Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

AGENDA

PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, May 7, 2015 *at* 1:00 P.M.
City Hall, 955 School Street, Napa, CA 94559

General Information

Agenda items will generally be considered in the order indicated below, except for Set Matters, which will be considered at the time indicated. Agenda items may from time to time be taken out of order at the discretion of the President.

The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Assistive listening devices and interpreters are available through the District Secretary. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids, or services may be made to the Secretary's office no less than than 48 hours prior to the meeting date by contacting 707.259.8603.

Any member of the audience desiring to address the District on a matter on the Agenda, please proceed to the rostrum and, after receiving recognition from the President, give your name, address, and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit you comments to the specific subject under discussion. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President.

State law requires agency officers (Directors and Officers) to disclose, and then be disqualified from participation in, any proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, if the officer has received from any participant in the proceeding an amount exceeding $250 within the prior 12 month period. State law also requires any participant in a proceeding to disclose on the record any such contributions to an agency officer.

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Directors which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Board by Board members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the NCRPOSD Office at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Board or County staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code §§6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Public Comment

In this time period, anyone may address the Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction but which is not on today's posted agenda. In order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to speak, time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President. As required by Government Code, no action or discussion will be undertaken on any item raised during this Public Comment period.

3. Administrative Items

a. Consideration and potential approval of minutes of April 2, 2015.

b. Consideration and potential approval of draft Final Report

4. Agenda Planning

Discussion of next steps

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

In this time period, members of the Advisory Committee, District staff and District Directors may announce meetings, events, and other matters of interest. No action will be taken by the Committee on any announcements.

6. Adjournment

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

MINUTES

PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, April 2, 2015 *at* 2:00 P.M.

City Hall, 955 School Street, Napa, CA 94559

General Information

Agenda items will generally be considered in the order indicated below, except for Set Matters, which will be considered at the time indicated. Agenda items may from time to time be taken out of order at the discretion of the President.

The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Assistive listening devices and interpreters are available through the District Secretary. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids, or services may be made to the Secretary's office no less than than 48 hours prior to the meeting date by contacting 707.259.8603.

Any member of the audience desiring to address the District on a matter on the Agenda, please proceed to the rostrum and, after receiving recognition from the President, give your name, address, and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit you comments to the specific subject under discussion. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President.

State law requires agency officers (Directors and Officers) to disclose, and then be disqualified from participation in, any proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, if the officer has received from any participant in the proceeding an amount exceeding $250 within the prior 12 month period. State law also requires any participant in a proceeding to disclose on the record any such contributions to an agency officer.

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Directors which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Board by Board members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the NCRPOSD Office at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Board or County staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code §§6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Howard Siegel. Committee members in attendance: Stu Williams, Sandy Fagan, Roberta Oswald, Jeff Dodd, Karen Chang, Howard Siegel, Richard Seiferheld, Denice Britton Smith, John Glaser, Mike Stanfield, Richard Niemann, Bob Russell, Brad Simpkins

Committee members excused absent: Phill Blake, Samantha Holland

2. Public Comment

In this time period, anyone may address the Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction but which is not on today's posted agenda. In order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to speak, time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President. As required by Government Code, no action or discussion will be undertaken on any item raised during this Public Comment period.

None.

3. Administrative Items

a. Follow up questions and discussion for the meeting of March 5, 2015, and consideration and potential approval of minutes of March 5, 2015.

The minutes were approved with a correction to the spelling of Lyman Park on item 3.B

SW- RS-PB-SH- RN-SF-RO-JD-KC-HS-SF-DBS-JG-MS- BR-BS

X X

b. Discussion and adoption of decision-making process for committee recommendations.

The process for discussing and adopting decisions was approved.

RN- SF-SH-PB-SW- RO-JD-KC-HS-RS-DBS-JG-MS -BR-BS

X X

c. Small group and full committee discussion of goals and objectives, track record, and future needs, and development of draft committee findings.

The committee broke into small groups to discuss these items, then reconvened for a full-group discussion. Staff will collate individual scores and prepare a draft report summarizing the findings.

d. Small group and full committee discussion and development of draft committee recommendations regarding long-term projected revenues and expenses for alternative service scenarios, potential future funding options.

The committee did not break into small groups, but discussed these items as a full committee. Staff will collate individual scores and prepare a draft report summarizing committee recommendations.

4. Agenda Planning

Discussion of committee schedule, including potentially scheduling one or more additional committee meetings prior to June 30, 2015.

Committee Members Stu Williams, John Glaser, Jeff Dodd and Howard Siegel volunteered to work with staff if preparing the draft report for consideration by the committee at the next meeting.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

In this time period, members of the Advisory Committee, District staff and District Directors may announce meetings, events, and other matters of interest. No action will be taken by the Committee on any announcements.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm

Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

John Woodbury
General Manager

May 7, 2015

To: Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee
From: John Woodbury
Agenda Item: 3
RE: Consideration and Potential Approval of Final Report

Recommendation

1. Discuss, amend if needed, and approve the Final Report

Background

At the April 2, 2015 meeting of the Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee, an ad hoc subcommittee consisting of John Glazer, Howard Siegel, Jeff Dodd and Stu Williams was formed to assist staff in preparing a draft Final Report based on the results of the discussion and scoring that was completed at the April 2nd meeting. The draft Final Report is attached.

