



REPORT TO COUNCIL

City of Sacramento

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604
www.CityofSacramento.org

STAFF REPORT
December 9, 2008

Honorable Mayor and
Members of the City Council

Title: *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan: Section 5: Financing*

Location/Council District: Citywide

Recommendation: Adopt **Resolution:** 1) adopting "Section 5: Financing" as an addendum to the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP)* (Attachment 1, Exhibit A, p. 6) including the recommendations contained therein related to: a) a "premier level" park development standard for PSIP projects, b) establishing Tier III level projects, c) funding transfers and reprogramming, d) fund appropriation, and e) financing priorities; Adopt a **Resolution** 2) authorizing staff to submit to the California Department of Parks and Recreation ("CDPR") an application for a Land and Water Conservation Fund ("LWCF") grant in an amount up to \$150,000 for the Chorley Park Development project; Adopt a **Resolution** 3) authorizing the City Manager or designated appointee to execute the required CPDR LWCF grant contract, including any amendments thereto, any and all other documents required or deemed necessary or appropriate to secure a LWCF grant from CDPR, to establish related revenue and expenditure budgets for the grant funds, and to appropriate the grant funds, contingent upon approval of the application; and 4) requiring staff to return to Council if there is any significant change in requested dollar amounts, either grant or match.

Contact: Jonathan Rewers, Parks and Recreation Analyst, 808-7590

Presenters: Jonathan Rewers, Parks and Recreation Analyst, 808-7590

Department: Parks and Recreation

Division: Office of the Director

Organization No: 19001411

Description/Analysis

Issue: On April 10, 2008, the City Council adopted the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP)*. Section 3 of PSIP (the "Implementation Plan") recommended a tiered approach to improvements. Tier I was in most cases immediate improvements to resolve on-site situations identified in Park Safety Audits. Tier II was largely long-range planning to change the "perception" of the nine priority parks and to increase recreational use and community ownership. The Council requested that staff come forward with recommendations on how actual park improvements identified through the Tier II process would be funded and developed. Staff is bringing forward for adoption an addendum to PSIP, Section 5: "Financing" with strategies to implement Tier III improvements consistent with the City's strategy to improve the safety of the City's parks system.

Policy Considerations: Providing Parks and Recreation facilities is consistent with the City's strategic plan to achieve sustainability and livability throughout the City.

Staff recommendation is consistent with the recommendations and action plans in the adopted *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (Resolution 2008-217)*.

PSIP projects were all identified as *priority* projects in the City Council adopted *2008 Parks and Recreation Programming Guide (Resolution 2008-756)*.

Staff's recommendation is consistent with numerous policies in the City Council adopted *2005-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan* associated with physical safety, community outreach, park use and addition of park lighting (Policy 1.6, 2.3, 3.3, 13.22, 13.26, 13.32 and 13.37).

Committee/Commission Action: The Parks and Recreation Commission participated in a public workshop on February 20, 2008, as part of the Park Safety Audit process. Members discussed and made recommendations on the nine parks selected for a Park Safety Audit. The Parks and Recreation Commission supported the adoption of PSIP at its March 6, 2008 meeting. On November 6, 2008, the Parks and Recreation Commission unanimously supported staff's recommendation regarding Section 5: Financing for PSIP.

Environmental Considerations:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): Staff's recommendation concerns administrative activities that will not have any significant effect on the environment and that do not constitute a "project," as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) [CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3); 15378(b)(2)].

Sustainability Considerations: Staff's recommendations have been reviewed for consistency with the goals, policies, and targets of the City's Sustainability Master Plan and the Parks and Recreation Sustainability Plan. If funded, these projects will advance the goals, policies, and targets of these plans by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution through the addition of trees and other plantings, and improving the health of residents through access to a diverse mix of wellness activities. Park design will also include sustainable elements such as use of recycled materials, solar lighting, and low water use landscaping.

