reduction, streambank/erosion mitigation, watershed management, and wetland conservation.

F. Federal Grants for Local Agency Law Enforcement

The U.S. Department of Justice offers grants supporting law enforcement and public safety activities in state, local, and tribal jurisdictions. These funds are used to, among other things, provide training and technical assistance. More specifically, The [Office of Community Oriented Policing Services \(COPS\)](#) advances the practice of community policing by the nation's state, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources. The COPS Office awards grants to hire community policing professionals, develop and test innovative policing

strategies, and provide training and technical assistance to community members, local government leaders, and all levels of law enforcement.

8.3.3.3 PRIVATE GRANTS AND FOUNDATIONS

Private grants and foundations provide money for a wide range of projects. They are sometimes difficult to find and equally difficult to secure because of the open competition. They usually fund unique projects or ones of extreme need. Many require monitoring and reporting necessitating the dedication of staff time to ensure compliance. This can be a great financial resource for unique projects with established user groups willing to support specific causes and projects. General development project applications do not fare well. Among the foundations that have been known to support parks are the Foundation Center, The Kresge Foundation, Ford Foundation, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

8.3.3.4 Foundation Grants for Law Enforcement

Few foundation resources exist for local agency law enforcement funds. Nevertheless, the Walmart Foundation Community Grant Guidelines document lists law enforcement funds used exclusively for public purposes as eligible activities. Other organizations offer funds for police equipment such as vehicles and bullet-proof vests.

8.3.4 JOINT PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

A public agency may enter into an agreement with other public agencies, including school districts, private, corporation and local organizations/foundations, to help fund, build, and/or operate a district facility and or program.

8.3.5 DONATIONS

The donations of labor, land or cash by service agencies, private groups, or individuals have been very important for our District and is a popular way to raise money for specific projects. Nonprofit organizations such as Kiwanis, Scouts (Eagle Scout Projects), Rotary Clubs, and the FEC Swim Team Booster Club often fund small projects such as playgrounds and park improvements.

Individual are encouraged to remember the District in their wills. Specific park improvements or recreation programs can be identified to benefit from bequests of money and/or donations of real property. The District should advertise this possibility to the community, to educate and informing them of the opportunity to benefit the parks and the community.

All donations are very beneficial to the District and to the community.

8.4 FINANCING STRATEGY

The cost to implement all of the identified projects greatly exceeds the District's current financial resources. The District has adopted a pay-as-you-go approach to addressing the projects identified in Table 8.1. Under this approach it will take many years to address the projects. Should the District desire to accelerate the project completion timeline other funding will be needed. Utilizing the funding sources identified in section 8.3 will allow the District to accelerate the rate of project completion.

In order to implement all of the projects identified in Table 8.1 in a timely manner, the District will have to pass a general obligation bond or secure a parcel tax. A General Obligation Bond would be the better of the two as it defines the improvements to be made and the improvements can be staged over time, and it would be more favorably received than a general parcel tax. However, at this time it takes a 2/3 vote to pass, as would a parcel tax. The District should explore both options as a means of accomplishing the goals of this plan. In the mean-time, a pay-as-you-go approach is the only financially viable option.

The District will utilize funds from the District General Fund, the Landscape and Lighting Districts, the State Park Bond and the grants from the Sacramento County Housing and Redevelopment Agency to address the prioritized list of improvements. These funding sources will be supplemented, to the maximum extent possible, by other grants and donations.

Once the Master Plan has been approved, a Capital Improvement Plan will be established outlining the strategy for implementation of the projects identified in Table 8.1.

