

Implementation Strategy

Implementation Strategy

Contents

Background and Overview 1

Summary Recommendations 1

Land Acquisition and Facility Development

Funding Needs - Parkland Acreage 2

Funding Needs - Recreation Facilities 3

Current Funding Mechanisms 4

- Parkland Dedications and In-Lieu Fees
- Parkland Reservations
- Park Development Impact Fees
- Development Agreements
- School Parks and Joint-Use Facilities
- General Fund Appropriations
- Grants and Donations
- Redevelopment Funds

Operations and Maintenance

Funding Needs 7

Current Funding Mechanisms 7

- Landscaping and Lighting Districts

Recreation Programming

Funding Needs 8

Current Funding Mechanisms 8

- Direct Revenue Streams

Expanding the Funding Options

Park Development Impact Fees 9

Off-Site Improvement Fee to In-Lieu Fee 10

Local Sales Tax 10

Parcel-Tax Benefit Assessment Districts . 11

General Fund Allocations 11

New Direct Revenue Streams 12

Proposed Master Plan

Funding Scenarios 13

Conclusion - Implementing the Plan

Master Plan Project List 14

Master Plan Park Project List & the CIP . 14

A Plan for the Future 14

Redding Master Plan Project List

2004-2020 15-17

Background and Overview

Implementing a plan for a comprehensive parks and recreation system is a complex task requiring a balanced approach. As with any viable business strategy, funding inputs must come from a variety of sources so that they create a stable operational environment with the capacity to grow and remain flexible through changing times.

While recent years have seen an increase in park development fees, at the present time our funding sources fail to provide an adequate number of developed parks or enough recreation facilities. Parkland already acquired has remained undeveloped for years due to a lack of funds, and maintenance on some existing improvements has been deferred because of personnel and materials shortages.

The General Plan's Public Facilities and Services Policy PF20D requires us to identify and pursue alternative funding sources for capital improvements, staffing, and ongoing maintenance of public improvement projects. Recreation Policy R10B also calls out the need to "explore innovative means of financing new facilities and maintaining existing and future parks."

In this section of the Master Plan, we undertake such an exploration. This will start with a discussion of the funding needs and current funding mechanisms for three major components of the park system:

- land acquisition and recreation facility development
- operations and maintenance
- recreation programming

Several options are presented that could be used to fill our existing and future funding gaps.

Finally, a summary table illustrates the impacts of each scenario on revenue generation, and a project list shows where investments need to be made.

Summary Recommendations

In general, the recommendations in the implementation strategy can be placed in five groups of increasing in complexity:

- 1) Continue to seek funding and in-kind opportunities with existing and new partners.
- 2) Continue and consider enhancing General Fund appropriations for park acquisition and improvements.
- 3) Address and update park development and in-lieu fees to provide for the same level of service that exists today.
- 4) Consider collecting park development impact fees from commercial development.
- 5) With community support, consider a ballot measure(s) for additional funding.

Should the park development and in-lieu fee recommendations be implemented, approximately \$15.9 million in additional fees would be generated from now until 2020 above the \$22.6 million anticipated with the current fee (\$38.5 million in total fee revenue). This represents an important funding source for projects such as neighborhood parks, which rarely meet the eligibility criteria of granting agencies.

The remaining funds needed to meet our goals will be obtained through other sources. The City has an impressive record of success with obtaining grants from various funding agencies and organizations. The Redding Sports Park, Clover Creek Preserve, and most of the trail projects were constructed primarily with grant funds. In addition, service clubs, the business community, and school districts have repeatedly stepped up to partner on the construction of various recreation improvements. Other funding sources within the City, such as Community Development Block Grants, Redevelopment Agency funds, and Utility Public Benefits funds should be sought as appropriate.

Preliminary estimates for the build-out of park projects outlined in the Master Plan total approximately \$96 million.

Land Acquisition and Facility Development

Funding Needs - Parkland Acreage

The parkland analysis in the Park Strategy makes it clear that the City will require additional acreage over the next two decades if we are to achieve the adopted General Plan goal of 10 acres of developed parkland per thousand people.

With our present population, 275.93 more acres of developed parkland are needed to meet our 10-acre service level goal.

While the development of the City's existing, undeveloped parkland will do much to alleviate this need in the short term, by 2020 continued population growth will necessitate the addition of 552 acres above our present developed parkland inventory.

In addition to land acquisition needs for parks and for recreation facilities, the proposed open space program and the expanding trail system will also

require land. Accurate acreage projections for these two components of the park system are difficult to make for two reasons. First, the proposed open space program does not specify acquisition goals at this time. Secondly, while additional trails have been generally set out, it is difficult to approximate acreage needs for them.

Beyond acreage goals, an additional consideration is that of park location. A quality park system is not created simply by providing a set number of park acres. It must also distribute recreation opportunities throughout the city (see: "The Geography of Parks" in the Park Strategy).

Funding Needs - Recreation Facilities

The Major Recreation Facility Needs Assessment (Park Strategy, page, 45) discussed the provision of seven facility types, their current service levels, and the additional fields, gyms, and pools required now and as our population grows. From those findings, new service levels were proposed, resulting in the facility recommendations found in the table below.

The last column in the table lists the total additional facilities needed above our current inventory to achieve the recommended facility service levels proposed in the Parks Strategy.