Rationale for Recommendation: Ensuring that the City's park and recreation system creates a positive, clean, vibrant and safe environment requires a comprehensive strategy that needs to be targeted at the individual facility/neighborhood level.

With the adoption of PSIP, the City Council approved action plans for nine City parks to implement capital improvements and operational enhancements to make these parks positive sources of recreation and safe environments for park users.

Staff's recommendation is that the City Council adopt an addendum to PSIP (Section 5: Financing) (Attachment 1, Exhibit A, p. 6). This new section establishes budget levels/goals for funding by creating a "premier level" park development standard for

PSIP projects, establishes capital improvement projects (CIP) and appropriates or reprograms funding for Tier III projects. Tier III projects are the development of the park site master plans or capital improvement recommendations generated through Tier II of PSIP. This section also recommends further financing strategies to continue implementation of PSIP. Those strategies include prioritizing projects for future Proposition 84 and 1C grant funding, and moving forward with Chorley Park Development as the priority for the 2009 round of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program grant.

Establishment of capital improvement projects, fund appropriation, funding transfers and support for grant proposals all require the approval of the City Council.

Financial Considerations: The total estimate for full implementation of PSIP Tier III capital improvements is \$57,720,800 (Attachment 1, Exhibit A, p. 9). This would complete build out of each park master plan or complete development of recommended capital improvements. The proposed first phase of implementation is estimated at \$19,240,267. Of that amount, the Department of Parks and Recreation and its partners have identified a total of \$5,455,589, leaving a funding gap of \$13,784,678.

Staff is recommending that the City Council approve a total of \$1,434,640 in various funding transfers and reprogramming of funds. These funds are from completed projects, or projects that are projected to have savings upon completion.

Staff is also recommending that the City Council approve a total appropriation of \$1,020,000 including: \$500,000 in Quimby In-Lieu Fees (Fund 2508), \$500,000 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) and \$20,000 in South Natomas Community Improvement Funds (Fund 2020).

The balance of identified funding, or \$3,000,949, comes from administrative transfers between projects, from fund appropriations made through prior actions of the City Council and consolidation of projects already authorized by the City Council.

In summary, the actions recommended by staff including funding transfers, new appropriations in addition to administrative transfers and prior City Council actions will result in funding for the first phase of Tier III projects as follows:

PROJECT	IDENTIFIED FUNDING
McClatchy Park	\$ 1,185,700
Hagginwood Park	\$ 1,134,940
Johnston Park	\$ 800,000
Strawberry Manor Park	\$ 700,000
Gardenland Park	\$ 750,000
Bill Bean Park Jr.	\$ 187,949
Chorley Park (Community Park)	\$ -
Chorley Park (Natural Area)	\$ 222,000
Ninos Park	\$ 125,000
Martin Luther King Jr. Park	\$ 350,000
TOTAL	\$ 5,455,589

Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD): Not applicable. There are no ESBD considerations with this report.

Respectfully Submitted by: 
for JAMES L. COMBS
Director of Parks and Recreation

Recommendation Approved:


for RAY KERRIDGE
City Manager

Table of Contents:

Report Pg 1

Attachments:

1 Resolution (PSIP: Section 5) Pg 5

Exhibits:

A. *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan: Finance Plan*

2 Resolution (LWCF State) Pg 16

3 Resolution (LWCF City) Pg 17

RESOLUTION NO. 2008-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

December 9, 2008

**PARKS AND RECREATION SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN:
SECTION 5: FINANCING**

BACKGROUND

- A. The public's perception of the safety of parks and recreation facilities has declined since 2003 according to two public surveys of residents within the City of Sacramento.
- B. Ensuring that the City's park and recreation system creates a positive, clean, vibrant and safe environment requires a comprehensive strategy that needs to be targeted at the facility/neighborhood level. No one solution will resolve the issue citywide.
- C. On January 8, 2008, the City Council approved Section 2 (the "Planning Process") for the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan* which established the methods for evaluating the safety of parks and recreation facilities, performing specific Park Safety Audits and developing Best Management Practice (BMP) recommendations for Park Safety Services.
- D. The results and data received through the Planning Process have resulted in specific Action Plans and other recommendations for the City Council to adopt.
- E. On April 10, 2008, the City Council adopted the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP)*. As part of the PSIP, the City Council approved action plans for nine City parks to implement capital improvements and operational enhancements to make these parks positive, clean, vibrant and safe environments for park users.
- F. On April 10, 2008, the City Council requested that staff come forward with recommendations on how actual park improvements identified through the Tier II process would be funded and developed.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL
RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. "Section 5: Financing" of the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP)* including the recommendations contained therein related to: a) a "premier level" standard for PSIP projects, b) establishing Tier III level projects, c) funding transfers and reprogramming, d) fund appropriation, and e) financing priorities is adopted.

Table of Contents:

Exhibit A: *Parks and Recreation Facility Implementation Plan: Section 5: Financing*

FINANCING

SECTION 5: FINANCING

BACKGROUND

- PSIP Concept

“PREMIER LEVEL” PARK DEVELOPMENT STANDARD

- Park Safety Development Concept
- Level of Financing
- Budget Projections

TIER III

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

- Funding Needs/Gaps and Phasing
- Establishing Tier III Level Projects
- Funding Transfers/Appropriation

FUTURE FINANCING

- Proposition 84 & 1C Grants
- 2009 LWCF Grant Program



BACKGROUND

Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan Concept

There is a growing perception within the community that City parks and recreation facilities are unsafe. The number of residents that felt that the safety of City parks and recreation facilities was “below average or poor” or “very poor or a failure” **increased 50%** between 2003 and 2006. As a result, the City needed to take action to combat this perception problem.

Using City Council approved *Park Safety Evaluation* criteria, a multi-departmental team performed safety evaluations of 38 park sites and recommended nine parks for Park Safety Audits. Police Department and Park Safety staff did daytime and nighttime site evaluations of each of the nine park site. The Neighborhood Services Department with Parks and Recreation staff coordinated 11 community meetings and workshops.

In many cases, the safety concerns at each park site were primarily due to the fact that the park was not a positive source of recreation within the communities in which they were located. In some cases, elements were dated, the park may have gained a bad reputation or regular inappropriate use of the facility was a barrier for the community as a whole.

On April 10, 2008, the City Council adopted the *Parks and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP)*. As part of the PSIP, the City Council approved action plans for nine City parks to implement capital improvements and operational enhancements to make these parks positive, clean, vibrant and safe environments for park users.

The Section 4 of PSIP or the *Implementation Chapter* recommended a “tiered” approach to improvements. **Tier I** was in most cases immediate improvements to resolve on-site situations identified in Park Safety Audits. **Tier II** was long-range planning (Park Master Plan updates) or capital improvements designed to change the “perception” of the nine priority parks and to increase recreational use and community ownership. To help insure that these parks are an asset to their neighborhood, projects resulting from the completion of Tier II were recommended to be implemented as funding became available.

The City Council when adopting PSIP requested staff in the future come forward with recommendations on how actual park improvements identified through the Tier II process would be funded and developed. Staff is bringing forward for adoption an addendum to PSIP, Section 5: “Financing” with strategies to continue implementation of PSIP and implement **Tier III** improvements consistent with the City’s strategy to improve the safety of the City’s park system.



PREMIER LEVEL STANDARD

Park Safety Development Concept

The most successful way to increase safety in the park system is to enhance **natural surveillance** and create parks that are a positive amenity in neighborhoods and communities. The goal of PSIP is to “redevelop” existing park sites to enhance recreation and create a sense of community ownership.

Tier I recommendations were capital improvements to the existing park sites to improve on-site conditions such as additional lighting, camera systems and fencing where appropriate for additional site control.

