

SECTION 7 – Projects and Funding

7.1 Introduction

The cost for all of the park, open space areas, trails and sport field projects listed in this Plan is approximately \$12.1 million, based on 2004 dollars. Including “Measure F” funds, the City currently has \$10 million available (see table 7.4) for capital development. This leaves an unmet need of approximately \$2.1 million without funding allocations.

Listed on the following pages is an implementation plan for improving park, recreation and open space services in the City of Albany.

7.2 Project Priorities

Below is a list of project priorities necessary to implement the Park, Recreation and Open Space plan. The Parks and Recreation Commission first prioritized the park projects list based on community needs and later prepared a Measure F initial project priority list to meet a City Council decision deadline. The proposed list, priorities and suggested funding options were presented to the public for comment and feedback. The list was then forwarded to the City Council. Following several Council meetings, the Council set priorities for Measure F funding (See Table 7.5) which established the baseline priorities for Albany facilities, parks and programs.

Based on Commission, community priorities and the City Council Measure F list, the capital projects are listed in Table 7.1 by facility and park type along with project costs.

Table 7.1
Projects Identified in the Plan
City of Albany

Priority	Map Key	Size	Project Description	Project Cost
MINI-PARKS				
	M-25	0.44	UC Village - Playground	\$0
	M-29	0.07	Dartmouth Tot Lot	\$28,400
	Subtotal			\$28,400

Table 7.1 (Continued)

Priority	Map Key	Size	Project Description	Project Cost
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS				
	M-22	1.70	UC Village - Dowling Park	\$0
	N-12a	2.00	Vista School (P)	\$240,414
	N-12b	1.00	Pierce Street Park (P)	\$1,600,000
	N-20	3.61	Ocean View Park	\$659,900
	N-31	1.32	Terrace Park	\$92,300
			Subtotal	\$2,592,614
COMMUNITY PARKS				
	C-7	6.75	Memorial Park	\$1,320,000
			Subtotal	\$1,320,000
REGIONAL PARKS				
	R-14	160.00	Eastshore State Park	\$0
			Subtotal	\$0
SPECIAL USE FACILITIES/AREAS				
	SU-8	–	Veteran's Memorial Building (P)	\$1,497,001
	SU-35	–	Pre School Building	\$42,000
	SU-9		Child Care Building	\$0
	SU-16	0.24	Albany Senior Center	\$21,300
	SU-18	1.04	Albany Community Center	\$14,200
	SU-23	3.54	UC Village - Community Gardens	\$0
	SU-24	10.29	Fielding Fields	\$0
	SU-27	6.86	UC Village – Recreation Center/Playfields	\$0
	SU-28	8.65	UC Village – Gill Tract (P)	\$0
	SU-34	16.00	Gilman Street Fields (P)	\$0
			Subtotal	\$1,574,501
LINEAR PARKS				
	L-5	1.40	Key Route Median (P)	\$161,675
	L-13	0.08	Catherine's Walk	\$53,056
	L-15	8.85	Ohlone Greenway	\$777,600
	L-21	0.50	Waterfront Trail	\$75,000
	L-32	0.11	Manor Walk	\$7,100
			Subtotal	\$1,074,431

Table 7.1 (Continued)

