



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Karen Turjanis
Director, Ward One

Tony Norris
Director, Ward Two

Michael Haley
Director, Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director, Ward Four

Barry Christian
Director, Ward Five

AGENDA

PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, April 2, 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 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 your 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. Follow up questions and discussion for the meeting of March 5, 2015, and consideration and potential approval of minutes of March 5, 2015.
- b. Discussion and adoption of decision-making process for committee recommendations.
- c. Small group and full committee discussion of goals and objectives, track record, and future needs, and development of draft committee 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.

4. Agenda Planning

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

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**

Karen Turjanis
Director, Ward One

Tony Norris
Director, Ward Two

Michael Haley
Director, Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director, Ward Four

Barry Christian
Director, Ward Five

MINUTES

PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, March 5, 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

The meeting was called to order by Chair Samantha Holland

Committee members in attendance: Samantha Holland Sandy Fagan, Roberta Oswald, Jeff Dodd, Karen Chang, Howard Siegel, Richard Seiferheld, John Glaser, Mike Stanfield, Phill Blake, Bob Russell (arrived late), Richard Niemann (arrived 1:30), Stu Williams (arrived 1:45), Denice Britton Smith (arrived 1:45),

Committee members absent: Brad Simpkins,

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 February 5, 2015, and consideration and potential approval of minutes of February 5, 2015.

Minutes of February 5, 2015 approved.

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

A A X X X X X

- b. Presentation by Steve Palmer, Director of Public Works and Jim Haller, Parks Supervisor, on the City of St. Helena's recreation and open space programs and projects.

The presentation was made by Jim Haller, Parks Supervisor, and Haidi Arias, Recreation Director, of the City of St. Helena. Jim Haller described the various parks and open space areas managed by the City, ranging from the oldest park (Liman Park) to the largest (Crane Park). Haidi Arias described the City's recreation programs. In addition to their own parks, the City partners with the school district on sports fields, but still has a shortage of sports fields compared to demand. The City also needs more open space parks. One example of a potential open space park is around the lower reservoir on Spring Mountain Road, which is no longer used as a municipal water supply. Going forward, the City needs additional funding for maintenance, acquisition of open space, and development of sports fields. The City this year is working on a 10 year plan.

- c. Presentation by Rick Thomasser, Watershed and Flood Control Operations Manager, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, about the current status and future needs for flood control and riparian restoration projects and needs.

Rick Thomasser made the presentation. The District’s responsibilities include (1) watershed maintenance, (2) Napa River restoration projects, (3) Napa Creek and Napa River flood control, (4) State Water Project contract management, and (5) the countywide stormwater program. Ongoing funding comes from a small countywide watershed assessment, in place since 1976, that generates about \$1.1 million per year. The assessment ranges from \$18/parcel/year for single family residential parcels, up to \$350/parcel/year for winery parcels. The District’s major flood control and restoration funding comes from Measure A, a ½ cent sales tax. The District also has a small assessment district for restoration work that generates about \$200,000/year. The District has been building up a reserve fund to cover ongoing maintenance costs, but the District’s ability to continue riparian and watershed restoration and improvement projects will be greatly reduced when Measure A expires in 2017.

- d. Review of the questions that the Advisory Committee is charged with addressing, observations about what has been learned to date, and identification of additional information the Advisory Committee needs to complete its deliberations. (materials to be distributed and discussed at meeting)

John Woodbury reviewed a two-page handout designed to help focus the committee’s future discussion and develop recommendations. The discussion centered on understanding the questions presented in the handout, and making suggestions for how to frame the discussion in the remaining committee meetings.

4. 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.

None.

5. Adjournment

Samantha Holland adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

SAMANTHA HOLLAND, Chair

ATTEST:

JOHN WOODBURY, General Manager

Key

The maker of the motion and second are reflected respectively in the order of the recorded vote.