Major Recreation Facility Needs - 2004 to 2020

Existing Inventoried Major Recreation Facilities*	Additional Need Now	Additional Need in 2010	Additional Need in 2020	Total Recreation Inventory in 2020
8.25 Baseball / Softball Fields, Large	1 More Fields	3 More Fields	2 More Fields	14 Large Ball Fields
15.00 Baseball / Softball Fields, Small	14 More Fields	4 More Fields	5 More Fields	38 Small Ball Fields
10.25 Soccer Fields	7 More Fields	2 More Fields	4 More Fields	23 Soccer Fields
1.00 Football Fields	2 More Fields	1 More Field	1 More Field	5 Football Fields
19.25 Tennis Courts	4 More Courts	2 More Courts	5 More Courts	30 Tennis Courts
6.00 Swimming Pools	None	1 More Pool	1 More Pool	8 Swimming Pools
7.50 Gymnasiums	2 More Gyms	1 More Gym	1 More Gym	11 Gymnasiums

** Inventoried Facilities have been counted to reflect the degree of ownership and control by the City. City-owned sites are counted at 100% their actual number. School sites under a Joint-Use Agreement with the City are counted at 75% of their number. Gymnasiums at school sites under a Joint-Use Agreement with the City are counted at 50% of their number. Recreation facilities at school sites used by non-profit leagues, but not controlled by any use agreement with the City, are given 25% credit in the inventory.*

Future inventory numbers have been rounded.

Current Funding Mechanisms for Land Acquisition and Facility Development

The City generally acquires areas for parks, recreation, trail corridors, and open space through eight mechanisms:

- Parkland Dedications and In-Lieu Fees
- Parkland Reservations
- Park Development Impact Fees
- Development Agreements
- School Parks and Joint-Use Facilities
- General Fund Appropriations
- Grants and Donations
- Redevelopment Funds

Parkland Dedications and In-Lieu Fees

Like many California cities, Redding obtains many, but not all, of its new park sites from dedication requirements applied to residential subdivisions, through the authority found in Ordinance No. 2091 (pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act, or Quimby Act). The primary intent of the dedication ordinance is “to provide land for functional recreation units of local or neighborhood service, including but not limited to, tot lots, play lots, playgrounds, neighborhood parks, playfields, community or district parks, and other specialized recreational facilities that may serve a family group and also senior citizen and childcare activities.” (A copy of the relevant Municipal Code Section is found in the Appendix.)

Under this ordinance, the subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final or parcel map, must dedicate suitable land to the City for park purposes, or pay fees in-lieu of the land dedication. Subdivisions containing fifty parcels or less are exempt from land dedication and are only required to pay the in-lieu fees. The code provisions do not apply to commercial or industrial subdivisions, nor to most condominium projects or stock cooperatives. Expenditures of in-lieu fees are restricted by our ordinance to the geographic quadrant from which the funds were generated.

Open space areas are also obtained through dedications and easements. The primary method for

this is the *(OS) Open Space District* found in Chapter 18.35 of the Zoning Code. These districts are defined primarily as having slopes in excess of 20 percent and being located within the 100-year-flood elevation of the Sacramento River or one of its local tributaries. The protection of areas having historic, archaeological and/or cultural value is also consistent with the OS District. The boundaries and uses of each open space dedication or easement are established at the time the City approves the development map.

Parkland Reservations

Where dedications do not yield sufficient acreage to create an adequately sized park, additional parkland may be acquired through the property reservation authority allowed by California state law (Government Code, Section 66479). Under this method, the City may reserve parkland in the subdivision, subject to certain restrictions. At the time of the approval of the final or parcel map, an agreement is drawn up to purchase the reserved area within 2 years after the completion of the subdivision improvements at fair market value. This process can be found within Ordinance 2091, and in Redding’s Municipal Code at 17.41.70.

Park Development Impact Fees

Park development impact fees, collected from residential building permits (but not presently from commercial or industrial development), provide for planning, acquisition, improvement, expansion, and financing of public parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities (pursuant to Chapter 5 of the California Government Code, Sections 66000-66009). Since increases in development and population will result in an increased need for park and recreation facilities, impact fees help pay for the additional facilities attributable to the impact of such development. Although the goal is to attain 10 developed acres per 1,000 people, park development fees, by state law, may only recover the amount of money necessary to maintain the existing level of service.

Development Agreements

Negotiated contracts between the City and a developer can be made that require certain public benefits from the developer in exchange for City commitments. Because the agreement is a mutually acceptable contract rather than simply regulatory compliance, the parties may negotiate conditions greater than the minimum requirements. The developer, for example, may commit to constructing the park at an expense greater than the fees.

School-Parks and Joint-Use Facilities

School-parks and joint-use facilities combine the resources of two public entities to allow for expanded recreational opportunities in a cost-effective manner. As cooperative ventures, they can often help fulfill the need for neighborhood parks or provide recreation facilities in areas where there is little available parkland.

The specific partnership arrangements in these types of sites are formalized in written agreements with the educational entity, and include facility development responsibilities, cost sharing formulas, after-school use schedules, and maintenance arrangements.

Redding has ten joint-use or joint-funding agreements with five different school entities.

General Fund Appropriations

The General Fund is a centralized fund from which the City Council allocates resources to pay for services. Public sector revenues funneling into the general fund include the municipal portion of various taxes (state sales tax, property tax, vehicle license fee, transient occupancy tax or hotel tax) and other sources of income.

Expenditures from the General Fund may be made for park acquisition and development when approved by a majority vote of City Council. Historically, appropriations beyond the incoming revenues generated by user fees and grants have not been a significant source of land acquisition funding in Redding.

Grants and Donations

The City receives grants on a sporadic basis from state, federal, and private sources. Some are awarded on a *per capita* basis, others based on a competitive application process. Most grants, whether public or private, come with specific limitations on how grant monies may be used and expended. Successful grant awards for the City depend on matching the appropriateness of our projects to funding sources, and the strength of our grant writing. The ability of grantors to award funds is often influenced by the overall economy.