Priority	Map Key	Size	Project Description	Project Cost
OPEN SPACE/GREENWAYS				
	OS-1	8.40	Cerrito Creek Bay Trail Connector (P)	\$100,000
	OS-2	4.88	Creekside Park	\$383,630
	OS-11a	12.98	Albany Hill Open Space Area Trail Easement	\$17,100
	OS-11b	10.02	Albany Hill Open Space Area (P)	\$0
	OS-26	7.90	Codornices Creek Greenway	\$1,804,330
			Subtotal	\$2,305,060
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS				
	S-3	10.76	Albany Middle School	\$0
	S-4	0.77	Albany Adult School	\$0
	S-6	4.20	Albany High School	\$0
	S-17	2.69	Cornell Elementary School	\$0
	S-19	4.29	Ocean View Elem. School	\$0
	S-30	2.64	Marin Elementary School	\$0
	S-33	6.00	St. Mary's College High School	\$0
			Subtotal	\$0
MISCELLANEOUS PATHWAY IMPROVEMENTS				
			Miscellaneous Trails	\$180,000
			Subtotal	\$180,000
OPEN SPACE CONTINGENCY				
			Open Space (general)	\$1,094,861
			Subtotal	\$1,094,861
CREEK RESORTATION CONTINGENCY				
			Creek Restoration (general)	1,161,695
			Subtotal	\$1,161,695
BALLFIELD CONTINGENCY				
			Ball fields (general)	\$750,000
			Subtotal	\$750,000
TOTAL				\$12,081,562

7.3 Project List

The projects listed on the previous pages have been identified through the master plan process. To further refine the specific projects, actions associated with each project have been broken into the categories listed on the following page.

Administration: This includes, but is not limited to, project budgeting, staffing and other work associated with project initiation.

Planning: This includes work associated with land use planning, environmental assessment, preparation of site master plans and the public process.

Acquisition: This includes work related to alternative site evaluation and selection, property appraisals, real estate negotiations and property transfers/easements, etc.

Development: For new site or facility development this includes work associated with selecting a design team, concept development, preparation of contract documents, project management and construction administration.

Major Rehabilitation: This includes major renovation work (work over \$25,000) to existing facilities.

Secure Funding: A few projects will require additional grants or other funding sources to complete the projects.

Minor Improvements: This includes minor repairs or improvements to existing sites (work under \$25,000).

Other: This includes work by other agencies or work associated with other issues, such as transportation improvements, mitigation, storm water detention, etc.

Table 7.2 is a summary of the actions required to implement the plan.

Table 7.2
Actions to Implement Parks Element of Albany Community Plan
Parks Master Plan

Facility	Administrative	Planning	Acquisition	Development	Major Rehabilitation	Minor Improvement	Other
Mini Parks							
M-25 UC Village - Playground							X
M-29 Dartmouth Tot Lot	X					X	

Table 7.2 (continued)

Facility	Administrative	Planning	Acquisition	Development	Major Rehabilitation	Minor Improvement	Other
Neighborhood Parks							
M-22 UC Village - Dowling Park							X
N-12a Vista School (P)	X	X		X	X		
N-12b Pierce Street Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
N-20 Ocean View Park	X	X			X		
N-31 Terrace Park	X					X	
Community Parks							
C-7 Memorial Park	X	X			X		
Regional Parks							
R-14 Eastshore State Park							X
Special Use Areas							
SU-8 Veteran's Memorial Bldg. (P)	X	X	X		X		
SU-35 Pre School Building	X						X
SU-9 Child Care Building	X						
SU-16 Albany Senior Center	X						X
SU-18 Albany Community Center	X						X
SU-23 UC Village – Comm. Garden							X
SU-24 Fielding Fields							X
SU-27 UC Village – Rec. Ctr./Fields							X
SU-28 UC Village – Gill Tract (P)							X
SU-34 Gillman Street Fields (P)	X	X					
Linear Parks							
L-5 Key Route Median (P)	X				X		
L-13 Catherine's Walk	X						X
L-15 Ohlone Greenway	X				X		
L-21 Waterfront Trail	X						X
L-32 Manor Walk	X						X
Open Space Areas							
OS-1 Cerrito Creek Greenway (P)	X	X	X	X			
OS-2 Creekside Park	X	X		X			
OS-11a Albany Hill OS Area (P)	X	X	X				X
OS-11b Albany Hill OS Area (P)	X						X
OS-26 Codornices Cr Greenway (P)	X	X	X	X			
Miscellaneous Areas							
Pathways/Trails (P)	X	X					X
Open Space (Contingency) (P)	X	X	X				

7.4 Basis for Estimating Costs

Development costs can vary widely depending on the locations, types of facilities constructed, off-site costs, quality of development and constraints on the project. For purposes of estimating cost, we have made the following assumptions:

Land Acquisition: The cost of land will vary widely depending on its location within the Albany Community. In some areas of the City, land acquisition could exceed \$100,000 an acre.