Also attached for your reference are the results of the scoring done at the April 2nd meeting. These are not proposed to be included in the Final Report, but are provided for your reference.

If the Advisory Committee is not prepared to adopt the draft Final Report at this meeting, a special meeting will need to be scheduled. The Advisory Committee is currently only established to run through June 30, 2015.

If adopted by the Advisory Committee at this meeting, the Final Report will go to the Board of Directors of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District at its May 11, 2015 meeting. After being reviewed by the Board of Directors, the Final Report will be sent to the Napa County Board of Supervisors and to each of the City Councils within Napa County. The Board of Directors will also then determine a course of action for implementing the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

Final Report

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee

D R A F T

May 4, 2015

I. Introduction and Summary

The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee (the "Committee") consists of 15 members. It was organized to review the goals of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (the "District"), evaluate the District's track record since formation in 2006, and develop recommendations regarding the future of the District including how to fund those recommendations. To ensure the Committee represents all parts of the County and a wide range of interests and backgrounds, five members were nominated by the four cities and one town in Napa County, five members were nominated by the Napa County Board of Supervisors, and five members were selected by the District's Board of Directors. A roster of committee members is included in Section V.

The Committee met on a monthly basis from September 2014 to May 2015, including a field trip where every member of the Committee participating in a field trip to view many of the district properties firsthand. The Committee also heard reports and updates from each of the municipal parks programs in Napa County, the Land Trust of Napa County, the Napa County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, and four regional park and open space districts from the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The Committee appreciates the thorough overview that District staff provided on the history of the District and their current maintenance and operations, as well as the challenges faced in meeting the broad demands of the the Master Plan.

We particularly want to commend the District's board and staff for very responsible fiscal management—a great deal has been done with very little.

The District has accomplished a great deal, particularly in the preservation and restoration of open space lands, providing public access to open space, and collaborating with other public and private agencies and jurisdictions to acquire and maintain those properties. Their efforts have produced an impressive portfolio and diverse group of parks and protected public lands available to the public. Furthermore,

their work illustrates what is possible by deploying a diverse collection of resources to provide a legacy of wilderness and open space consistent with Napa County's agricultural values. The District has demonstrated the County's potential to preserve precious environmental resources long into the future.

The Committee agrees that the Agricultural Preserve is critical to the quality of life in Napa County, and its existence depends on public support. With more of the County's residents living in urban areas, accessible open space is critical to preserving our quality of life. The District provides a critical lever to get residents and visitors alike into and enjoying our precious public land, and committed to its perpetual preservation.

The Committee believes there is ample evidence that agriculture, tourism, and open space access are very compatible. Further, the local tourism industry has indicated that it wants tourists to have longer visits in order to generate less traffic coming and going in the County. A vibrant recreational program featuring our natural environment can support that vision. In that context, the Committee agrees that future funding mechanisms to complete this critical vision should include revenue generated by visitors who travel to Napa County to share and enjoy our beautiful natural resources and open space facilities.

The Committee believes that the District has done an outstanding job in filling the need for a county-wide district that oversees, maintains, and protects Napa County's precious open spaces. It further believes that a larger revenue source will be critical to completing our collective vision in sustaining the rural and agricultural nature of our valley. To this end, we recommend that the District Board of Directors investigate the feasibility of placing a funding measure on a county-wide ballot so the District is able to continue to protect open space, provide more outdoor and accessible recreational areas, promote environmental education, and perpetuate its successful efforts for the general public and Napa County's generations to come.

II. District Goals, Track Record and Unmet Needs

The Committee's first charge was to review District goals. These include acquiring critical open space lands in Napa County, stewarding the environment and maintaining the infrastructure of public lands, and providing outdoor recreation, and educational, interpretive and recreational programming. The Committee was then asked to assess the District's track record in addressing these goals and, in light of this track record, whether there are still unmet needs.

A. Acquisition of Open Space

The Committee agrees that preservation of the most significant of the open space lands in Napa County has been and should continue to be the primary purpose of the District. The District has preserved these areas by acquiring fee title from willing sellers and accepting donations of fee title and conservation easements from private property owners. Since all District transactions are voluntary, with

no use or threat of eminent domain, the District needs to be able to act quickly when important properties are available for acquisition; there are not many second chances to secure and protect these significant open space areas.

Finding: The protection of significant open space lands is an important goal for the District.

Finding: The District has developed an excellent track record of acquiring open space lands and improving public access to the outdoors.

Finding: The District should be doing more in the future to achieve the goal of protecting open space lands.

Finding: Priority should be given to acquisitions that provide multiple benefits.

Discussion: For some on the Committee, protecting wildlife habitat is important in and of itself, while others are primarily interested in public access and outdoor recreational opportunities. Protecting water quality and quantity in our rivers and lakes is seen as crucial, and the Committee agrees the most effective way to accomplish this is generally through overall watershed protection, rather than focusing just on the bodies of water themselves. Many on the Committee are interested in focusing on open space lands close to where the bulk of the population lives.

The District's acquisition of Moore Creek Park is an example of simultaneously achieving multiple objectives: (a) protection of three miles of year-round Moore Creek which is important to the City of Napa's municipal water supply, (b) protection of wildlife habitat that supports bear, bobcat, mountain lion and numerous other mammals, birds, amphibians and reptiles, and (c) providing over 15 miles of trails for hiking, bicycling and horseback riding within a 30 minute drive of the City of Napa.