In recent years, the City has received several substantial State grants. Almost \$600,000 of these funds have been dedicated toward the Redding Aquatic Center. In addition, \$3 million was awarded for expansion of the Sacramento River Trail, \$10 million was given to develop the Redding Sports Park, \$500,000 has been granted to upgrade the Tiger Field baseball stadium, and \$148,000 was used to purchase neighborhood parkland. Another round of State grants was made available when, in 2002, voters passed Proposition 40, of which Redding will receive a projected \$616,000 for various projects.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are Federal monies that can be used for park development in qualified areas, or for projects benefitting particular populations. At least five city park sites have benefitted from this program, including Alta Mesa Park, South City Park, Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, Caldwell Park, and the Parkview Riverfront Park.

Private donations have played a prominent role in the development of local parks and trails. For example, a donor from Redding contributed more than \$700,000 for extensions of the Sacramento River Trail and related property acquisition. As a major player in the creation of Turtle Bay Park and many other projects, The McConnell Foundation has also been a significant contributor to Redding's public landscape and recreation opportunities.

Partnerships and donations of materials and services have for years been an important resource for community building in Redding. Labor and

material donations from private sector businesses, and fund-raising dollars and expertise given to the City by service organizations have been a source of pride and accomplishment for residents, and will continue to be sought for future projects.

While grants and donations from public and private agencies and organizations have been a funding source for Redding's parks, trails, and open space development, they should be viewed as windfalls, rather than dependable funding mechanisms.

Redevelopment Funds

The Redding Redevelopment Agency has been actively involved in the acquisition and/or development of many City parks, special purpose facilities, trails, and open spaces. The Sacramento River Trail, the Parkview Riverfront Park, the Redding Aquatic Center, Clover Creek Preserve, and the Redding Sports Park are just a few examples of the Agency's significant contribution to the park and recreation system.

Redevelopment funds are made available to cities through a method called "tax increment financing." When a city council approves a redevelopment plan, the property within the boundaries of the plan has a certain total property tax value. If this total assessed valuation increases, most of the money derived from the increase goes to the redevelopment agency, and is called tax increment revenue. It is important to note those taxes from the sale, development, or rehabilitation of property reflects a rise in property value and not an increase in tax rates. Assessed values and tax rates in redevelopment areas are restricted by Proposition 13 limitations.

Operations and Maintenance

Funding Needs

While the previous section described the needs and funding mechanisms for one-time capital expenditures, equally important are the ongoing, operations and maintenance needs of the park system.

In addition to daily maintenance costs, deferred park maintenance and improvements at more than three dozen existing parks need to be addressed. These include:

- playground equipment replacements,
- handicapped accessibility upgrades,
- parking lot repairs,
- landscape improvements,
- major park building repairs, and
- site furnishings such as benches, drinking fountains, trash receptacles, and picnic tables.

Finally, as new parks are added and additional trails and other facilities are built, more personnel, equipment, and maintenance funds will be required to keep them safe and attractive.

Current Funding Mechanisms for Operations and Maintenance

Operations and maintenance needs have fewer funding mechanisms available to them than acquisition and facility development. These important ongoing costs are not generally eligible under most grant programs, which typically focus only on capital costs. While General Fund appropriations are generally used, there is an additional mechanism to fund operations and maintenance of public landscapes:

Landscape and Lighting Assessment Districts

The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 allows local governmental agencies to form Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts for the purpose of financing the costs associated with landscaping and lighting public areas.

The many approved uses include installation and maintenance of landscaping, statues, fountains, general lighting, traffic lights, recreational and playground courts and equipment, and public restrooms, acquisition of land for parks and open spaces, plus the construction of community centers, municipal auditoriums or halls, which may be financed with notes or bonds.

Recreation Programming

Funding Needs

Recreation programs for all age groups — from seniors to toddlers — are an essential part of any park and recreation system. Redding's Recreation Division responds to this need by offering a variety of classes and activities, and provides them at locations throughout the city.

The Recreation Facility Needs Assessment in the Park Strategy found that additional facilities will be necessary to bring recreation programs to more residents. With these additional athletic fields, the City and community leagues will be able to grow their programs to include those now on waiting lists and others not currently participating. New gyms will allow the expansion of volleyball and basketball teams and also extend our ability to offer a wider array of leisure classes and activities.

All these programs will aid the City in providing healthy, safe opportunities to youth whose after-school hours may not always be filled with productive behaviors. It will also help combat our society's sedentary lifestyle, which contributes to obesity and long-term illnesses due to inactivity.

Current Funding Mechanisms for Recreation Programming

General Fund Appropriations

Appropriations from the General Fund supplied 100 percent of the Recreation Division's \$1.6 million budgeted operational costs for FY 2000-2001. Cultural programming created by the Community Services Department, Turtle Bay Exploration Park, the Art in City Hall program, and the Shasta County Arts Council, all receive General Fund support.

Direct Revenue Streams

Direct revenue streams are fees charged to those who use a service. Examples include admission to facilities, rental charges for using city facilities, direct operation of concession-based items (like snack bar foods), and contracts with private companies to operate concession-based services. Direct revenue streams are affected by the types of services offered, the location of those services, and the efficiency of the concessionaire's operation.

User fees generated \$250,000 in FY 2000-2001 for the Recreation Division, which helped to offset the above General Fund appropriations. These fees were realized through swimming pool admissions, swimming lessons, summer camp fees, and participant fees for other recreational programs.

Grants and Donations

The City's Recreation Division has also been the grateful recipient of several program grants from local businesses and organizations. Over the years, gifts from the McConnell Foundation, Wells Fargo Foundation, US Bank, KRCR, and many others have provided funds for swimming, basketball, and other recreational programming.

Expanding the Funding Options

To achieve the goals for parkland acres, facility development, operations, maintenance needs, and recreation programming, a substantial investment will be required by the City and its citizens.

While the City avails itself of many funding mechanisms commonly available to local jurisdictions, we could bring additional resources and methods into play. An expanded menu of funding options will increase the rate at which the City achieves its park and recreation goals.