Development: A spreadsheet has been prepared for each park site that details potential costs for each element of park development. This spreadsheet is found in the Appendix F. Costs may not include street improvements and other unforeseen costs.

The figures assume that projects will be designed by a professional design firm, bid through a competitive public bidding process, and overseen by City Project Management.

7.5 Capital Costs

Listed below is a summary of the probable construction costs of all the projects recommended in the Plan. For convenience purposes, the projects are divided between (1) Land Acquisition, (2) Planning, (3) Development, (4) Major Rehabilitation, (5) Minor Improvements, and (6) Other (creek corridor rehabilitation).

Table 7.3
Summary of Probable Cost for
Projects Identified in the Plan
City of Albany

Item	Cost
1) Land Acquisition (1)	\$3,880,001
2) Planning (1) (2)	\$440,000
3) Development (1)	\$1,909,815
4) Major Rehabilitation	\$2,667,507
5) Minor Park Improvements	\$770,230
6) Other (Creek Corridor Rehabilitation) ⁽³⁾	\$1,161,695
Project Contingency	\$695,728
A & E Fees	\$556,586
TOTAL	\$12,081,562

- (1) Excludes cost associated with Proposed Pierce Street Park
- (2) Includes \$100,000 for Cerrito Creek planning
- (3) Includes a contingency of \$1,161,695

A detailed opinion of probable costs for each of the projects can be found in Appendix F.

7.6 Current Funding Availability

As you see, the cost to implement all the projects identified in the plan (see Section 6) is estimated to be \$12.1 million. If this amount is compared to the available resources identified in Table 7.4, there is a deficit of roughly \$2.1 million.

Financing of proposed improvements listed in Table 7.4 will come from a number of sources including grants and prior tax measures.

Based on the funding sources listed below, the City receives a fair amount of grants and assessment revenues that can be used for park and recreational facilities. The current appropriation and/or balances from these sources are listed below:

Table 7.4
Summary of Fund Balances for
Park and Recreational Facilities
City of Albany

Source	Balance
Community Development Block Grant (Fund 270) estimate	\$ 137,880
Proposition 12 (Fund 485)	
Roberti-Z Berg -Harris Block Grant	\$51,973
Per Capital Allocation	\$0
Proposition 40 (Fund 485)	
Roberti-Z Berg -Harris Block Grant	\$45,257
Per Capital Allocation	\$214,000
Various Grants – Cordonices Creek	\$1,832,650
Measure R (Assessment District 1996-1)	
Open Space/Albany Hill (Fund 780)	\$1,495,591
Recreation Playfields (Fund 781)	\$1,587,093
Creek Restoration (Fund 782)	\$1,261,695
Measure F	\$3,400,000
TOTAL	\$10,026,139

The City Council recently approved \$3.7 million from Measure F dedicated for park and recreation facilities and improvements. Of this amount \$300,000 has already been expended on Memorial Park improvements leaving a balance of \$3.4 million. Listed on the following page is a breakdown of the City's appropriation for Measure F funds.

Table 7.5
City Council-approved Allocation of Measure F Funds
City of Albany

Priority	Project	Measure F allocation Not to exceed:
Recently Appropriated		
1a and 1b	Memorial Park Phase II and Ocean View Park	\$ 1,400,000
2c and 4	Dartmouth Tot Lot and Terrace Park	\$65,000
3 and 2b	Contingency funds: 1) Pierce Street (park development) and/or 2) Ohlone Greenway (grant match or partial funding for safety improvements)	\$735,000
Other	Reserve for appropriation to other projects, potentially including Veterans Building, Waterfront trail, additional improvements to Ohlone Greenway, or lower priority projects.	\$ 1,200,000
Subtotal		\$3,400,000
Previously Appropriated		
-	Memorial Park Phase I (prior expenditure)	\$300,000
Subtotal		\$300,000
TOTAL		\$3,700,000

7.7 Current and Potential Funding Sources

The following are current and potential funding options available for developing, upgrading and maintaining parks and other recreational facilities in the City of Albany. While the City has used many of these mechanisms in the past, some of these are new and may provide an opportunity for additional funding.