Tier II recommendations were meant to be long-term plans to create more permanent solutions. The majority of Tier II recommendations primarily focused on creating new site master plans for the nine priority park facilities identified in PSIP. The new master plans were intended to reconnect the community with these facilities, and develop specific recommendations for capital improvements that improve and enhance recreational opportunities for the community.

Tier III recommendations are meant to establish budgets, financing and phasing plans for the implementation of the master plans generated during Tier II.

Level of Financing

The designs of each of the master plans recommended as part of Tier II were based on the following:

- Each of the nine priority and other park sites identified in PSIP are existing developed parks; as such they require **“redevelopment”** and refurbishment of existing infrastructure in many cases;
- Each of these park facilities has a “perception” problem and needs a **“signature” recreational item** to reactivate the site, and
- Each of these park sites will need **“draws” beyond their established service area**, to increase use, natural surveillance of the park site and make existing neighbors who are familiar with the site more comfortable using it on a day-to-day basis.

Based on the above, the assigned level of financing necessary to successfully complete these projects was determined to be at a **construction cost of \$525,000 per acre of development**. Nature areas were determined to be \$100,000 per acre of development. This would be a premier level of park development as it is currently beyond the standard per acre cost.



Budget Projections

Based on the "Premier Level" park development standard, an estimated probable cost has been developed for each of the nine priority parks. The total cost for full development of these newly designed sites and or full implementation of all aspects Tier III is \$57,720,000 as detailed below.

PREMIER LEVEL PARK STANDARD PER ACRE COST - CONSTRUCTION ONLY	
DEVELOPMENT TYPE	PER ACRE COST
Park Development (Neighborhood and/or Community)	\$525,000
Nature Area (Community Park/Passive Recreation)	\$100,000

COST OF FULL BUILD OUT PER ACRE PER PARK - FULL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT		
PROJECT	ACREAGE	ESTIMATED PROBABLE COSTS
McClatchy Park	15.33	\$ 11,497,500
Hagginwood Park	17	\$ 12,750,000
Johnston Park	23.31	\$ 17,482,500
Strawberry Manor Park	1.38	\$ 1,035,000
Gardenland Park*	1.5	\$ 1,125,000
Bill Bean Park Jr.*	1	\$ 750,000
Chorley Park (Community Park)	11.84	\$ 8,880,000
Chorley Park (Natural Area)**	20.39	\$ 2,685,800
Ninos Park*	1.52	\$ 375,000
Martin Luther King Jr. Park	1.52	\$ 1,140,000
TOTAL		\$57,720,800.00

*The improvement plan only represents the addition of recreational element(s), in a portion of the park, not comprising the entire facility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1.0 Premier Level Park Development Standard

- 1.1 A "Premier Level" park development standard for Park and Recreation Safety Implementation Plan (PSIP) projects is approved.
- 1.2 Premier Level parks are designed to draw users from beyond the standard service area for that specific type of park facility.
- 1.3 Premier Level parks are existing park facilities that require major redevelopment, reconstruction and infrastructure improvements.
- 1.4 Premier Level parks have "signature" recreational amenities or those that could be considered destination attractions.
- 1.5 Premier Level park development is estimated at a construction cost of \$525,000 per acre.



TIER III CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Funding Needs/Gaps and Phasing

With the total resource need identified of approximately \$58 million for full implementation of the master plans and capital improvements identified as part of Tier II of PSIP, a phased approach for **Tier III** is being recommended, with available resources allocated to park sites based on an initial phase of development. With a total of three phases of development recommended the initial funding need for a first phase of development of **Tier III** projects is estimated at **\$19,240,266**.