Notations under vote: N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused

Vote: Phill Blake (PB) Karen Chang (KC) Jeff Dodd (JD) Sandy Fagan (SF) John Glaser (JG) Samantha Holland (SH)
Richard Niemann (RN) Roberta Oswald (RO) Bob Russell (BR) Richard Seiferheld (RS) Howard Siegel (HS)
Brad Simpkins (BS) Denice Britton Smith (DBS) Stu Williams (SW) Michael Stanfield (MS)



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

John Woodbury
General Manager

April 2, 2015

To: Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee
 From: John Woodbury
 Agenda Item: 3.B
 RE: Discussion and adoption of decision-making process for committee recommendations

Recommendation

1. Agree to seek consensus as much as possible while developing committee recommendations.
2. Adopt the definition of consensus presented in this memo.
3. Allow for minority reports in the event that consensus is not achieved.

Background

At the April 2, 2015 meeting the advisory committee will be asked to start the process of developing recommendations to guide the future direction of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District. The committee is currently scheduled to complete its work on May 7, 2015, though additional meetings in May or June may need to be scheduled to complete the committee's work.

It is the District's hope that the advisory committee's final recommendations be based on consensus as much as possible; the greater the level of consensus, the more powerful will be the advisory committee's recommendations. If consensus cannot be reached, the committee will need to decide whether to make no recommendation on the issue in question, or to make a recommendation based on majority opinion, with those who disagree having the option of preparing a minority report.

Coming to consensus is not easy. The typical consensus process may result in decisions that no one objects to but also that no one is very excited about. Also, when only a yes/no vote is possible, individuals may be reluctant to fully express themselves out of a fear of breaking consensus.

Staff recommends the committee adopting the following system for determining whether there is consensus. The system involves voting on a scale of 1 to 5, with each person voting as follows:

Score Meaning

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | I think this is important and I will be a leader in advocating for it. |
| 2 | I think this is good, and I'm happy to support it. |
| 3 | I'm neither for or against, and will support the decision of the group. |
| 4 | I don't really like this, but my negative feelings aren't strong enough to make me break consensus; I won't object to the group moving forward. |
| 5 | I think this is a bad idea and I'm on record opposing it |

This system has several advantages:

- (a) It captures the level of passion (if no one votes "1", and the majority of votes are not "1" or "2", it's probably not worth doing, even if no one is in opposition.
- (b) It provides a way to express discomfort without breaking consensus (if there are many "3" or "4" votes, a committee recommendation is still possible, but there's a strong signal that the recommendation won't be effective; the committee would be well advised to continue working on the issue).
- (c) If someone is really opposed, they retain their right to break consensus.



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

John Woodbury
General Manager

April 2, 2015

To: Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee
 From: John Woodbury
 Agenda Item: 3.C
 RE: Discussion of District goals, track record, and future needs, and development of draft committee conclusions.

Recommendation

1. Homework: Prior to the meeting, review and complete the attached spreadsheet of goals, track record, and future needs.
2. Break into three groups to discuss each member's preliminary votes, answer questions, and modify votes if desired.
3. Each group report to the full committee, including reporting on the level of consensus.
4. After full group discussion, modify votes if desired, and submit to staff for tabulation and preparation of draft findings and recommendations.

Background

The attached spread sheet includes a list of District goals, followed by three columns.

In column one, please rate each goal using the 1-5 voting system described in Agenda Item 3.B. A vote of "1" means you strongly agree with the statement that the goal is very important; a vote of "5" means you are opposed to the District working on this goal.

In column two, rate the District's track record as it relates to each goal. A vote of "1" means you strongly agree with the statement that the District has an excellent track record in addressing that objective; a vote of "5" means you feel strongly that the District's track record over the past eight years has not been acceptable.

In column three, indicate whether you agree with the statement that there is a need for the District to do more in the future regarding each goal. A vote of "1" means you strongly agree with the statement that the District needs to do more in the future to meet each goal; a vote of "5" means you believe the District should not be doing anything more on the goal.