- 1. Operating General Fund [City Fund 100]:** This is the City's primary source for operating revenue. Most of this revenue comes from taxes levied on property and the sale of merchandise within the city's boundary. During the last fiscal year, the City appropriated approximately \$7 million from this source. In a typical year, the General Fund represents about 50% of the City's total operating budget.

During the last budget year, the City allocated approximately 1.3 million from this source for to fund park, recreation and community service operations. (See Appendix C for specific appropriations).

2. **Capital Facilities Fund [City Fund 841]:** This fund is annually allocated to major capital expenditures.
3. **General Obligation Bond :** These are voter-approved bonds with the assessment placed on real property. The money may only be used for capital improvements but not for maintenance. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 15-20 years). Passage requires a two-thirds majority approval by the voters. Major disadvantages of this funding option are the high approval requirement and the high interest costs.

The City recently passed a bond measure, known as **Measure F**. While this bond has a number of intended uses, \$3.7 million has been allocated for park rehabilitation and development.

4. **Revenue Bonds:** These bonds are sold and paid for from the revenue produced from the operation of a facility. The City does not have any recreational facilities funded in this manner.

Since there are no major revenue producing facilities, this funding mechanism may not be a viable alternative.

5. **Donations:** The donations of labor, land, or cash by service agencies, private groups or individuals are a popular way to raise small amounts of money for specific projects. Service agencies, such as the Lions Club and Rotary Club often fund small projects such as playground improvements.

In the past, the local service groups have been active in upgrading or developing small projects in Albany.

6. **Exchange of Property:** If the City has an excess parcel of land with some development value it could be traded for private land more suitable for park use.

Since there is limited vacant land in Albany, this may not be a viable alternative.

7. **Joint Public/Private Partnership:** This concept has become increasingly popular for park and recreation agencies. The basic approach is for a public agency to enter into a working agreement with a private corporation to help fund, build, and/or operate a public facility. Generally, the three primary incentives a public agency can offer is free land to place a facility (usually a park or other parcel of public land), certain tax advantages and access to the facility. While the public agency may have to give up certain

responsibilities or control, it is one way of obtaining public facilities at a lower cost.

There may be some opportunity for the City to work cooperatively with local sport organizations to develop additional sport fields, provided the City makes the land available for their use.

8. Public/Government Grant Programs:

8a. HUD Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) [City Fund 270]: These grants from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development are available for a wide variety of projects. Most are distributed in the lower income areas of the community. Grants can cover up to 100% of project costs. The City has received a number of grants from this source. The City receives about \$ 120,000 per year from this source and there are a number of projects competing for these dollars. These funds are used for ADA access ramps and annual allocations for restroom replacement at Ocean View Park. This amounts to roughly \$30,000 annually.

8b. Land and Water Conservation Fund: This is a federal grant program that receives its money from offshore oil leases. The money is distributed through the National Park Service and is administered locally by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. In the past this was one of the major sources of grant money for local agencies. In the 1990s, funding at the federal level was severely cut but in recent times more money has become available. The funds can be used for acquisition and development of outdoor facilities and requires a 50% match.

8c. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA): Over the years, California has received considerable revenue for trail related projects. Originally called The *Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act* (ISTEA), it funded a wide variety of transportation related projects. In 1998 this program was modified some and is now referred to as TEA21.