In this next part, we review current mechanisms that should be revised or enhanced, and some additional options for consideration. A summary table on page 13 illustrates how the park funding revenues can be increased with various supplementary funding sources.

Adjust the Park Development Impact Fee

Background

As discussed on page 4, park development impact fees are charged on new homes to offset the impact that new development has on the park and recreation infrastructure. Fee revenue, which is dependent upon residential building permits, can swing wildly depending on the economic climate.

State legislation governing impact fees (AB1600) does not set a maximum dollar amount that can be charged. However, it does stipulate that the City may not charge a park development impact fee that allows it to achieve a higher level-of-service ratio (park acreage per thousand people) than that which currently exists.

Recent Impact Fee Revisions

In 2000, the “maximum justified fee,” for funding park facilities was presented in the *Comprehensive Impact Fee Study* (pages 86-87), by the consulting firm MuniFinancial. The fee recommended in 2000 was \$2,410 for a single-family, 1,500 sq. ft. home, and \$1,662 for each multi-family unit. This amount,

which combines the park development impact fee and the park in-lieu fee, was calculated to cover the cost of park development based on a 2000 level-of-service ratio of 4.62 developed acres per thousand people.

The fee ultimately adopted by the City Council, however, is below the recommended amount, with the difference being subsidized by the City. This lower fee, which went into effect in April 2001, is being phased-in.

In 2006 at full phase-in, the park fee (in-lieu and development impact fees) will be \$2,037 for a typical 3-bedroom house. However, if the maximum justified fee had been put in place instead, it would have yielded \$2,798 per house by 2006, adjusted for inflation.

At the time of adoption in 2001, the subsidy for the adopted park fee amounted to \$1,293 per house. This will amount to 73 percent of the justified fee, with a subsidy of \$761 for each 3-bedroom house built.

Proposed Fee Adjustment

The remedy for this situation is to remove the subsidy that has been placed on the park impact fee and allow it to reach the maximum justified fee provided for by state law.

The first column in the table on page 13 indicates that current fees will bring in \$22.5 million from now until 2020. The corresponding first section of the Project List at the end of the section shows what potential park projects could be created with this level of funding.

The next column, Scenario “A,” shows that an additional \$15 million in revenue for park facility development could be generated by removing the subsidy of the park development impact fee.

Add an Off-Site Improvement Fee to the Existing Park In-Lieu Fee

Park in-lieu fees may be used for either new or existing park and recreational facilities. Our local ordinance restricts expenditures to the geographic quadrant from which the fees were generated. The existing in-lieu fee is derived from Ordinance 2091, and is found in Chapter 17.42 of the Redding Municipal Code (RMC).

When park sites are dedicated to the City, certain improvements are required as a condition to their acceptance. Currently, a subdivider must provide, without credit:

- Full street improvements and utility connections, including curbs, gutters, street paving, traffic control devices, street trees, sidewalks, and any needed public access improvements;
- Fencing along subdivision property lines contiguous to the dedicated land;
- Improved drainage through the site; and
- Other minimal improvements essential to the acceptance of the land for recreational purposes.

While the City receives these improvements with all land dedications, we have not factored the cost for these improvements when fees are paid in-lieu of land.

Other cities, such as Santa Rosa, Sacramento, and Chico, have recognized this gap and have addressed it by adding 20 percent to the in-lieu fee to cover the off-site costs associated with parks.

While Redding's ordinance currently has no such provision, General Plan Goal PF1B specifically supports this recommendation:

“Require that all new development, including major modifications to existing development, construct or provide a fair share contribution toward the construction of any off-site improvements necessary to offset project impacts and/or support the project.”

As shown in Scenario “B” (page 13) the inclusion of a similar 20 percent charge is projected to generate approximately \$614,384 by 2020.

Increase the Local Sales Tax

A local sales tax is an additional percentage of sales tax applied in a particular jurisdiction on top of the currently existing State sales tax rate. The tax funds are recovered by the State Board of Equalization and returned to the local jurisdiction for spending. An amendment to the State Revenue and Taxation Code is necessary for a jurisdiction to impose an additional percentage on the sales tax. Revenue generated from a local sales tax is dependent upon the rate charged, the scope and duration of the tax, the size of the area to be taxed, and the number of sales generated within that area.

Initial steps have already been taken in the consideration of a sales tax increase for Redding. In June 2002, the state legislature passed Senate Bill 1889, which grants the City authority to impose a local sales tax at a rate of 0.25 percent. For the sales tax to go forward, the City Council must approve a ballot measure by a two-thirds vote. The voters must then approve the measure by a majority vote at the next scheduled election of Council members.

The sales tax increase is another option for closing the park system funding gap. Funding Scenario “C” on page 13 proposes a one-eighth of a cent (0.125 percent) sales tax — half the amount allowed by SB 1889. By 2020, the sales tax would generate \$43.9 million in revenue for parks, trails, and open spaces. (Because of the lengthy approval timeline, revenue generation would not be expected until at least 2005.)

While sales tax revenues at this time are growing at a high rate, a modest 3 percent growth in sales over the next 10 years is assumed in the scenario presented, which should compensate for any recession or slow growth years.

If 15 percent of this sales tax revenue were set aside (Column “E”, p. 13), between \$385,000 and \$598,000 annually could also be made available to address important maintenance needs.

Form Parcel-Taxed Benefit Assessment Districts

Benefit assessment districts are special financing and improvement areas formed by any local government agency (county, city, water district, etc.). The districts encompass all properties receiving a direct benefit from the construction of new public improvements, or from the maintenance of existing public improvements. Typically, an assessment district will issue bonds, pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915, to finance the construction improvements.