District Goals, Track Record and Future Needs

Name: _____

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"	Comments
Acquiring regionally-significant open space lands*				
Acquiring wildlife habitat*				
Acquiring rivers, streams and lakes*				
Maintaining existing public open space lands				
Maintaining existing open space facilities and infrastructure				
Expanding public recreational use of existing public open space lands				
Constructing new natural trails (walking, hiking, biking, horseback riding)				
Constructing new campgrounds and picnic areas in natural settings				
Constructing new paved regional trails for walking and bicycling				
Supporting cities acquire and develop new urban parks (including sports fields)				
Educating the next generation about the environment and how to take care of it				
Providing recreation programs (guided walks, outdoor events, etc)				

Notes:

* Acquisition can mean fee title or easement purchase or donation



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

John Woodbury
General Manager

April 2, 2015

To: Park and Open Space District Advisory Committee
 From: John Woodbury
 Agenda Item: 3.D
 RE: Consideration of long-term projected revenues and expenses for alternative service scenarios, and potential future funding options.

Recommendation

1. Homework: Prior to the meeting, review and complete the attached spreadsheet (Exhibit Five) containing potential recommendations regarding the future funding of the District
2. Break into three groups to discuss each member's preliminary votes, answer questions, and modify votes if desired.
3. Each group report to the full committee, including reporting on the level of consensus.
4. After full group discussion, modify ratings if desired, and submit to staff for tabulation and preparation of draft findings and recommendations.

Background

Keeping in mind the goals and track record of the District in its first eight years, as covered in the prior agenda item, the next step for the Advisory Committee is to develop recommendations to guide the future of the District. Attached to this memo as Exhibit Five is a spreadsheet of potential findings and recommendations. Committee members should complete the spreadsheet as much as possible before the meeting. At the meeting the committee will break into three groups to discuss the potential findings and recommendations, then report the group results to the full committee. After full committee discussion, members may modify their ratings if desired. Staff will use spreadsheet to prepare draft findings and recommendations for review by the committee at its next meeting.

To assist the committee, several exhibits are attached to this memo which provide background information. Exhibit One has previously been distributed to the committee;; the only difference is that it now includes the expected County grant amount for the next fiscal year.

Exhibit Two projects future annual funding needs. Expenses are broken into the cost for general administrative purposes, the cost to complete and operate a Core Park System, and the cost for three enhancements to the Core Park System. The Core Park System is a subset of the more than 60 projects identified in the District Master Plan. The 10 parks and trails that compose the Core Park

System have already received considerable District attention and funding. Potential enhancements to the Core Park System include expanded environmental education programming, expanded land conservation, and completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail. Several key facts can be extrapolated from the information contained in Exhibit Five:

- The existing County grant to the District that utilizes Transient Occupancy Tax revenues is sufficient to cover basic administrative costs and operation of the Core Park System (assuming minimal improvements beyond what is on the ground today).
- Once operating and maintenance costs are accounted for, there is only a small amount of discretionary funding (under \$100,000/year) available for future capital needs to complete the Core Park System and for any enhancements to the system (further open space protection,, environmental education programs, or completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail segments that are outside of the Core Park System)
- Although the District has in the past been successful in leveraging the County grant with other grants at a three to one ratio, this success rate in leveraging funds is considerably higher than is the norm for other agencies. Going forward, the District cannot count on such a high rate of success in obtaining outside grants, especially considering the limited amount of local funding that will be available as local match for state and federal grants.
- Without new funding sources, it could take 100 years or more to fully complete the remaining acquisitions and improvements needed for the Core Park System.
- An expanded environmental education program is estimated to cost an addition \$740,000/year. Assuming the District could provide an expanded program at the same cost per student as is the case for the District's past efforts, this amount of funding would provide for one field trip per year for each of the approximately 23,000 K-12 students in Napa County.
- An expanded land conservation program is estimated to cost \$250,000/year to administer, and \$41 million to implement. This estimate is based on staff knowledge of what it would cost in today's dollars to acquire from willing sellers the most significant of the priority conservation areas identified in the District Master Plan and related planning documents, as they become available over the next two decades. A reasonable assumption for planning purposes is that approximately half of the cost of acquisition can be obtained through competitive state, federal and foundation grants.
- Completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail within Napa County is estimated to cost \$15 million. Most of this cost is for acquisition of land or easements not covered by the proposed expanded land conservation program.
- A new parcel tax dedicated to the District would enable the Core Park System to be completed more quickly, and could also fund an expanded land conservation program. However, it would not be sufficient to fund a meaningful land conservation program.

