

5. FUNDING

To successfully implement the Master Plan recommendations and expand parks and recreation facilities and services, an adequate budget is needed. This chapter identifies estimated costs for existing park improvements, maintenance costs, and potential funding sources that may be used to achieve Grass Valley's vision for the future of its park system.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ESTIMATING CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The following is a basic construction cost estimating guide to provide the City with guidelines for calculating estimated acreage or square footage costs. The unit costs in the General Guidelines may not be consistent with the line item costs for specific improvements in existing built parks.

Neighborhood and Community Parks

- \$115,000 per acre for developed and redeveloped parks
- \$130,000/acre for new construction (\$3/square foot)
-

Playground Improvements

- \$50,000 to \$100,000 per neighborhood park
- \$200,000 to \$300,000 per community park/regional park
-

Urban Plaza

- \$10/square foot: includes site preparation, concrete paving, site amenities, limited plantings and irrigation
-

Trail and Open Space Development

- \$400,000 per mile for developed trail: 8' wide, paved surface
- \$150,000 per mile for less developed trail development: 4' to 6' wide, soft surface, foot trails
-

Pool Complex

- \$2.2 million: 8000 square foot water surface and bathhouse
-

Community Center

- \$180 per square foot (public funding/ownership, at prevailing wages)
-

Wolf Creek Corridor

- Will be a combination of Urban Plaza/Park and Trail Development

ESTIMATED COSTS OF SPECIFIC PARK IMPROVEMENTS

The second section lists specific improvements for individual parks, built and unbuilt. These are rough cost estimates and are meant to be only a guideline. The costs do not reflect fees for community outreach, master planning, and construction document preparation.

Condon Park (80 acres) - \$925,000

- Parking lot expansions (70 spaces): \$150,000

- Foot trails (soft surface, 2 miles): \$200,000
- Paved bike/pedestrian paths (2000 l.f., 8' wide) : \$50,000
- Landscape improvements for 3 acres: \$260,000
- Picnic area cover: \$60,000
- Play field: \$145,000
- Skateboard park: \$50,000
- Improved entryway into the Park (wider, paved sidewalk, etc.): \$20,000

*Dow Alexander (.25 acres) - \$46,000 to \$71,000**

- Sidewalk improvements (\$4/sq.ft): \$3,000
- Playground improvements: \$30,000
- Landscape and picnic area: \$8,000
- Restroom (portable toilet enclosure, masonry): \$3,000*
- Restroom (prefab): \$10,000*
- Restroom (custom): \$25,000*
- Relocated war canon to Memorial Park: \$2,000

*Note: depending on restroom option selected

Elizabeth Daniels Park (.16 acres) - \$150,000

- Concrete plaza paving (\$6/sq.ft.): \$41,000
- Steps and ramps: \$34,000
- Renovate restroom: \$15,000
- Site furniture, seatwalls: \$50,000
- Limited landscaping and irrigation: \$10,000
- Glen Jones / Pelton Wheel (2 acres) - \$13,000
- Improved trail within park: \$13,000
- Memorial Park (7.6 acres) - \$650,000
- Sidewalks on Colfax Ave. and Memorial Lane (\$4/sq. ft.): \$20,000
- Tennis Court (\$5/sq.ft.): \$25,000
- Soft surface foot trails: \$3,000
- Memorial Trail (paved foot path, 6' wide): \$72,000
- Relocation of memorials: \$6,000
- Site furniture, bollards, fencing: \$30,000
- Renovated Ball field announcers box (\$10/sq. ft.): \$2,000
- Pool complex renovations (new front entry, equipment): \$200,000
- New Parking Lot (7,000 sq. ft. @ \$6): \$42,000
- Scout Lodge renovations: \$100,000
- Paving treatment for Oak Street (inside the park): \$50,000
- Site preparations: \$100,000

Minnie Park (2 acres) - \$150,000

- Play ground renovations (equipment and surface material): \$100,000
- Road work (AC removal, add cul-de-sac installation): \$15,000
- Landscape renovation: \$13,000
- Sidewalks: \$16,000
- Picnic area: \$3,000
- Signs, gateways: \$3,000
- Morgan Ranch (4 acres) - \$270,000
- Limited lawn, foot trails, replanting, survey, site preparations: \$1.50/sq. ft.
- Mulcahy Field (12.9 acres) - \$1,376,000
- Site preparation: \$20,000

- Utilities: \$23,000
- Alta Street improvements: \$50,000
- Play area - \$50,000
- Soccer fields (\$2/sq. ft.): \$348,000
- Concession/restroom/storage/maintenance building. (2000 sq. ft.)-\$100/sq. ft.): \$200,000
- Paved Trails (ADA compliant): \$20,000
- Picnic area: \$5,000
- Passive recreation area (\$1.75/sq ft.): \$400,000
- Roadway and parking (\$5/sq. ft): \$260,000

Other City Maintained Grounds: \$3/sq. ft. to renovate

STAFFING AND MAINTENANCE COST ANALYSIS

Of special concern is the increased workload of parks maintenance staff. Maintenance staffing levels are now at twenty acres per full time staff (FTE). In addition to maintaining parklands and recreation facilities, maintenance staff are also responsible for several other City facilities, such as City Hall, the Police Department, Quartz Marker, downtown planters, Kidder Cemetery, Corporation Yard. Other demands on staff time include park renovations and improvements, training, and response to citizen complaints.