To approve a district, a majority vote of affected property owners is made through an assessment balloting procedure. Once approved, assessments are placed on property tax bills each year to pay for the improvements and services. By law, benefit assessments cannot be based on the value of property. Instead, a benefit formula is established for each district and each parcel in the service area is assessed according to the benefit it receives from the services and improvements.

While these districts have been in use for decades, in 1996, additional restrictions were placed on them with the passage of Proposition 218. Among the changes made were the requirement that a majority voter approval must be obtained before substantially increasing assessment charges. In addition, voters could reduce or repeal any existing local tax, assessment of charge through the initiative process.

Since Prop 218's enactment six years ago, few challenges have been made to the revised assessment districts, and no districts have been voted themselves out of existence, as was once feared. Benefit assessment districts funded through a parcel tax are viable mechanisms that the City should use to help fund park acquisition, improvements, and maintenance.

In some jurisdictions, such as Vacaville, California, a maintenance district is required with the approval of *any* residential subdivision. Funds from the assessments provide for the development's

proportionate share of maintenance costs for the city-owned neighborhood park.

If the entire City were to become an assessment district with a tax of \$40 on all city parcels in 2004, revenue for parks, recreation facilities, and trails could almost double. As shown in Funding Scenario "D" on page 13, the tax would generate about \$1 million annually. This amount could be used to build one 5-acre neighborhood park per year, construct athletic fields and trails, preserve open space lands, or renovate existing facilities.

A park maintenance set-aside of 20 percent (Column "F", page 13) has also been recommended with this scenario, which would create between \$243,000 to \$307,000 annually for this ongoing need. The set aside could also be used for vegetation management control in areas subject to wildland fires.

Appropriate Larger General Fund Allocations for the Park System

Allocations from the General Fund come from revenues collected by the City through its traditional funding sources. Any decline in revenues, or an unexpected financial obligation, can negatively affect resources for parks and recreation needs.

The City uses a biannual budget process, and is also governed by a financial plan that maps out expenditures over the next decade. Opportunities brought to the City Council during the budget process are evaluated against the competing demands of other departments. Given the wide range of City commitments and operations, the process is extremely competitive for a limited pool of resources.

Increased allocations from the General Fund for park projects and maintenance should be considered, especially if other revenue for the City becomes available.

Develop New Direct Revenue Streams

Ground leases, management agreements, concessions, and rental fees are all legitimate sources of revenue that many jurisdictions utilize, and which should be considered more often in Redding's overall funding strategy.

In particular, ground leases have significant potential for revenue generation and recreation service delivery. With a ground lease, City-owned property is leased to carefully selected developers who build and operate facilities that add to the City's inventory of recreation opportunities. This creates a revenue stream that helps offset other costs within the park system.

The City is employing a version of this with Big League Dreams, Inc., at the Redding Sports Park in order to defray the enormous costs of maintaining such a large complex of high-quality fields and recreational amenities. Other opportunities should be explored where parkland could be leased to others to provide special services and amenities attractive to park users.

Proposed Master Plan Funding Scenarios

Comparison of Current Subsidized Park Development Impact Fee with Proposed Supplementary Funding Scenarios: Unsubsidized Park Development Impact Fee, Off-Site Improvement Fee, Sales Tax and Parcel Tax

Revised: January 2004

	CURRENT PARK FEES	ADDITIONAL REVENUE GAINED FROM PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDING SCENARIOS				REVENUES SET ASIDE FOR MAINTENANCE	
		A	B	C	D	E	F
		Unsubsidize the Development Impact Fee	Implement a 20% Off-Site Improvement Fee	Implement a 0.125% Municipal Sales Tax	Implement a \$40 Per Parcel Parcel Tax	Proposed Maintenance Revenues Generated Through Dedicated Percentage of Parcel and Sales Taxes	
Total Fee Revenue	Additional Revenue Gained	Additional Revenue Gained	Additional Revenue Gained	Additional Revenue Gained	Sales Tax (15% to Maint)	Parcel Tax (20% to Maint)	
Year 2003	\$ 729,770	-	-	-	-	-	-
Year 2004	\$ 804,464	\$ 839,358	\$ 34,857	-	-	-	-
Year 2005	\$ 1,056,960	\$ 836,251	\$ 37,227	\$ 2,177,499	\$ 975,961	\$ 384,264	\$ 243,990
Year 2006	\$ 1,162,601	\$ 770,811	\$ 37,121	\$ 2,242,824	\$ 993,226	\$ 395,792	\$ 248,307
Year 2007	\$ 1,185,310	\$ 789,262	\$ 37,014	\$ 2,310,108	\$ 1,010,442	\$ 407,666	\$ 252,610
Year 2008	\$ 1,208,628	\$ 808,082	\$ 36,908	\$ 2,379,412	\$ 1,027,608	\$ 419,896	\$ 256,902
Year 2009	\$ 1,230,723	\$ 826,146	\$ 36,748	\$ 2,450,794	\$ 1,044,699	\$ 432,493	\$ 261,175
Year 2010	\$ 1,254,221	\$ 845,214	\$ 36,615	\$ 2,524,318	\$ 1,061,729	\$ 445,468	\$ 265,432
Year 2011	\$ 1,277,329	\$ 864,078	\$ 36,455	\$ 2,600,047	\$ 1,078,685	\$ 458,832	\$ 269,671
Year 2012	\$ 1,299,996	\$ 882,699	\$ 36,269	\$ 2,678,049	\$ 1,095,553	\$ 472,597	\$ 273,888
Year 2013	\$ 1,324,116	\$ 902,363	\$ 36,109	\$ 2,758,390	\$ 1,112,348	\$ 486,775	\$ 278,087
Year 2014	\$ 1,347,771	\$ 921,763	\$ 35,922	\$ 2,841,142	\$ 1,129,056	\$ 501,378	\$ 282,264
Year 2015	\$ 1,372,943	\$ 942,256	\$ 35,763	\$ 2,926,376	\$ 1,145,689	\$ 516,419	\$ 286,422
Year 2016	\$ 1,399,716	\$ 963,907	\$ 35,630	\$ 3,014,168	\$ 1,162,261	\$ 531,912	\$ 290,566
Year 2017	\$ 1,428,171	\$ 986,781	\$ 35,523	\$ 3,104,593	\$ 1,178,783	\$ 547,869	\$ 294,696
Year 2018	\$ 1,457,303	\$ 1,010,188	\$ 35,417	\$ 3,197,730	\$ 1,195,255	\$ 564,305	\$ 298,814
Year 2019	\$ 1,491,613	\$ 1,037,261	\$ 35,417	\$ 3,293,662	\$ 1,211,728	\$ 581,235	\$ 302,932
Year 2020	\$ 1,525,695	\$ 1,064,259	\$ 35,390	\$ 3,392,472	\$ 1,228,188	\$ 598,672	\$ 307,047
TOTALS 2003-2010	\$ 8,632,675	\$ 5,715,124	\$ 256,490	\$ 14,084,955	\$ 6,113,665	\$ 2,485,580	\$ 1,528,416
TOTALS 2003-2020	\$ 22,557,328	\$ 15,290,679	\$ 614,394	\$ 43,891,585	\$ 17,651,210	\$ 7,745,574	\$ 4,412,803