- A new property tax supporting the issuance of bonds would speed the completion of the Core Park System, but could not be used for the environmental education program, and would only fund a limited land conservation program.
- A ¼ cent sales tax over 20 years would be sufficient to complete the Core Park System and all three of the identified enhancements (environmental education, land conservation and completion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail in Napa County).
- The degree to which any new revenues are shared with other agencies that have compatible but different priorities than the District (eg, funding for city parks, funding for continued Napa River restoration) would reduce the amount of revenue available to the District, and thus extend the length of time necessary for the District to complete the Core Park System and protect key open space lands.

Exhibits

- One History of Funding for Park District
- Two Projected Expenditures and Revenues by Purpose
- Three Revenue Estimates for Alternative Funding Measures
- Four Sales and Use Tax Rates for California
- Five History of Bay Area Conservation Funding Measures
- Six Homework: Potential Findings and Recommendations

History of Revenues and Assets

prepared March 18, 2015

Fiscal Year	Revenues				Off-budget			Assets	
	County grant (3)	Other Grants and Program Revenues		Program Revenues as Percentage of All Revenues	Volunteer Services and In-Kind Donations	Year-end Fund Balance (2)	Year-end Capital Assets		
		Cash Donations	(1)					(1)	
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		
2014-15	\$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

Projected Expenditures and Revenues by Purpose

draft for April 2, 2015

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

April 2, 2015

<u>Parcel Tax</u>	<u>Number of Parcels</u>	<u>Rate/Parcel/Year</u>	<u>Revenue/Year</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
	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	
<u>Property Tax</u>	<u>Assessed Value</u>	<u>Rate/\$100,000/Year</u>	<u>Revenue/Year</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
	\$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	

Revenue Estimates by Type of Funding Measure

April 2, 2015

<u>Sales Tax</u>		<u>Notes</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>Taxable Sales</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Revenue/Year</u>		
\$330,000,000	1/8 %	rate=smallest allowable increment per state law	operating or capital	requires partnership with Napa County
\$330,000,000	1/4 %	rate= MROSD and SCAPOSD measures	The only city in the Bay Area with a lower sales tax rate than Napa County cities is Vallejo.	
\$330,000,000	1/2 %	rate= Napa Measure A	Significant share of revenues comes from tourists and other non-residents	
<u>Transient Occupancy Tax</u>		<u>Notes</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>Total 2014 County TOT</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Revenues/Year/%</u>		
\$10,883,724	12%	\$906,977	paid mostly by visitors not residents	rates already at 14%, among highest in nation
		only includes unincorporated area hotels	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

April 2, 2015

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

California Sales and Use Tax Rates by County and City*
Effective October 1, 2014 (includes state, county, local, and district taxes)