B. Environmental Stewardship and Maintenance

The Committee agrees that taking good care of what the public already owns is an important goal for the District, and should continue be a priority in the future. Approximate one-quarter of the land in Napa County is publically-owned; unfortunately, stewardship of these lands by their public agency managers has been inconsistent. The Committee applauds the fact that since its formation the District has placed considerable focus on improving the stewardship of both the natural resources and man-made infrastructure of these public lands.

Finding: Maintenance of existing open space lands, facilities and infrastructure is just as important as acquiring new open space areas.

Finding: Good stewardship of the natural environment, including the restoration of degraded landscapes, should be a primary goal for the District.

Finding: The District has a good track record maintaining the open space lands for which it is responsible.

Finding: The District should be doing more in the future to improve the stewardship of existing public open space lands.

Discussion: The largest property owner in Napa County is the federal government, under the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, followed by the State of California, under the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Department of Parks and Recreation, and the State Lands Commission. These agencies lack the financial resources to adequately steward all of the lands for which they are responsible. This is especially true for ecological stewardship and restoration of the natural environment. Little has been done to control invasive weeds on public lands. Illegal shooting, hunting and off-road vehicle use is also common on public lands. Soil erosion from old and unkept dirt roads that cross public lands is a major source of water pollution.

An example of the District's stewardship role is its operation of Bothe-Napa Valley State Park and the Bale Grist Mill State Historic Park. Both of these parks were in serious disrepair and slated for closure by the California Department of Parks and Recreation due to budgetary and operational problems, until the District assumed operational responsibilities in 2012. The District is now operating these two parks in the black financially, and successfully addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance.

The Napa River Ecological Reserve is another example of the District's stewardship efforts. The District has assumed management of a portion of this State-owned reserve, organizing students and other community volunteers, and hiring contractors to remove teasel, blackberry and other invasive plants and restore native grasses, flowering plants and trees. While modest in scope, this project demonstrates what the District can accomplish working together with the community and with other public agencies.

Given limited resources, many on the Committee believe that the preservation of open space resources by the District is more critical than the development of facilities and infrastructure and, therefore, maintenance efforts should focus on protecting the natural more than the man-made environment.

C. Outdoor Recreation

Outdoor recreation is important for mental and physical health. It is also important for the future of the agricultural and open space preservation policies for which Napa County is a recognized leader.

Obesity, particularly childhood obesity, is now recognized as one of the major public health problems in America. A growing body of studies point to what one author has referred to as Nature Deficit Disorder—marked by symptoms including excessive weight, heart and respiratory problems, ADD, anxiety and depression. Outdoor activities in natural settings have demonstrated efficacy in addressing these problems.

Outdoor recreation is also seen as essential for maintaining public support for Napa's agricultural economy. Protecting open space has been a core land use policy for Napa County for more than four decades Nearly all of unincorporated Napa County is designated as either Agricultural Preserve or Agricultural Watershed/Open Space. The voters passed Measure J in 1990 to lock in these land use

designations, and have repeatedly upheld and extended Measure J land use policies. However, the population of Napa County is growing increasingly urban; more than 80 percent of the residents of Napa County now live in its four cities and one town. Future voter support for open space protection depends on residents not only being able to see open space from the distance, but also being able to touch it, breath it in, witness wildlife up close, splash through the creeks, and generally have fun.

Finding: Expanding public recreational use of existing public lands is an important goal for the District, both for the mental and physical health benefits, and for maintaining and strengthening public support for Napa's agricultural economy.

Finding: The District has established a good track record expanding public recreational use of existing public lands, but more needs to be done.

Finding: Specific recreational goals—new trails, campgrounds, and picnic areas—are important, but not as much as the overall goal of expanding recreational opportunities.

Finding: Construction of new natural trails as well as new paved regional trails that are compatible with the natural environment are both important goals for the District.

Finding: The protection and enjoyment of significant natural open space is the District's primary responsibility, with urban parks and organized sports primarily the responsibility of the county's four cities and one town. While recognizing these distinct roles, there may be value in the District and the municipalities working together to fund and strengthen their distinct yet complementary goals.

Discussion: The Committee supports the District working with the municipalities in Napa County to provide a full range and balance of outdoor recreational opportunities, provided this does not distract the District from its primary purpose of protecting significant open space areas. One potential partnership would be for the District to assist the cities' efforts to protect open spaces at their urban edges, and construct trails that connect urban and open space areas.

One example of an effective partnership between the District and the cities is the Napa River and Bay Trail. The District and the City of American Canyon have collaborated in constructing over five miles of Class I bicycle and pedestrian trail to and along the Napa River. The District, with easement and permit assistance from the City of Napa, has constructed another 0.7 miles of this trail under the Highway 29 bridge over the Napa River, and the County, the City of Napa and the District are working to continue this trail through the Napa Pipe property to Kennedy Park. Finally, the District has supported efforts by the Vine Trail Coalition and the City of Calistoga to plan and construct a safe pedestrian and bicycle route connecting the City of Calistoga with the Oat Hill Mine Trail and Bothe-Napa Valley State Park.

Another example of an effective District-city partnership is the Lake Hennessey Unit of Moore Creek Park. The City of Napa owns approximately 900 acres of beautiful oak woodland on the north side of Lake Hennessey and added that land to the 673 acres owned by the District—forming a 1,500-acre regional park with exceptional trails for hiking, bicycling, horseback riding, bird and other wildlife observation, and quiet contemplation.