TEA3, which will be the third iteration of this transportation vision. Funding for this had been reauthorized by the Federal Government through FY 2004. These funds can generally be used for landscape and amenity improvements related to trail and transportation projects. (Creek improvements, Key Route Median or Ohlone Greenway)

8d. State Bicycle Funds: Revenue from state gas taxes is distributed to each city for the development of bicycle lanes. For Albany, the amount received is minimal.

8e. Recreation Trails Program: This is a grant program funded through the California Parks and Recreation Department. Projects eligible under this program include 1) maintenance and restoration of existing trails, 2) development and rehabilitation of trailhead facilities, 3) construction of new recreation trails, and 4) acquisition of easements and fee simple title to property. Grants are distributed on an annual basis and require a 20% match.

8f. Urban Forestry Grants: There are several grant programs that provide money for urban forestry projects. One is funded by the U.S. Small Business Administration and provides grants to purchase and plant trees. This program sometimes funds urban street tree planting programs.

- 9. Statewide Park Bond (Proposition 12 and 40) [City Fund 485]:** California has recently passed two statewide bond measures for funding parks and open space. The funding program has several elements including a grant based on a per capita allocation, a matching grant and several competitive grant programs. The City received \$211,973 from Proposition 12 (per capita and Roberti-Z Berg -Harris Block Grant) and expects to receive roughly \$259,357 from Proposition 40 (per capita and Roberti-Z Berg -Harris Block Grant).
- 10. Other State Funds:** Other grant sources from the State of California include: Youth Soccer Recreation Program Grant. Project grants range from \$75,000-\$1,000,000.
- 11. Landscaping and Lighting District:** This funding mechanism is based on the Landscape and Light Act of 1972 and permits a public agency to assess housing units, or land parcels. The assessment revenues can be used for parkland acquisition, development and/or maintenance. Formation requires a 50% approval rather than the traditional two-thirds requirement of other tax mechanisms. The agency can choose to use the revenue generated on a pay as you go basis or can sell bonds in order to receive a lump sum amount. The bonds are then paid back from the annual revenue generated from the assessment. Establishment of an assessment district or the revision of an existing assessment requires a majority vote of property owners.

The City currently has two in place: These include: 1) Assessment District 1988-1 and 2) Assessment District 1996-1 commonly referred to as Measure R. Each of these is discussed below:

Assessment District 1988-1 [City Fund 730] is used to fund recurrent annual expenses associated with operation and maintenance of the City's park system as well as bond repayments for the Maintenance Center and Community Center. For 2002/03 year, this revenue was expected to generate \$522,889. The same is expected for FY 2003/04. Of this amount, roughly \$338,000 is directed toward bond repayment. The annual assessment for a single-family residence is \$75.54.

The current bonds will be retired in 2012. At this time, the Parks and Recreation Commission should work with the City Council to redirect these funds for other park, recreation and open space projects.

Measure R (Assessment District 1996-1) is used to fund the acquisition of open space/Albany Hill; the creation of recreation playfields; and the restoration of creeks. In 1999, the City issued bonds in the amount of \$6,230,000, which yielded \$5,456,347. The annual bond repayment is \$479,000. The annual assessment for a single-family residence is \$69.00.

Measure R provides that the assessment district revenues be allocated as follows

Open Space [City Fund 780] Open space acquisition on Albany Hill would receive 50% of the available resources. Roughly \$1,495,591 of this total remains unspent.

Recreational Playfields [City Fund 781] Recreation playfield development would receive 25% of the available resources. The balance of this fund is \$1,587,093.

Creek Restoration [City Fund 782] Creek restoration would receive 25% of the available resources. The balance of this fund is \$1,261,695.

12. Mello-Roos District:

This funding mechanism is based on the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 and permits a public agency to assess housing units, or land parcels. The assessment revenues can be used for most municipal services including parkland acquisition, development and/or maintenance. Services may be financed only to the extent that they are in addition to those provided in the District before it was created and may not supplant services already available when the district was created. In essence, services may only be financed to the extent of new growth. Formation requires a traditional two-thirds vote.