ALAMEDA CO. 9.00% City of Albany 9.50% City of Hayward 9.50% City of San Leandro 9.25% City of Union City 9.50%	LASSEN CO. 7.50%	NEVADA CO. 7.625% City of Grass Valley 8.125% City of Nevada City 8.50% Town of Truckee 8.375%	SANTA CRUZ CO. 8.25% City of Capitola 8.75% City of Santa Cruz 8.75% City of Scotts Valley 8.75% City of Watsonville 9.00%
ALPINE CO. 7.50%	LOS ANGELES CO. 9.00% City of Avalon 9.50% City of Commerce 9.50% City of Culver City 9.50% City of El Monte 9.50% City of Inglewood 9.50% City of La Mirada 10.00% City of Pico Rivera 10.00% City of San Fernando 9.50% City of Santa Monica 9.50% City of South El Monte 9.50% City of South Gate 10.00%	ORANGE CO. 8.00% City of La Habra 8.50%	SHASTA CO. 7.50% City of Anderson 8.00%
AMADOR CO. 8.00%	PLACER CO. 7.50%	PLUMAS CO. 7.50%	SIERRA CO. 7.50%
BUTTE CO. 7.50%	RIVERSIDE CO. 8.00% City of Cathedral City 9.00% City of Palm Springs 9.00%	RIVERSIDE CO. 8.00% City of Cathedral City 9.00% City of Palm Springs 9.00%	SISKIYOU CO. 7.50% City of Mount Shasta 7.75%
CALAVERAS CO. 7.50%	SACRAMENTO CO. 8.00% City of Galt 8.50% City of Sacramento 8.50%	SACRAMENTO CO. 8.00% City of Galt 8.50% City of Sacramento 8.50%	SOLANO CO. 7.625% City of Fairfield 8.625% City of Rio Vista 8.375% City of Vacaville 7.875% City of Vallejo 8.625%
COLUSA CO. 7.50% City of Williams 8.00%	MADERA CO. 8.00%	SAN BENITO CO. 7.50% City of Hollister 8.50% City of San Juan Bautista 8.25%	SONOMA CO. 8.25% City of Cotati 9.25% City of Healdsburg 8.75% City of Rohnert Park 8.75% City of Santa Rosa 8.75% City of Sebastopol 9.00% City of Sonoma 8.75%
CONTRA COSTA CO. 8.50% City of Antioch 9.00% City of Concord 9.00% City of El Cerrito 9.50% City of Hercules 9.00% Town of Moraga 9.50% City of Orinda 9.00% City of Pinole 9.00% City of Pittsburg 9.00% City of Richmond 9.00% City of San Pablo 9.25%	MARIN CO. 8.50% Town of Corte Madera 9.00% Town of Fairfax 9.00% City of Larkspur 9.00% City of Novato 9.00% Town of San Anselmo 9.00% City of San Rafael 9.25%	SAN BERNARDINO CO. 8.00% City of Montclair 8.25% City of San Bernardino 8.25%	STANISLAUS CO. 7.625% City of Ceres 8.125% City of Oakdale 8.125%
DEL NORTE CO. 7.50%	MARIPOSA CO. 8.00%	SAN DIEGO CO. 8.00% City of El Cajon 9.00% City of La Mesa 8.75% City of National City 9.00% City of Vista 8.50%	SUTTER CO. 7.50%
EL DORADO CO. 7.50% City of Placerville 8.00% City of South Lake Tahoe 8.00%	MENDOCINO CO. 7.625% City of Fort Bragg 8.625% City of Point Arena 8.125% City of Ukiah 8.125% City of Willits 8.125%	SAN FRANCISCO CO. 8.75%	TEHAMA CO. 7.50%
FRESNO CO. 8.225% City of Huron 9.225% City of Reedley 8.725% City of Sanger 8.975% City of Selma 8.725%	MERCED CO. 7.50% City of Atwater 8.00% City of Gustine 8.00% City of Los Banos 8.00% City of Merced 8.00%	SAN JOAQUIN CO. 8.00% City of Lathrop 9.00% City of Manteca 8.50% City of Stockton 9.00% City of Tracy 8.50%	TRINITY CO. 7.50%
GLENN CO. 7.50%	MODOC CO. 7.50%	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO. 7.50% City of Arroyo Grande 8.00% City of Grover Beach 8.00% City of Morro Bay 8.00% City of Paso Robles 8.00% City of Pismo Beach 8.00% City of San Luis Obispo 8.00%	TULARE CO. 8.00% City of Dinuba 8.75% City of Farmersville 8.50% City of Porterville 8.50% City of Tulare 8.50% City of Visalia 8.25%
HUMBOLDT CO. 7.50% City of Arcata 8.25% City of Eureka 8.25% City of Trinidad 8.25%	MONO CO. 7.50% Town of Mammoth Lakes 8.00%	SAN MATEO CO. 9.00% City of Half Moon Bay 9.50% City of San Mateo 9.25%	TUOLUMNE CO. 7.50% City of Sonora 8.00%
IMPERIAL CO. 8.00% City of Calexico 8.50%	MONTEREY CO. 7.50% City of Carmel-by-the-Sea 8.50% City of Del Rey Oaks 8.50% City of Greenfield 8.50% City of Marina 8.50% City of Pacific Grove 8.50% City of Salinas 8.00% City of Sand City 8.00% City of Seaside 8.50% City of Soledad 8.50%	SANTA BARBARA CO. 8.00% City of Santa Maria 8.25%	VENTURA CO. 7.50% City of Oxnard 8.00% City of Port Hueneme 8.00%
INYO CO. 8.00%	NAPA CO. 8.00%	SANTA CLARA CO. 8.75% City of Campbell 9.00%	YOLO CO. 7.50% City of Davis 8.50% City of West Sacramento 8.00% City of Woodland 8.25%
KERN CO. 7.50% City of Arvin 8.50% City of Delano 8.50% City of Ridgecrest 8.25%			YUBA CO. 7.50% City of Wheatland 8.00%
KINGS CO. 7.50%			
LAKE CO. 7.50% City of Clearlake 8.00% City of Lakeport 8.00%			