D. Education, Interpretation and Recreation Programs

Environmental education, interpretation and recreation programming are important for teaching the public the importance of land conservation and how to care for the land, as well as strengthening support for future conservation efforts.

Finding: The District does not have much of a track record addressing the goal of environmental education, due to limited funding and other priorities.

Finding: The District should do more in the future to support environmental education, relying on schools and other education experts as much as possible.

Finding: Educating the next generation about the environment and how to take care of it, as well as providing recreation and interpretive programming (guided walks, outdoor events, etc) are important goals for the District, but secondary to the primary goals of preserving and stewarding open space lands.

Discussion: The District has undertaken several modest efforts to provide outdoor education and interpretation. For example, the District has over several years organized student field trips to the Napa River Ecological Reserve that offer hands-on learning about ecosystems and habitat restoration, and together with the Resource Conservation District has developed a teacher training manual and workbook to enable classes to visit the Reserve without the need for paid experts. On the Napa River and Bay Trail, in addition to designing and installing interpretive panels, the District has partnered with others to develop a smart phone-based interpretive tour. At Bothe-Napa Valley State Park and the Bale Grist Mill State Historic Park the District and its partners offer natural and cultural history tours and walks. The District has also partnered with other non-profit and for-profit organizations in offering trail runs and mountain bicycle tours.

These District efforts only scratch the surface compared to what the County needs to engage our youth and the general public. Funding is a major constraint.

The Committee understands and supports the need to do more to involve Napa's residents through interpretive materials and programs, provided this does not distract from the District's primary goals of preserving and taking care of significant open space lands. Where possible, the District should take a supporting role, and encourage other partners (the school districts, Friends of the Napa River, the Resource Conservation District and others) to take the lead.

III. The Future of the District

Regarding the future of the District, the Committee was asked to address three basic questions: (1) does the District's track record over the past three years justify its continued existence, (2) if yes, has it done enough or should it attempt to do more, and (3) if more should be done in the future, how should this be funded?

A. Pack it up, Status Quo, or Move Forward

Finding: The District has demonstrated an excellent track record of planning and implementing projects effectively and efficiently.

Finding: The Committee unanimously agrees that more is needed to preserve special places and land and water resources, provide nature-based recreation, and environmental education in Napa County.

Recommendation: The Committee unanimously recommends that the District should seek additional funding to accomplish its goals.

Discussion: All members of the Committee agree that the District's track record is exemplary and justifies its continued existence. The District has developed a creative "can do" approach, unusual among public agencies. For example, one of the District's first projects was to unravel complex issues associated with the historic Oat Hill Mine Road and re-open it to legal public recreational use, ending 30 years of controversy. Overall, the District has protected over 4,000 acres of open space and today operates approximately 40 miles of non-motorized recreational trails. Finally, the District has leveraged its funding from the Napa County Special Projects Fund with outside grants and donations at a ratio of over three to one.

While impressive, the District's accomplishments pale compared to what is needed to preserve Napa County's most important remaining open space resources. Going forward, the District's existing financial capacity will be mostly consumed stewarding the resources, maintaining the infrastructure and providing public access for the 10 regional park areas and trails to which the District is already financially committed. To do more, therefore, the District will need to develop additional sources of revenue. If new revenues are not forthcoming, the District will have no choice but to shift to a purely maintenance and operations mode.

B. Non-Tax Options for Funding the District

The Committee considered a variety of non-tax options with the potential to increase District revenues. These included user fees, formation of a non-profit foundation to stimulate additional donations and grants, and encouraging other agencies to take a greater role in implementing District goals.

Recommendation: The District should utilize user fees to cover some of the cost of operating parks and trails.

Recommendation: The District should actively seek to increase private donations, and consider establishing a non-profit foundation to take the lead in this effort.

Recommendation: The District should actively encourage the school districts to do more for outdoor environmental education.

Discussion: While there is reluctance by some members of the Committee to increase user fees, the consensus is that users should pay for at least some of the costs of operating and maintaining the District's parks and trails. All members of the Committee support the District's active efforts to obtain private donations. Although there is general recognition that private donations would only be able to fund a relatively small part of the District's mission, the Committee believes formation of a non-profit foundation could be effective in increasing private donations.

The Committee believes that education in general is primarily a responsibility of the school districts. The Committee favors the District playing a role that encourages, supports, and collaborates with the local school districts in deploying excellent outdoor environmental education. At the same time, however, there is general recognition that this is a limited option for meeting the needs for outdoor environmental education, given the funding challenges that school districts face, as well as the limitations posed by state and federal curriculum and testing requirements. As a result, other partners may need to be developed to fulfill the environmental education goals.

C. Potential New Tax Options for Funding the District

Recognizing that potential non-tax sources of revenue would be insufficient to enable the District to meet the goals supported by the Committee, the Committee has also considered a range of potential tax measures.

Recommendation: The District should explore the feasibility of placing a funding measure on the ballot, through outreach to the community, through public hearings and through public opinion surveys.

Recommendation: At this time, it appears the most promising potential funding measure that could meet the District's future funding needs involves partnering with the County to place a ¼ cent sales tax on the ballot to support park and open space purposes.