Assumptions:

1. Future development and projected revenues are based on population growth figures obtained from the City of Redding Development Services Dept.
2. In-Lieu Fee calculations presume that 30% of projected development will result in parkland dedications and only 70% of projected In-Lieu Fees will be received in cash.
3. In-Lieu Fees raised from current rate of \$225 single-family/\$250 multi-family per unit to \$450 single-family/\$500 multi-family per unit effective January 1, 2005.
4. Unsubsidized park development fees scenario uses 100% of allowable fee for a Level of Service (LOS) of 6.78 acres per 1000 people, and a development cost of \$160,000 per acre effective Jan. 1, 2004. Fee includes value necessary to capture an additional 1.78 acres per 1000 people (6.78 acres/1000 LOS less the 5.00 acres/1000 provided via State Map Act dedications).
5. Off-Site Improvement Fee scenario calculated by charging a 20% of In-Lieu fee, using the 70% of projected In-Lieu Fees received in cash.
6. Municipal Sales Tax scenario assumes implementation no sooner than January 1, 2005. Maintenance set aside of 15% has been deducted.
7. Parcel Tax scenario assumes implementation no sooner than January 1, 2005. Maintenance set-aside of 20% has been deducted.
8. Maintenance set-aside revenues are in addition to the Sales Tax (Scenario C) and Parcel Tax (Scenario D) revenue projections.

Conclusion - Implementing the Plan

Master Plan Park Project List

Through the analyses and assessments undertaken with the Master Plan, a list of park-related projects have been identified (see list at end of section). Together, they include improvement and renovation projects to existing parks, acquisition of new recreational sites, and development of new and existing sites.

The first page of projects are those that can be funded over the next 17 years with expected revenues from existing fees.

The next list illustrates the types of projects that can be created if the park development impact fees and the park in-lieu fees are revised. The final list includes all the other projects needed to achieve the goals of the General Plan and this Master Plan, which must be funded from other funding sources. These sources could be grants, a local sales tax increase, a parcel tax, or redevelopment funds.

Project List and the Capital Improvement Plan

Every two years, the City updates its six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). This comprehensive, multi-departmental planning document sets out all public capital projects (streets, sewer lines, waterlines, storm drains, fire stations, parks, and other City facilities) and their funding sources.

While not a budget, it provides the necessary information for prudent budget recommendations because it compares over a period of years anticipated revenues with various departmental needs.

With the assistance of the Community Services Advisory Commission, the City will select projects from the Master Plan Park Project List for inclusion in the CIP. This selection will be based upon several factors, such as current project opportunities, cost estimates, potential development

partners, available funding, and other information pertinent to creating successful projects.

A Plan for the Future

The Committee that was brought together to develop the Redding *Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan* was charged with the task of creating the blueprint for a comprehensive and coordinated park, trail, and recreation system. The Plan was to reflect the concerns and interests of residents, and to implement the goals that had been set out in the General Plan.

The Master Plan, by definition and intent, outlines a comprehensive program of improvements. To create a plan that is anything less would have been a disservice to the people of this city and would have fallen short of its original purpose.

The implementation of the proposed project list within the next twenty years will allow Redding's park system to achieve the General Plan's adopted service goal of 10 acres of developed parkland per one thousand people.

Ahead of us is the opportunity to create the vision first set out in the General Plan with broad brush strokes. The Master Plan has filled in some details of that enticing picture, proposing new ways for Redding residents to engage in sports, to fish, to bike and hike in our wonderful north state setting.