The 2000/2001 Adopted Budget for Parks maintenance allocates \$352,187 (includes: salaries/benefits and maintenance/operations costs) for 108.5 total acres of developed and undeveloped parkland. The average maintenance cost per acre is \$3,246.

The current staff is maintaining 91.1 developed acres and 16.9 undeveloped acres of parkland. This averages to 19.6 acres per FTE. When Mulcahy Field and the additional .5 acres for Minnie Park are developed, the maintenance demands will increase by another FTE. These figures are based on maintaining the parks at their existing levels. Other cities in the region use an average of 15 acres per FTE for park maintenance.

The following is a basic guideline used by larger cities (50,000+ population) in developing their maintenance budgets and is included as a source of information for the City. These figures may not necessarily apply to the City, and are included as information.

- \$600 per acre for open space and undeveloped parkland;
- \$4,500 per acre for neighborhood parks and urban plazas;
- \$6,000 per acre for community and regional parks;
- \$4,000 per mile of soft-surface trails; and
- \$8,000 per mile for paved, multi-use trails

Applying the above figures to the existing city parklands and a finished Mulcahy Field, and an average salary of \$47,300 (based on the 2000/2001 budget), an estimated 10 staff would be needed to maintain the City's parks at the national standard of maintenance.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

Potential Funding Sources for park system improvements include:

- Development impact fee based on park system improvement costs
- State and federal grants
- Bond issue for multi-generational community center/gym/sports fields

- Developer installations/development agreements
- Continued full use of Quimby Act exaction
- Joint use/maintenance agreement with school districts
- Continued reliance on service clubs, sports leagues, etc.
- Non-profit fund-raising or grants
- Use of State wide funds – i.e., AB 1740 in state budget
- User fees - consider increased non-resident fees
- Landscape and lighting assessment districts for maintenance
- General Fund
- CIP (Capital Improvements Program)
- County-wide recreation district - user fee/assessments

Two of these options can be implemented immediately. They are the joint-use/maintenance agreements with schools and the standardized Memoranda of Understanding with non-profit organizations. Joint-use agreements with the school districts will clearly define what each agency is providing in exchange for the use of school property for city-wide activities after school hours. By incorporating school fields and courts into the facilities matrix, the City will not need to build additional facilities. When the school and City facilities are maintained at the same level, there will be a seamless overlay of adequate facilities.

The Memoranda of Understanding with non-profit organizations needs to be standardized. They should include a clear definition of responsibilities for the organization and the City. This includes fee schedules, 'sweat equity' options, levels of maintenance and installation, and user statistics (number of people, where they live, ages, number of users who could not be accommodated because of space limitations, facility needs, etc.). Of major concern to the City of Grass Valley is the use of city facilities by county residents. Forty percent of the Planning Area population is outside the city limits, yet these residents use the City's facilities. The City does not receive any compensation from the County at this time for non-resident use of facilities. The City will need to identify the number of users who do not reside within the city limits and begin discussions with the County on cost sharing. Table 15 lists potential sources of initial funding of trails and open space/habitat improvements.

Table 14: Potential Funding Sources

Program	Agency
Rails to Trails	Rails to Trails Conservancy 1100 17 th Street, 10th Floor Washington DC 20036 www.trailsandgreenways.org
TEA 21 (Transportation Efficiency Act)	US Department of Transportation
Environmental Restoration Program: Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration	US Army Core of Engineers
Five Star Restoration Challenge Grant	Environmental Protection Agency
Pollution Prevention Incentives for States (PPIS)	Environmental Protection Agency
Clean Water Act 205(J)	Environmental Protection Agency Regional Water Quality Control Board
Clean Water Act: Non-point Source Implementation Grants: 319	Environmental Protection Agency Regional Water Quality Control Board
Forest Stewardship Program/Stewardship	US Department of Agriculture, US Forest

Incentive Program	Service, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Riparian Habitat Conservation Program	State of California Wildlife Conservation Board (with DFG)
Wildlife Conservation Board Program	State of California Wildlife Conservation Board (with DFG)
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Grants/ Challenge Grants	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (with NRCS, NACD)
Community Based Restoration	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Restoration Center
Watershed Restoration Branch Grants (Fishery Restoration Grants)	CA Department of Fish and Game
Ecosystem Restoration Project and Programs	Cal-Fed
Resource Enhancement Program	California Coastal Conservancy
California Farmland Conservancy Program	CA Department of Conservation
Water Bank Program	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Wetland Development Program	US Bureau of Reclamation
Public and Private Partnerships	Environmental Protection Agency
Sustainable Development Challenge Grants	Environmental Protection Agency
Wetlands Protection Development Grants	Environmental Protection Agency
Partners for Fish and Wildlife	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Private Lands Program	US Fish and Wildlife Service
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund (Standard Grant Program)	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Conservation Technical Assistance	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Emergency Watershed Protection	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Environmental Quality Incentives Program	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Small Watershed Programs/ Flood Prevention Program	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Wildland Incentive Program	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Wetland Reserve Program	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Watershed Planning Projects	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Land and Water Conservation Fund	USDA/ USDI
Forest Legacy Program	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Habitat Conservation Fund	California Department of Parks and Recreation
Environmental License Plate Fund	California Resources Agency
Conserving California Landscapes	The Packard Foundation