Discussion: The Committee considered several potential new taxes, including an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax, two levels of parcel taxes ($9 and $23 per parcel), two levels of property taxes ($3 and $10 per $100,000 assessed valuation), and two levels of sales tax (¼ cent and ½ cent). The parcel and property tax rates considered by the Committee were set based on successful tax measures for parks and open space that passed elsewhere in the San Francisco Bay Area in recent years. The sales tax rates considered by the Committee were based on sales tax rates that have passed elsewhere in the region.

The County's Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) has been increased twice in the past decade, and at 14% is one of the highest rates in the nation. In the Committee's judgment it is not reasonable to consider another increase in the TOT at this time.

Regarding parcel taxes, most properties in Napa County already pay a wide variety of parcel taxes for education, mosquito abatement, storm water management, flood control and more. Parcel taxes are

the most regressive of the tax options considered, since every property owner pays a flat rate regardless of the value of the property or the wealth of the property owner and/or tenant. Parcel taxes also don't have the potential to raise sufficient revenues to fund very much of the land preservation and stewardship purposes that the Committee believes the District should be its top priority.

Property taxes are limited because they can only be raised to pay off bonded indebtedness. Since bond funds can only be used for capital projects, any new property tax revenues could not be used to support operations and maintenance needs.

The recommends the District explore the ¼ cent sale tax measure option because:
(a) tourists and other non-County residents pay an estimated one-third of sales taxes in Napa County and it may be appropriate to look to these groups to pay their share because visitors and visitor-serving businesses, as well as local residents, benefit from public parks and trails;
(b) residents in the cities of Napa County currently pay the lowest sales tax rates compared to the residents of any city in the San Francisco Bay Area with the exception of the City of Vacaville;
(c) a sales tax is overall more equitable in that it affects everyone (except for food and medicine purchases), as compared to parcel and property taxes, which are only levied on property owners, and transient occupancy taxes, which only affect those renting short-term overnight accommodations,
(d) unlike property taxes, sales taxes can be used for either capital or operating purposes; and
(e) a ¼ cent sales tax would produce the level of annual revenues sufficient to meet the District's projected annual needs to not only operate and maintain the District's current portfolio of 10 regional park areas and trails, but also help support a comprehensive outdoor education program and acquire the most significant of the open space lands that are expected to be available over the next 15-20 years.

D. Features of any New Tax Measure

In addition to considering whether the District should investigate the feasibility of placing a tax measure on the ballot, the Committee considered what limitations and conditions, if any, should be part of the measure.

Recommendation: Any tax measure should include a sunset provision.

Recommendation: Any tax measure should include a citizen's oversight committee.

Recommendation: Any tax measure should be coupled with an assurance that the new revenues would supplement, not replace or reduce, the County of Napa's current level of support for parks and recreation.

Discussion: The Committee supports placing a sunset on any new tax measure, so that the tax is not open-ended; instead, the District would need to justify to the voters any continuation of the tax. The

Committee considered a 10 to 15 year sunset, although many members suggested a longer term of 20 years or more.

Some tax measures require a citizen's oversight committee, to ensure that the use of revenues is consistent with the intent of the measure. The Committee believes this is a good idea.

Finally, the Committee believes that any new tax measure actually should result in expanded park district capacity, and not be allowed to simply free-up existing government revenues for other unspecified government purposes. In particular, the Committee recommends that if a funding measure is placed on the ballot, the District and the County should extend the current agreement through which the County grants a portion of the County Transient Occupancy Tax to the District, with the extension to run for at least the same length of time as the proposed measure.

E. Partnering with Other Agencies and Organizations

The Committee heard formal presentations from Napa County's four cities and one town regarding their park and recreation programs and needs, from the Napa County Water Conservation and Flood Control District regarding its "living river" project and future unmet needs, and from the Land Trust of Napa County regarding its land conservation program.

Recommendation: The District should explore partnering with the cities within Napa County, and/or with the Napa County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, regarding any new tax measure.

Recommendation: Any new funding measure should set aside funds to be available as grants to other organizations to support projects that are consistent with the District's land preservation, stewardship, outdoor recreation and educational goals.

Discussion: The Committee supports the District working in partnership with other agencies and organizations to implement projects that are consistent with the District's primary goals of acquiring, taking care of and providing public access to open space lands. As a way to increase voter support, it may also make sense to propose a measure which provides some funding for distinct but compatible purposes, such as urban parks, municipal watersheds or programs to combat childhood obesity. With this in mind, the Committee supports cooperation and coordination with other agencies and organizations, subject to two cautionary observations: (1) the broader a measure's purposes the more thinly its revenues would have to be spread, thereby limiting its effectiveness, and (2) if purposes are too broad the result could be a reduction in support as voters become confused about what they are being asked to consider.