COST OF FULL BUILD OUT PER ACRE PER PARK		
PROJECT	FULL BUILD OUT	COST PER PHASE
McClatchy Park	\$ 11,497,500	\$ 3,832,500
Hagginwood Park	\$ 12,750,000	\$ 4,250,000
Johnston Park	\$ 17,482,500	\$ 5,827,500
Strawberry Manor Park	\$ 1,035,000	\$ 345,000
Gardenland Park	\$ 1,125,000	\$ 375,000
Bill Bean Park Jr.	\$ 750,000	\$ 250,000
Chorley Park (Community Park)	\$ 8,880,000	\$ 2,960,000
Chorley Park (Natural Area)**	\$ 2,685,800	\$ 895,266
Ninos Park*	\$ 375,000	\$ 125,000
Martin Luther King Jr. Park	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 380,000
TOTAL		\$19,240,266.00

PHASE I IDENTIFIED FUNDING & FUNDING SHORTFALL			
PROJECT	COST PER PHASE	IDENTIFIED FUNDING	PHASE I FUNDING SHORTFALL
McClatchy Park	\$ 3,832,500	\$ 1,185,700	\$ (2,646,800)
Hagginwood Park	\$ 4,250,000	\$ 1,134,940	\$ (3,115,060)
Johnston Park	\$ 5,827,500	\$ 800,000	\$ (5,027,500)
Strawberry Manor Park	\$ 345,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 355,000
Gardenland Park	\$ 375,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 375,000
Bill Bean Park Jr.	\$ 250,000	\$ 187,949	\$ (62,051)
Chorley Park (Community Park)	\$ 2,960,000	\$ -	\$ (2,960,000)
Chorley Park (Natural Area)	\$ 895,266	\$ 222,000	\$ (673,267)
Ninos Park	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ -
Martin Luther King Jr. Park	\$ 380,000	\$ 350,000	\$ (30,000)
TOTAL		\$ 5,455,589	\$(13,784,678)

To date a total of **\$5,455,589** has been identified from a variety of funding sources for the first phase implementation of Tier III of PSIP. This includes funding transfers from completed projects, project savings, one-time funding opportunities and appropriation of some Redevelopment Funding, Park Development Impact Fees and Quimby-In Lieu Fees. This leaves a funding gap of **\$13,784,678**.

For the Tier III recommendation, some PSIP projects have been consolidated (Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III) to realize savings and



efficiencies including economies of scale in project bidding and construction.

Adoption of the proposed 2030 General Plan is also assumed, allowing for some additional flexibility in project funding with changes in the boundaries of community planning areas.

Establishing Tier III Level Projects

For Tier III projects, six new capital improvement projects are recommended to be established.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.0 Tier III Level Projects

- 2.1 Establish a capital improvement project for Hagginwood Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19808800).
- 2.2 Establish a capital improvement project for Johnston Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19808900).
- 2.3 Establish a capital improvement project for Gardenland Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809000).
- 2.4 Establish a capital improvement project for Ninos Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809100).
- 2.5 Establish a capital improvement project for Chorley Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809200).
- 2.6 Establish a capital improvement project for Martin Luther King Jr. Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809300).

Funding Transfers/Appropriations

City Council approval is required for a number of the funding transfers between existing CIP's associated with this Finance Plan. In addition, any appropriation of new funding requires approval of the City Council.

The total in funding transfers recommended is \$1,434,640 and reflects reprogramming of appropriated funds and reprogramming of realized project savings. Staff is also requesting the authority to transfer fund balances upon project completion and authority for PSIP projects only, to transfer funds between projects if savings are realized or additional development can be realized with adjustments in project budgets.

The total fund appropriation requested is \$1,020,000 which includes one-time capital improvement funding such as Park Development Impact Fees.