Celebrating the Opening of the Sacramento River Trail's Stress Ribbon Bridge

Redding Master Plan Park Project List

Park Improvement, Acquisition, and Development Activities, By Quadrant 2004-2020

Revised: May 2004

PROJECTS FUNDED OVER NEXT 17 YEARS WITH CURRENT IN-LIEU AND PARK DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES						
City Quad	Project Name	Proposed Action	Park Acreage	Additional Developed Acreage	Estimated Project Cost	
--	Enterprise Park Debt Service (17 years)	--	--	--	\$2,244,000	
NE	Gregory Lake Community Park, Phase I	Acquire/Develop	45.00	5.00	\$2,585,000	
NE	Mountain View School Park Site	Develop	6.00	6.00	\$1,302,000	
NE	Valley Oak Neighborhood Park, Phase I	Acquire	30.00		\$1,300,000	
NE	Vista Ridge Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	0.92	0.92	\$60,000	
NE	Whistling Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	1.57	1.57	\$282,600	
NW	Buckeye Community Park Upgrade	Improve			\$200,000	
NW	Buckeye Middle School-Park	Acquire	3.00		\$216,000	
NW	Caldwell Regional Park Upgrade Phase I	Improve			\$500,000	
NW	Redwood Large Neighborhood Park, Phase I	Acquire	5.00		\$360,000	
SE	Alta Mesa School-Park / Future Joint Use	Improve		2.25	\$321,000	
SE	Clover Creek Preserve Enhancements	Develop	129.00	7.00	\$1,500,000	
SE	East Oak Small Neighborhood Park*	Develop	2.64	2.64	\$572,880	
SE	Enterprise Community Park, Ph II, Recr. Center	Develop	94.59	5.00	\$4,700,000	
SE	Hawn (Rotary) Small Neighborhood Park	Improve	0.31		\$70,000	
SE	Mistletoe School-Park, Phase I	Acquire	3.50		\$252,000	
SE	Parsons School Joint-Use Site	Improve			\$60,000	
SE	Rother School Future Joint-Use Site	Improve		2.25	\$60,000	
SE	Shastina Large Neighborhood Park, Phase I *	Acquire	8.00		\$403,200	
SW	Bonny View School-Park, Phase I	Acquire	4.00		\$200,000	
SW	Buenaventura Sports Fields	Develop	15.00	12.00	\$2,604,000	
SW	Rivercrest Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	6.25	6.25	\$1,608,250	
SW	Rolling Hills Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$60,000	
SW	Sequoia School Joint-Use Site	Improve			\$321,000	
SW	T.R. Woods Memorial Park	Improve			\$100,000	
SW	Waverly Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	0.75	0.75	\$20,000	
SW	Westridge Large Neighborhood Park, Phase I *	Acquire	13.00		\$504,000	
SUBTOTAL ACQUIRE/DEVELOP ACRES				51.63	\$18,469,930	
SUBTOTAL IMPROVE				--	\$1,692,000	
SUBTOTAL DEBT SERVICE				--	\$2,244,000	
TOTAL COSTS FOR PROJECTS FUNDED WITH CURRENT FEES					\$22,405,930	

NOTES:

- Estimated project costs have been calculated using inflation-adjusted, per-acre costs averaged over the 2003-2020 period. Land acquisition costs equal \$72,000 per acre and development costs equal \$217,000 per acre. Many factors could cause variances in costs, including partnerships and special amenities.
- Baseline development costs are derived from actual Enterprise Park development costs (\$3.415 million), divided by developed park acreage (25 acres), and inflation-adjusted to 2003.
- Baseline land acquisition costs are a weighted median value between single-family (72 percent) and multi-family (28 percent) per acre land costs based on the most recent Planning Department estimates. Weighting is based on the historical single-family/multi-family unit construction from 1980-2002.
- Land acquisition costs anticipate that some park acres will be obtained through State Map Act dedications based on past City of Redding development ratios. Projects where dedications are anticipated are noted with an asterisk (*) in the Project Name column.
- Achievement of 10 acres per 1000 population goal by 2020 assumes at least 233 acres will be gained through grant-funded trail construction.
- Enterprise Park debt service costs are projected at \$132,000 per year through 2020. Actual debt service period is anticipated to end in 2023.
- Current In-Lieu and Park Development Impact Fees equal \$22,557,328 in total revenue, projected through 2020 (see page 13).

Redding Master Plan Park Project List - Continued

Park Improvement, Acquisition, and Development Activities, By Quadrant 2004-2020

Revised: Mar 2004

PROJECTS FUNDED OVER NEXT 17 YEARS WITH UPDATED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES & REVISED IN-LIEU FEES					
City Quad	Project Name	Proposed Action	Park Acreage	Additional Developed Acreage	Estimated Project Cost
NE	Redding Sports Park Site, Phase II	Develop	12.00	10.00	\$5,000,000
NE	Gregory Lake Community Park, Phase II	Develop	45.00	15.00	\$3,255,000
NW	Buckeye M. Schl-Park & Future Joint-Use, Ph. II	Develop	3.00	3.00	\$651,000
NW	Redwood Large Neighborhood Park, Phase II	Develop	5.00	5.00	\$1,085,000
NW	River Ridge Terrace Park Site	Develop	2.04	2.04	\$442,680
SE	Enterprise Community Park, Phase III, Fields	Develop	94.59	12.00	\$2,604,000
SW	Westridge Large Neighborhood, Park Phase II	Develop	13.00	13.00	\$2,170,000
TOTAL ADDITIONAL PROJECTS FUNDED WITH REVISED FEES				60.04	\$15,207,680