IV. Background Materials

The Committee reviewed numerous documents in the course of its deliberations, including:

1. Master Plan for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (available at www.NapaOutdoors.org)
2. Master Plan 2012 Update (available at www.NapaOutdoors.org)
3. History of Revenues and Assets for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (attached)
4. Projected Expenditures and Revenues for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District for General Administration, Completion and Operation of the Core Park System, and Potential Enhancements to the Core System (attached).
5. Revenue Estimates by Type of Funding Measure, for Hypothetical Countywide Tax Measures and Non-tax Funding Options (attached)

V. About the Advisory Committee

The Park and Open Space Advisory Committee consists of the following members:

1. City-Nominated Representatives

Karen Chang	City of Calistoga
Jeff Dodd	City of Napa
Sandy Fagan	Town of Yountville
Roberta Oswald	City of St. Helena
Michael Stanfield	City of American Canyon

2. County-Nominated Representatives

John Glaser	Supervisor Wagenknecht
Richard Niemann	Supervisor Luce
Bob Russell	Supervisor Caldwell
Denice Britton Smith	Supervisor Dillon
Stu Williams	Supervisor Dodd

3. District-Appointed Representatives
   - Phill Blake
   - Samantha Holland
   - Richard Seiferheld
   - Howard Siegel
   - Brad Simpkins

History of Revenues and Assets

prepared May 4, 2015

	Revenues				Off-budget	Assets	
Fiscal Year	County grant (3)	Other Grants and Cash Donations	Program Revenues (1)	Program Revenues as Percentage of All Revenues	Volunteer Services and In-Kind Donations	Year-end Fund Balance (2)	Year-end Capital Assets
2006-7	$170,136	$0	$0	0.00%	$66,670	$18,204	$0
2007-8	$376,579	$6,906	$0	0.00%	$21,036	$61,896	$125,414
2008-9	$673,129	$2,535,000	$5,868	0.18%	$45,000	$80,070	$2,933,295
2009-10	$470,899	$33,332	$12,979	2.51%	$46,316	$88,770	$2,986,827
2010-11	$744,710	$173,473	$10,773	1.16%	$4,320,870	$430,168	$7,228,314
2011-12	$322,324	$1,146,942	$92,775	5.94%	$229,563	$527,052	$7,219,188
2012-13	$926,850	$178,570	$366,080	24.88%	$210,174	$1,114,400	$7,210,060
2013-14	$688,413	$137,803	$514,765	38.39%	$313,275	$1,209,252	$7,352,612
2014-2015	$753,607	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
2015-16	$811,638						

Notes

1) includes rents, user fees, and interest

2) includes both restricted and unrestricted funds

3) from County TOT Special Project Fund; prior to FY 2013-14, amount shown is amount actually used, not amount available from the County grant

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

Exhibit Two

Projected Expenditures and Revenues by Purpose

	annual expenditures			annual	Net annual	Capital Needs	
	administration	field operations	maintenance	revenues	expense	improvements	land
General Administration							
Includes administration, office, insurance, legal, audit, public involvement, and planning	$350,000	$0	$0	$0	$350,000	$0	$0
Subtotal	**$350,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$350,000**	**$0**	**$0**
Completed Core Park System							
Napa River and Bay Trail	$5,000	$20,000	$10,000	$0	$35,000	$5,000,000	$0
Napa River Ecological Reserve	$5,000	$20,000	$5,000	$0	$30,000	$0	$0
Oat Hill Mine Trail including northern extension	$5,000	$20,000	$5,000	$0	$30,000	$100,000	$2,500,000
Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park including access trails	$5,000	$20,000	$5,000	$0	$30,000	$500,000	$1,000,000
Berryessa Peak Trail	$1,000	$5,000	$5,000	$0	$11,000	$0	$0
Moore Creek Park including Lake Hennessey	$5,000	$30,000	$15,000	$10,000	$40,000	$300,000	$0
Camp Berryessa	$25,000	$200,000	$50,000	$150,000	$125,000	$1,500,000	$0
Skyline Park including Kirkland	$10,000	$10,000	$5,000	$0	$25,000	$0	$2,000,000
Spanish Valley, Crystal Flats and Stone Corral	$20,000	$50,000	$20,000	$45,000	$45,000	$600,000	$1,700,000
Bothe-Napa Valley State Park*	$50,000	$350,000	$150,000	$550,000	$0	$6,000,000	$0
Subtotal	$131,000	$725,000	$270,000	$755,000	$371,000	$14,000,000	$7,200,000
Subtotal General Admin Plus Core System	**$481,000**	**$725,000**	**$270,000**	**$755,000**	**$721,000**		
Enhancements to Core System							
Expanded Environmental Education Programming	$50,000	$690,000	$0	$0	$740,000	$0	$0
Expanded Land Conservation	$50,000	$100,000	$100,000	$0	$250,000	$1,000,000	$40,000,000
Complete Bay Area Ridge Trail	$10,000	$20,000	$30,000	$0	$60,000	$625,000	$15,000,000
Subtotal	$110,000	$810,000	$130,000	$0	$1,050,000	$1,625,000	$55,000,000
Total General Admin and Core System Plus Enhancements	**$591,000**	**$1,535,000**	**$400,000**	**$755,000**	**$1,771,000**	**$15,625,000**	**$62,200,000**

Note: Annual Operating Expenses and revenues are estimates for buildout conditions

Revenue Estimates by Type of Funding Measure

Parcel Tax Numer of Parcels	Rate/Parcel/Year	Revenue/Year	Notes	Pros	Cons
51,124	$9	$460,116	most polls say this is low enough that 2/3 will support	operating or capital	more regressive than property tax or sales tax
	$23	$1,175,852	the highest rate that voters have approved for parks in the Bay Area	no need to form JPA with County	least ability to generate revenues
				regressivity can be reduced by exempting seniors, other low income property owners, and/or by having different rates for SFR, MFR, and commercial properties	