*(For more details, refer to www.boe.ca.gov/sutax/pam71.htm.)

Please note: Some communities located within a county or a city may not be listed. If you are in doubt about the correct rate or if you cannot find a community, please call our toll-free number at 1-800-400-7115 (TTY:711), or call the local California State Board of Equalization office nearest you for assistance.

2014 Santa Clara County Open Space Authority 11/2014 Parcel Tax (\$24/parcel) Excess Fund Revenue
 Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District 11/2014 Proprietary Tax (\$3.18 / \$100,000) \$300,000,000

History -- Bay Area Conservation Funding Measures (1988 - 2012)

Jurisdiction Name	Date	Finance Mechanism	Total Funds at		Conservation		Status		%	
			Stake	Funds Approved	Funds Approved	Pass?	Yes	No	Yes	No
2012										
Marin County	11/06/2012	Sales tax (1/4 cent)	\$90,000,000	\$90,000,000	✓	Pass	74%	26%		
San Francisco	11/06/2012	Bond	\$185,000,000	\$185,000,000	✓	Pass	72%	28%		
Total			\$275,000,000	\$275,000,000	2					
2010										
California (Prop 21)	11/02/2010	Vehicle Tax (\$18)	\$10,000,000,000	0		Fail	43%	57%		
Total			\$10,000,000,000	\$0	0					
2009										
Portola Valley	11/03/2009	Utility Tax (0.02 cent)	\$984,000	\$984,000	✓	Pass	66%	34%		
Total			\$984,000	\$984,000	1					
2008										
East Bay Regional Park District	11/04/2008	Bond	\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	✓	Pass	72%	28%		
San Francisco	02/05/2008	Bond	\$180,000,000	\$180,000,000	✓	Pass				
San Mateo County	06/03/2008	Sales tax (1/8 cent)	401,862,150	0		Fail	61%	39%		
Total			\$1,081,862,150	\$680,000,000	2					
2006										
California (Prop 84)	11/07/2006	Bond	\$5,388,000,000	\$5,388,000,000	✓	Pass	54%	46%		
Castro Valley	11/07/2006	Bond	\$30,000,000	0		Fail	63%	37%		
Santa Clara County	06/06/2006	Dedicated Prop Tax	\$368,400,000	\$368,400,000	✓	Pass	71%	29%		
Sonoma County Agricultural					✓					
Preservation and Open Space District	11/07/2006	Sales tax (1/4 cent)	\$340,000,000	\$340,000,000		Pass	76%	24%		
Total			\$6,126,400,000	\$6,096,400,000	3					