RECOMMENDATIONS

3.0 Funding Transfers/Reprogramming

- 3.1 Upon completion of the Argonaut Park Master Plan project (L19179000), transfer remaining Park Development Impact Fee Balance (Fund 3204) to the Chorley Park Master Plan Project (L19808500).
- 3.2 Close and defund the Garden Highway River Observation Deck Project (L19191000) and transfer \$52,000 in General Funds (Fund 1001) to the Chorley Park Master Plan Project (L19808500).
- 3.3 Transfer \$300,000 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) from the Robertson Park Improvement Project (L19190000) to the Strawberry Manor Park Safety Improvement Project (L19808300).
- 3.4 Transfer \$94,700 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) from the Bill C. Bean Jr. Park Safety Improvement Project (L19807700) to the McClatchy Park Safety Renovation Project (L19136000).
- 3.5 Close and defund the Hagginwood Park Project (L19195000) and transfer \$8,000 in Landscape and Lighting Funds (Fund 2232) to the Hagginwood Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19808800).
- 3.6 Transfer \$120,000 in Landscape and Lighting Funds (Fund 2232) from the Sport Court Rehabilitation Project (L19003000) to the McClatchy Park Safety Renovation Project (L19136000).
- 3.7 Close and transfer fund balance from the Park Enhancements/APP CD2 Project (L19147000) - \$49,940, General Funds (Fund 1001) and \$22,000 Landscape and Lighting Funds (Fund 2232) to the Hagginwood PSIP Tier III Project (L19808800).
- 3.8 Transfer \$300,000 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) from the Oak Park Community Center Phase II Project (L13000100) to the McClatchy Park Safety Renovation Project (L19136000).
- 3.9 Upon completion of the Oak Park Community Center Phase II Project (L13000100), transfer any remaining Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) balance to the McClatchy Park Safety Improvement Project (L19136000).



3.10 Transfer \$488,000 in CIP Reimbursable Funds (Fund 3702) from the Park Easement North and South Natomas Project (L19008000) to the Gardenland PSIP Tier III Project (L19809000).

RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 Fund Appropriation

- 4.1 Appropriate \$400,000 in Quimby In-Lieu Fees (Fund 2508) to the Johnston Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19808900).
- 4.2 Upon adoption of the 2030 General Plan, appropriate \$150,000 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) to the Chorley Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809200).
- 4.3 Upon adoption of the 2030 General Plan, appropriate \$350,000 in Park Development Impact Fees (Fund 3204) to the Martin Luther King Jr. Park PSIP Tier III Project (L19809300).
- 4.4 Appropriate \$100,000 in Quimby In-Lieu Fees (Fund 2508) to the Gardenland PSIP Tier III Project (L19809000).
- 4.5 Appropriate \$20,000 in South Natomas Community Improvement Funds (Fund 2020) to the Gardenland PSIP Tier III Project (L19809000).



FUTURE FINANCING

With a financing gap remaining of \$13,784,678, future financing options are being recommended. While the City and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency continue to work in partnership to make wise investments with the use of redevelopment funds for improvement to park safety in the City, there are other outside funding opportunities that the City will be able to pursue in the next 24-36 months.

Proposition 84 & 1C Grants

With the recent approval of the State Budget, two new grant programs for park development in urbanized cities were established.

As part of **Proposition 84**, the Statewide Park and Community Revitalization Program was created. The program is a \$400 million dollar competitive grant program managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Funds are expected to be distributed in two cycles, the first being as soon as October 2009. This program will fund the acquisition of new parks, development of new parks, expansion of overused parks and/or the creation of new recreational opportunities.

As part of **Proposition 1C**, \$200 million was set aside for local parks related to affordable housing. Specifics regarding this program have not yet been released, but the City of Sacramento could see significant funds for park development.

It is recommended that, for the first rounds of Proposition 84 and 1C that unfunded PSIP projects be the priority, if identified projects qualify under the grant criteria.

2009 Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Program

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program is administered by the National Park Service and provides funds to federal agencies, and to the 50 states and 6 territories. The money allocated to the states may be used for statewide planning, and for acquiring and developing outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Eligible projects are for the acquisition or development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Priority development projects include trails, campgrounds, picnic areas, natural areas and cultural areas for recreational use. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public outdoor recreation use.

The current concept for the development of Chorley Park is to make it a premier nature interpretive area. This would include



the development of passive recreational opportunities on more than 20 acres of nature area in a well established neighborhood. The site could be a regional nature center for local schools as well as a center of passive recreation for the Airport/Meadowview Planning Area. Development of the master plan currently includes addition of picnic areas, walking/jogging trails and other support facilities. These items are consistent with priorities for funding from LWCF.