Property Tax Assessed Value	Rate/$100,000/Year	Revenue/Year	Notes	Pros	Cons
$30,667,288,288	$3.18	$975,220	rate=MROSD 2012 Measure AA	probably capable of raising more revenue than parcel tax	only for capital purposes
	$10.00	$3,066,729	rate=EBRPD 2008 Measure WW	more progressive than parcel tax	

Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee

Revenue Estimates by Type of Funding Measure

Sales Tax					
Taxable Sales	Rate	Revenue/Year	Notes	Pros	Cons
				operating or capital	requires partnership with Napa County
$330,000,000	1/8 %	$4,125,000	rate=smallest allowable increment per state law	The only city in the Bay Area with a lower sales tax rate than Napa County cities is Vallejo.	
$330,000,000	1/4 %	$8,250,000	rate= MROSD and SCAPOSD measures	Significant share of revenues comes from tourists and other non-residents	
$330,000,000	1/2 %	$16,500,000	rate= Napa Measure A		

Transient Occupancy Tax					
Total 2014 County TOT	Rate	Revenues/Year/%	Notes	Pros	Cons
$10,883,724	12%	$906,977	only includes unincorporated area hotels	paid mostly by visitors not residents	rates already at 14%, among highest in nation
				operating or capital	requires partnership with Napa County and/or cities
					only applies to jurisdiction of city/county partner

Revenue Estimates by Type of Funding Measure

Other Potential Funding Sources (non-exclusive)			
Type of Funding	Description	Pros	Cons
Mitigation Banking	Development projects often have to mitigate for environmental impacts. If District sets up approved program, it can gets paid to provide the mitigation	not a tax; no need to get voter approval	diffucult to set up approved programs can only pay for limited range of projects tied to actions by others not a stable source of funds
Donations	The District can accept tax-deductible donations, with or without a non-profit foundation, though a foundation can raise visibility and thus effectiveness	not a tax; no need to get voter approval increases community engagement useful source of funds for "feel good" purposes	may compete with other non-profit purposes not a stable source of funds requires considerable staff time
User Fees	Could include charges for day use fees, camping fees, pool fees, use of facilities for group events, merchandise sales, longer term leases and rents	not a tax; no need to get voter approval	may price out some users would cause shift in priorities to most profitable projects agencies seldom get more than 10% to 30% of budget from user fees
General Purpose Taxes	County or cities could seek voter approval for general purpose tax increase (parcel, sales, TOT), and make a grant to the District	only requires 50%+1 voter approval	no guarantee the County would use for parks voters may not trust County to spend on parks funds would compete with other governmental purposes

Park and Open Space Advisory Committee

Summary Committee Scores: District Goals, Track Record and Future Needs

Goal	"This is an important goal for the District"	"The District has an excellent track record addressing this goal"	"The District should be doing more to achieve this goal"
Acquiring regionally-significant open space lands*	9(1); 4(2)	10(1); 3(2);	8(1); 4(2); 1(3)
Aquiring wildlife habitat*	8(1); 3(2); 1(3); 1(4)	6(1); 3(2); 4(3)	5(1); 4(2); 3(3); 1(4)
Acquiring rivers, streams and lakes*	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)	3(1); 6(2); 3(3); 1(4)	6(1); 3(2); 4(3)
Maintaining exising public open space lands	11(1); 2(2)	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)	8(1); 3(2); 2(3)
Maintaining existing open space facilities and infrastructure	10(1); 3(2)	7(1);3(2); 3(3)	7(1); 5(2); 1(3)
Expanding public recreational use of existing public open space lands	10(1); 1(2); 2(3)	3(1); 7(2); 2(3)	7(1); 4(2); 2(3)
Constructing new natural trails (walking, hiking, biking, horseback riding)	7(1); 6(2)	3(1); 8(2); 1(3)	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)
Constructing new campgrounds and picnic areas in natural settings	4(1); 6(2); 3(3)	4(1); 5(2); 4(3)	3(1); 8(2); 2(3)
Constructing new paved regional trails for walkng and bicycling	6(1); 2(2); 5(3)	2(1); 10(2)	5(1); 2(2); 5(3); 1(4)
Supporting cities acquire and develop new urban parks (including sports fields)	4(1); 3(2); 2(3); 2(4); 1(5)	0(1); 5(2); 4(3); 2(4)	4(1); 3(2); 3(3); 1(4); 2(5)
Educating the next generation about the environment and how to take care of it	8(1); 4(2); 0(3); 1(4)	0(1); 5(2); 6(3); 2(4)	5(1); 4(2); 4(3)
Providing recreation programs (guided walks, outdoor events, etc)	4(1); 5(2); 2(3); 1(4)	2(2); 10(3); 1(4)	4(1); 5(2); 3(3); 1(4)

Notes:
Each number in parentheses represents the score from 1-5. The number in front of each parentheses represents how many committee members gave this score.