PROJECTS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM OTHER PROPOSED SOURCES					
City Quad	Project Name	Proposed Action	Park Acreage	Additional Developed Acreage	Estimated Project Cost
NE	Boulder Rock Large Neighborhood Park*	Acquire/Develop	20.70	13.00	\$3,864,280
NE	Collyer Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	10.00	10.00	\$2,674,000
NE	Gateway (Blossom) School-Park Site	Develop	5.90	5.90	\$1,280,300
NE	Hawley Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	5.00	5.00	\$1,337,000
NE	Minder Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$60,000
NE	Northridge Gardens Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$55,000
NE	Oasis Community Park *	Acquire/Develop	30.00	20.00	\$6,140,000
NE	Ravenwood Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$60,000
NE	Rosetree Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	2.00	2.00	\$434,000
NE	Stillwater Heights Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$55,000
NE	Valley Oak Neighborhood Park, Phase II	Develop	30.00	15.00	\$3,255,000
NW	Amethyst Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$64,000
NW	Bel Air Small Neighborhood Park*	Acquire/Develop	3.00	3.00	\$802,200
NW	Buckeye Community Park Expansion	Develop	17.84	10.00	\$3,069,136
NW	Caldwell Regional Park Upgrade, Phase II	Improve			\$2,000,000
NW	Lake Redding Large Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$500,000
NW	Newtown Creek Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	13.50	10.00	\$2,850,400
NW	Peppertree Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$44,000
NW	River Park Highlands Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	1.89	1.89	\$410,130
NW	Stanford Hills Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	15.00	15.00	\$4,011,000
NW	Upper Churn Creek Large Neighborhood Park *	Acquire/Develop	8.40	6.50	\$1,833,860
NW	Valley Ridge Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$50,000
SE	Churn Creek Large Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	17.30	10.00	\$2,170,000
SE	Clover Creek Small Neighborhood Park	Develop/Improve	2.30	1.30	\$125,000
SE	Enterprise Community Park, Phase IV, Pool	Develop	94.59	2.00	\$3,000,000
SE	Foxtail Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$75,000
SE	Graham Park (Special Purpose Facility)	Improve			\$10,000
SE	Mistletoe School-Park, Phase II	Develop	3.50	3.00	\$651,000
SE	Oakwood Small Neighborhood Park*	Acquire/Develop	5.00	5.00	\$1,445,000
SE	Pacheco School District School-Park*	Acquire/Develop	6.00	6.00	\$1,604,400
SE	Shastina Large Neighborhood Park, Phase II*	Develop	8.00	8.00	\$1,736,000
SE	Western Oaks Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$53,000
SW	Bonny View School-Park, Phase II	Develop	4.00	4.00	\$868,000
SW	Canyon Hollow Natural Area Park *	Acquire/Develop	6.00	6.00	\$510,000
SW	Cascade Community Park Expansion	Develop	10.00	10.00	\$2,170,000
SW	Cascade Community Park, Phase III	Improve			\$174,000
SW	Country Heights Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$66,000
SW	Creekside / Summerfield Small Neighborhood Park	Develop	4.21	2.26	\$490,420
SW	Downtown Square / Plaza	Acquire/Develop	1.80	1.80	\$520,200
SW	Foothill Park	Improve			\$25,000
SW	Indian Hills Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$68,000

SW	Magnolia Park / Future Joint-Use Site	Develop	1.00	1.00	\$217,000
SW	Mary Lake Natural Area Park	Improve			\$50,000
SW	MeadowCreek Small Neighborhood Park Site	Develop	1.87	0.50	\$108,500
SW	MLK Jr. Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$182,000
SW	Ridgeview Small Neighborhood Park	Improve			\$60,000
SW	South Bonnyview Boat Launch, Phase II	Improve			\$203,000
SW	South City Community Park	Improve			\$201,500
SW	Southwest Community Park *	Acquire/Develop	30.00	25.00	\$7,585,000
SW	Sycamore School Park / Future Joint-Use Site	Acquire/Develop	5.00	5.00	\$1,445,000
SW	Turtle Bay Boat Ramp, Phase II	Improve			\$75,000
SUBTOTAL ACQUIRE /DEVELOP ACRES			208.15		\$56,606,826
SUBTOTAL IMPROVE				-	\$4,130,500
TOTAL PROJECTS FUNDED FROM OTHER PROPOSED SOURCES				-	\$60,737,326

PROJECT LIST SUMMARY		<i>Additional Developed Acreage</i>	<i>Estimated Project Costs</i>
TOTAL ALL ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS		319.82	\$90,284,436
TOTAL ALL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS			\$5,822,500
TOTAL ALL DEBT SERVICE			\$2,244,000
TOTAL PLAN COST			\$98,350,936

NOTES:

1. Estimated project costs have been calculated using inflation-adjusted, per-acre costs averaged over the 2003-2020 period. Land acquisition costs equal \$72,000 per acre and development costs equal \$217,000 per acre. Many factors could cause variances in costs, including partnerships and special amenities.
2. Baseline development costs are derived from actual Enterprise Park development costs (\$3.415 million), divided by developed park acreage (25 acres), and inflation-adjusted to 2003.
3. Baseline land acquisition costs are a weighted median value between single-family (72 percent) and multi-family (28 percent) per acre land costs based on the most recent Planning Department estimates. Weighting is based on the historical single-family/multi-family unit construction from 1980-2002.
4. Land acquisition costs anticipate that some park acres will be obtained through State Map Act dedications based on past City of Redding development ratios. Projects where dedications are anticipated are noted with an asterisk (*) in the Project Name column.
5. Achievement of 10 acres per 1000 population goal by 2020 assumes at least 233 acres will be gained through grant-funded trail construction (6.06 acres per mile of 50'-wide trail corridor).
6. Enterprise Park debt service costs are projected at \$132,000 per year through 2020. Actual debt service period is anticipated to end in 2023.

NOTES ON FUNDING SOURCES (Summarized from table on page 13):

1. Current In-Lieu Fee and Park Development Impact Fees (projected through 2020) equal \$22,557,328 in total revenue.
2. Revising the Park Development Impact Fee to remove the subsidy (projected through 2020) generates \$15,290,679 in new revenue (\$37,848,007 in cumulative revenue).
3. Revising In-Lieu Fees to include a 20% off-site improvement fee (projected through 2020) generates \$614,384 in new revenues (\$38,462,391 in cumulative revenue).
4. Implementing a one-eighth percent (0.125%) Municipal Sales Tax, instead of the Parcel Tax, (projected from 2005-2020) produces \$43,891,585 in new revenue (\$82,353,976 in total cumulative revenue).
5. Implementing a \$40 per acre Parcel Tax, instead of the Sales Tax, (projected from 2004-2020) generates \$17,651,210 in new revenue (\$56,113,601 in total cumulative revenue).