2005	Marinwood Community Services District 03/08/2005	Parcel Tax (\$74-\$150)	\$5,200,000	✓	Pass	71%	29%
	Portola Valley	11/08/2005	Utility Tax (2%)	\$800,000	✓	Pass	58%
	Total		\$6,000,000	2			42%
2004	Contra Costa County	07/27/2004	BAD	\$167,320,000	0	Fail	50%
	Martinez	11/02/2004	Bond	\$30,000,000	0	Fail	62%
	Total		\$197,320,000	\$0	1		38%
2002	California (Prop 40)	03/05/2002	Bond	\$2,600,000,000	✓	Pass	57%
	California (Prop 50)	11/05/2002	Bond	\$3,440,000,000	✓	Pass	55%
	California (Prop 51)	11/05/2002	Vehicle tax	\$20,000,000,000	0	Fail	41%
	Oakland	11/05/2002	Bond	\$198,250,000	✓	Pass	80%
	Total		\$6,238,250,000	3			20%
2001	Portola Valley	11/06/2001	Utility Tax (2%)	\$760,000	✓	Pass	74%
	Santa Clara County	11/06/2001	BAD (\$20)	\$160,000,000	✓	Pass*	26%
	Total		\$160,760,000	\$160,760,000	2		
2000	California (Prop 12)	03/07/2000	Bond	\$2,100,000,000	✓	Pass	63%
	California (Prop 13)	03/07/2000	Bond	\$1,970,000,000	✓	Pass	65%
	Napa County	11/07/2000	TOT (1.5%)	\$14,900,000	0	Fail	64%
	San Francisco	03/07/2000	Property Tax - set aside	\$510,000,000	✓	Pass	36%
	Total		\$4,594,900,000	\$4,580,000,000	3		
1999	San Carlos	11/02/1999	Parcel Tax	1,200,000	✓	Pass	76%
	Total		\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	1		24%

1988							
California (Prop 70)	06/07/1988	Bond	\$776,000,000	✓	\$776,000,000	Pass	65% 35%
East Bay Regional Park District	11/08/1988	Bond	\$225,000,000	✓	\$225,000,000	Pass	
Total			\$1,001,000,000		\$1,001,000,000	2	2
TOTAL			\$54,999,132,489		\$21,542,522,539	35	45

Homework: Potential Findings and Recommendations

Name: _____

1. Score your level of agreement with each of the following statements:	Score 1-5*	Comments
(a) The District's track record doesn't justify its continued existence.		
(b) The District should be dissolved and its assets distributed to other agencies.		
(c) There really isn't any compelling need for the District to do more than it already has		
(d) The District should shift to a maintenance mode and live within its current means.		
(d) More is needed to preserve special places and land/water resources, provide nature-based recreation, and/or environmental education in Napa County.		
(e) The District should seek additional funding to accomplish its goals.		
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		
b. The District should actively seek to increase private donations		
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		
d. The District should actively encourage the school districts to spend more on outdoor environmental education		

* use the scoring system described in Agenda Item 3.B

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		
f. The District should explore placing a \$9 parcel tax on the ballot		
g. The District should explore placing a \$23 parcel tax on the ballot		
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		
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		
j. The District should explore placing a 1/4 cent sales tax on the ballot		
k. The District should explore placing the 1/2 cent sales tax on the ballot		

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		
b. If a tax measure is placed on the ballot, a citizen's oversight committee should be required		
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.		

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		
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.		
c. If a tax measure is 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.		