Park and Open Space Advisory Committee

Summary Committee Scores: District Goals, Track Record and Future Needs

Goal	"This is an important goal for the District"	"The District has an excellent track record addressing this goal"	"The District should be doing more to achieve this goal"
Acquiring regionally-significant open space lands*	9(1); 4(2)	10(1); 3(2);	8(1); 4(2); 1(3)
Aquiring wildlife habitat*	8(1); 3(2); 1(3); 1(4)	6(1); 3(2); 4(3)	5(1); 4(2); 3(3); 1(4)
Acquiring rivers, streams and lakes*	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)	3(1); 6(2); 3(3); 1(4)	6(1); 3(2); 4(3)
Maintaining exising public open space lands	11(1); 2(2)	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)	8(1); 3(2); 2(3)
Maintaining existing open space facilities and infrastructure	10(1); 3(2)	7(1);3(2); 3(3)	7(1); 5(2); 1(3)
Expanding public recreational use of existing public open space lands	10(1); 1(2); 2(3)	3(1); 7(2); 2(3)	7(1); 4(2); 2(3)
Constructing new natural trails (walking, hiking, biking, horseback riding)	7(1); 6(2)	3(1); 8(2); 1(3)	6(1); 5(2); 2(3)
Constructing new campgrounds and picnic areas in natural settings	4(1); 6(2); 3(3)	4(1); 5(2); 4(3)	3(1); 8(2); 2(3)
Constructing new paved regional trails for walkng and bicycling	6(1); 2(2); 5(3)	2(1); 10(2)	5(1); 2(2); 5(3); 1(4)
Supporting cities acquire and develop new urban parks (including sports fields)	4(1); 3(2); 2(3); 2(4); 1(5)	0(1); 5(2); 4(3); 2(4)	4(1); 3(2); 3(3); 1(4); 2(5)
Educating the next generation about the environment and how to take care of it	8(1); 4(2); 0(3); 1(4)	0(1); 5(2); 6(3); 2(4)	5(1); 4(2); 4(3)
Providing recreation programs (guided walks, outdoor events, etc)	4(1); 5(2); 2(3); 1(4)	2(2); 10(3); 1(4)	4(1); 5(2); 3(3); 1(4)

Notes:
Each number in parentheses represents the score from 1-5. The number in front of each parentheses represents how many committee members gave this score.

Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee

Summary Committee Scores: Recommendations Regarding the District's Future Direction

1. Score your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Score 1-5*
(a) The District's track record doesn't justify its continued existence.	13(5)
(b) The District should be dissolved and its assets distributed to other agencies.	13(5)
(c) There really isn't any compelling need for the District to do more than it already has	9(5); 4(4)
(d) The District should shift to a maintenance mode and live within its current means.	4(5); 7(4); 1(3)
(d) More is needed to preserve special places and land/water resources, provide nature-based recreation, and/or environmental education in Napa County.	10(1); 1(2); 2(3)
(e) The District should seek additional funding to accomplish its goals.	9(1); 2(2); 2(3)

2. Score your level of agreement with each of the following potential funding sources (NOTE THE DISTRICT COULD DO NONE, SOME OR ALL OF THESE:

a. The District should raise user fees to make parks and trails more self-sufficient	5(1); 2(2); 3(3); 3(4)
b. The District should actively seek to increase private donations	7(1); 6(2)
c. The District should actively encourage city water agencies to increase water rates to make it possible to acquire and protect more of their municipal watersheds	1(1); 4(2); 3(3); 3(4); 2(5)
d. The District should actively encourage the school districts to spend more on outdoor environmental education	3(1); 7(2); 1(3); 2(4)

Note: The number in parentheses is the score; the number in front of the parentheses shows the number of votes for that score

3. Score your level of agreement with each of the following potential funding sources (SCORE ALL, BUT REMEMBER THAT IN THE END THE DISTRICT CAN AT MOST ONLY SELECT ONE OF THESE)

e. The District should partner with Napa County to place an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax on the ballot to support District purposes	1(1); 1(2); 4(3); 4(4); 3(5)
f. The District should explore placing a $9 parcel tax on the ballot	2(1); 3(2); 1(3); 4(4); 3(5)
g. The District should explore placing a $23 parcel tax on the ballot	2(1); 2(2); 4(3); 3(4); 2(5)
h. The District should explore placing a 20-year property tax of $3/$100,000 assessed valuation on the ballot to support a ~$15 million bond	2(1); 1(2); 6(3); 2(4); 2(5)
i. The District should explore placing a 20-year property tax of $10/$100,000 assessed valuation on the ballot to support a ~$45 million bond	2(1); 2(2); 2(3); 5(4); 2(5)
j. The District should explore placing a 1/4 cent sales tax on the ballot	6(1); 3(2); 1(3); 3(4)
k. The District should explore placing the 1/2 cent sales tax on the ballot	1(1); 2(1); 2(3); 5(4); 3(5)

4. Score your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

a. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, it should have a 10-15 year sunset	9(1); 4(3)
b. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, a citizen's oversight committee should be required	10(1); 3(2)
c. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, it should be coupled with a guarantee that the County's existing grant to the District is guaranteed for the same length of time as the tax.	9(1); 4(2)

5. Score your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

a. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, the District should explore partnering with the 5 cities in the County and sharing some of the revenue with the cities to be used for urban park acquisition, development, maintenance and programs	4(1); 6(2); 1(3); 2(4)
b. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, the District should explore partnering with the Napa County Water Conservation and Flood Control District and sharing some of the revenue with the flood district for riparian restoration and watershed protection efforts.	2(1); 10(2); 2(3)
c. If a tax measure in placed on the ballot, it should include a grant program to support the land conservation, restoration and outdoor environmental education efforts of non-profit organizations and other public agencies.	2(1); 3(2); 7(3); 1(5)

Note: The number in parentheses is the score; the number in front of the parentheses shows the number of votes for that score