

**PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD
JANUARY 23, 2008**



POLICY PLAN UPDATE AGENDA

- A. Background
- B. November 28th Board meeting: questions?
- C. Use of park impact fees, use within ten years –
more info
- D. Revenue to offset O & M costs
- E. Goals for the build out discussion
- F. Review/discussion of the park build out options
- G. Next steps



A. BACKGROUND

THE ISSUE

A downturn in the economy has impacted the City's General Fund challenging the ability to sustain the current level of service standards for City services, including parks and recreation, without consideration of new funding sources



BACKGROUND

Current Status of Service Provision

In the past four years, the Parks Department has reduced its reliance on the General Fund by \$1M, due in large part to: use of Conservation Trust Fund, increased emphasis on reduced O & M designs, staffing reductions, lifecycle reductions, delays in equipment replacement, energy savings, Gateway to Natural Resources, etc.



BACKGROUND

City Council Request

As part of the Policy Plan Update, City Council has asked the Department to present three options. Including the status quo for the level of service, for addressing this issue.

The Board is requested to provide its recommendation.



B. NOVEMBER 28, 07

BOARD MEETING

- Operation and maintenance cost efficiencies
- Recreation centers and cultural centers
- Ballfields in neighborhood parks
- Three park development options: current level of service, reduced level and austere level



C. USE OF PARK IMPACT FEES

- City Code Sec. 7.5-24
- Fees must be appropriated within seven years
- Fees must be spent within ten years
- Owner may ask for the fee to be returned
- Moneys are appropriated and spent on a “first in, first out” basis



USE OF PARK IMPACT FEES CONTINUED

- City Code Sec. 7.5-28
- Community parkland fees must be spent on improvements identified in the capital improvements plan for community parkland (ie: Policy Plan)



USE OF PARK IMPACT FEES CONTINUED

- Examples –
- Funding appropriated in budget process
- Residential area has steady growth – land purchased and park developed within 10 years
- Residential growth slows or stops with land purchased for park. Worst case we would need to develop something that would match fees collected at the ten year mark (land value would count)



D. REVENUE TO OFFSET PARK O & M COSTS

- Conservation Trust Fund
- Park maintenance fee
- Trail impact fee for development
- City sales tax increase including Parks O & M
- City ¼ cent capital for renovation, life cycle, ADA upgrades, sustainability



CONSERVATION TRUST

- The Conservation Trust Fund could be used for the O & M needs for new parks and trails. The Fund would be impacted by each build out option as follows:
- **Current** - would consume the Fund in about year 2013
- **Reduced** - would consume the Fund in about year 2018
- **Austere** - would consume the Fund in about year 2024



PARK MAINTENANCE FEE

- A park maintenance fee for community parks would offset the need for General Fund revenue as follows:
- The park maintenance fee could be structured to eliminate any new General Fund needs as community parks are developed. The starting fee need is about \$4.00 per household/month.



TRAIL IMPACT FEE

- The trail impact fee would be placed on new residential units similar to other fees that reflect “growth paying its way”

More work is needed in this area to determine the sections of trail that would be eligible, cost estimates, etc. But the initial estimate is the fee would be in the range of \$250 to \$350 per new household.



CITY SALES TAX

- A City sales tax could contain funding for O & M of the park and or trail system. Any number of options could be developed reflecting the community's willingness to fund existing parks and trails, only new parks and trails, portions of the need, etc.



CITY ¼ CENT CAPITAL

- The BCC ¼ cent capital ballot contained funding for “Regional Trail Development”.
- Future ballot initiatives could include capital funding for new trail development. This funding source could offset Conservation Trust Funds being used for Park O & M.
- The new revenue would reduce the build out time of the trail system as less Conservation Trust Funds are used for O & M.



E. GOALS FOR THE BUILD OUT REVIEW/DISCUSSION

Exercise developing goals for the build out review/discussion.



F. PARK BUILD OUT REVIEW OPTION 1

The **Current** build out option maintains the neighborhood park development at every year with the Community parks in years 2012, 2016 and 2020. Complete park build out would be in year 2024.



PARK BUILD OUT REVIEW OPTION 2

The **Reduced** build out option spaces the neighborhood park development at every other year with the Community parks in years 2015, 2020 and 2025. Complete park build out would be in year 2028.



PARK BUILD OUT REVIEW OPTION 3

The **Austere** build out option spaces the neighborhood parks at every other year with the community parks at year 2015, 2020 and 2025. Complete park build out would be in year 2026



GREENPLAY INPUT

The needs assessment identified that Fort Collins citizens are very satisfied with the current park service levels; however it is prudent to control increasing maintenance costs to the extent possible

GreenPlay recommendation:

Keep options open for the future – use available funding to acquire land for needed parks and trail waysides

Concentrate turf grass area within the system to areas of high use

Increase alternative landscaping within the system

Pursue new funding sources to preserve current level of service



GREENPLAY INPUT

Given the existing O&M funding situation, if you are unable to acquire new funding sources, we further recommend the reduced service option

- Delay the development of some future parks
- Combine future park locations as identified in the reduced service option
- Create trails and wayside enhancements to provide a connected system of parks
- Pursue restroom construction options that minimize maintenance costs
- Shift programmable game fields to community parks from neighborhood parks



GREENPLAY INPUT

the austere option

Given the expectations and satisfaction levels in this community we find the austere option to be a drastic measure

- Would reduce the level of service throughout the system
- Would create an inequity in the system
- Would create potential overuse of existing facilities



GREENPLAY INPUT

Funding Options:

- Consider creation of a dedicated park maintenance fee
- Consider a dedicated park maintenance tax (price of government discussion)
- Create a community wide trail impact fee
- Use Conservation Trust Funds for o&m revenue stream
- Focus community park development on active, revenue generating areas in early phases



G. NEXT STEPS

- Discussions leading to Board recommendation at the February 27th meeting on park build out
- February 27th meeting also the review of other GreenPlay findings
- Public outreach and other Boards/Commissions in February/March
- Council Work Session on April 8th