The application is due in March 2009. A 50% or dollar-for-dollar match will need to be secured. Staff is recommending the setting aside of funding for a \$150,000 match for the 2009 round of the grant program, for a total project budget of \$300,000.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Financing Priorities

- 5.1 *Proposition 84* - The City Council supports developing competitive grant proposals for the first round of Proposition 84 grant funds for PSIP projects if those projects are competitive based on the approved grant criteria.
- 5.2 *Proposition 1C* - The City Council supports using allocations of Proposition 1C funds associated with park development for PSIP projects if those projects are competitive based on the approved grant criteria.
- 5.3 *Land and Water Conservation Fund* - The City Council supports the development of a Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant for the development of trails and support elements at Chorley Park as part of the 2009 Grant Round.



RESOLUTION NO. 2008-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

December 9, 2008

**APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND
CHORLEY PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

BACKGROUND

- A. The Congress under Public Law 88-578 has authorized the establishment of a federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant-In-Aid program, providing Matching funds to the State of California and its political subdivisions for acquiring lands and developing Facilities for public outdoor recreation purposes; and
- B. The California Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible for administration of the program in the State, setting up necessary rules and procedures governing Applications by local agencies under the program; and
- C. Said adopted procedures established by the State Department of Parks and Recreation require the Applicant to certify by resolution the approval of Applications and the availability of eligible Matching funds prior to submission of said Applications to the State; and
- D. The proposed Chorley Park Project is consistent with the most recent *California Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP)*; and
- E. The Project must be compatible with the land use plans of those jurisdictions immediately surrounding Project.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL
RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

- Section 1. Approves the filing of an Application for Land and Water Conservation Fund assistance; and
- Section 2. Certifies that said agency has Matching funds from eligible source(s) and can finance 100 percent of the Project, which up to half may be reimbursed; and
- Section 3. Certifies that the Project is compatible with the land use plans of those jurisdictions immediately surrounding the Project; and
- Section 4. Appoints the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, Director of Parks and Recreation or Support Services Manager as agent of the Applicant to conduct all negotiations and execute and submit all documents, including, but not limited to, Applications, contracts, amendments, payment requests, and compliance with all applicable current state and federal laws which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned Project.

RESOLUTION NO. 2008-

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

December 9, 2008

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY AGREEMENTS, ESTABLISH RELATED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE BUDGETS FOR THE GRANT FUNDS AND APPROPRIATE THE GRANT FUNDS CONTINGENT ON RECEIPT OF AWARD ASSOCIATED WITH THE 2009 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM GRANT FOR CHORLEY PARK DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

- A. The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Program funds projects related to outdoor recreational activities and indoor facilities that support outdoor recreational activities.
- B. LWCF has a 50% match or dollar-for-dollar match requirement. The City of Sacramento in 2008 will request up to \$150,000 total in grant funds, thus a \$150,000 grant request requires a match of \$150,000 for a total project budget of \$300,000 for the two proposed projects.
- C. The match for the Chorley Park Development project will come from Park Development Impact Fees.
- D. While the City's required contribution to the proposed projects is 50% of the total project budget, those funds identified as "required match" may only be used to cover costs related to the project that are eligible under the LWCF program. With some grant programs, other costs such as indirect rate charges are not eligible, therefore the City's contribution to the grant-funded project will exceed the required match amount.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

- Section 1. Appoints the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, Director of Parks and Recreation or Support Services Manager as agent of the City of Sacramento to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents, including, but not limited to applications, agreements, amendments, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project.
- Section 2. Authorizes the City Manager to execute all necessary agreements, establish related revenue and expenditure budgets for the grant funds and appropriate the grant funds contingent on receipt of award.
- Section 3. Staff will return to Council if there is any significant change in requested dollar amounts, either grant or match.