13. Exactions: Costs of necessary public improvements that are passed on the adjacent landowners.

14. Public Land Trusts: Private land trusts such as the Trust for Public Land, Inc. and the Nature Conservancy will acquire and hold land for eventual acquisition by a public agency.

14. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW): CDFW may provide technical assistance and administer funding for projects that enhance water quality, including debris removal, flood mitigation, and enhancements to water crossings.

15. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW): USFW may provide technical assistance and administer funding for projects related to water quality improvement through debris and habitat/vegetation management, watershed management and stream bank erosion, and sediment deposition projects.

Other potential sources:

Partnerships: The City is in a unique position to develop additional partnerships with other jurisdictions or agencies to implement projects identified in the plan. Some potential partners include City of Berkeley, City of El Cerrito, City of Richmond, Albany School District, East Bay Regional Park District, CALTRANS and various other private groups.

East Bay Regional Park District: The East Bay Regional Park District will be responsible for the operation and management of the Eastshore State Park. There may be resources available through the District to develop trail connections and linkages to this site.

7.8 Maintenance Funding

A high priority identified throughout the planning process was the need for adequate funding to be dedicated for park maintenance to properly care for existing and new parks. To determine a citywide cost, MIG assumed an average maintenance cost of \$8,000 per acre of active use areas and \$2,500 per acre for open space. The costs are summarized in Table 7.6.

In addition we have estimated a maintenance cost (exterior, ongoing preventative maintenance tasks such as painting and repairs) for existing and new community buildings at a cost of \$1.85 per square foot. The estimates are listed in Tale 7.7.

Table 7.6
Estimated Park and Open Space Maintenance Costs
City of Albany

Project	Acres	Cost per Acre	Estimated Maintenance Costs
Cerrito Creek Bay Trial Connector (P)	8.40	\$2,500	\$21,000
Codornices Creek Greenway	7.90	\$2,500	\$19,750
Key Route Median (P)	1.40	\$8,000	\$11,200
Pierce Street Park (P)	4.14	\$8,000	\$33,120
Vista School (P)	.25	\$8,000	\$2,000
SUBTOTAL (proposed)	23.84		\$149,670
Albany Community Center	.25	\$8,000	\$2,000
Albany Hill Open Space Area	12.98	\$2,500	\$32,450
Albany Senior Center	0.05	\$8,000	\$400
Catherine's Walk	0.08	\$8,000	\$640
Creekside Park	4.88	\$2,500	\$12,200
Dartmouth Tot Lot	0.07	\$8,000	\$560
Manor Walk	0.11	\$8,000	\$880
Memorial Park	6.75	\$8,000	\$54,000
Ocean View Park	3.61	\$8,000	\$28,880
Ohlone Greenway	9.12	\$8,000	\$72,960
Terrace Park	1.32	\$8,000	\$10,560
Waterfront Trail	0.30	\$8,000	\$2,400
SUBTOTAL (existing)	40.70		\$217,930
Add Administration (@10%)			\$38,940
Net Operating Cost			\$406,540

- (1) Source: City of Albany net operating cost (include staffing and utilities)
(P) Represents proposed park

Table 7.7
Estimated Recreation Building Maintenance Costs
City of Albany

Project	Square Footage	Cost per Square foot	Estimated Maintenance Costs
Albany Community Center	28,000	\$1.85	\$51,800
Albany Child Care Center	3,300	\$1.85	\$6,142
Albany Senior Center	3,940	\$1.85	\$2,682
Albany Teen Center	1,450,	\$1.85	\$7,289
Veteran's Memorial Building	10,420	\$1.85	\$19,277
TOTAL	47,130		\$87,190

The total estimated maintenance cost for both parks and recreation buildings is \$493,730.

7.9 Funding Strategies

As described above, the City has substantial existing resources allocated to both capital funding and ongoing maintenance. Additional resources would be needed to address the \$2.1 million shortfall for the remaining projects and improve the quality and consistency of park and facility maintenance.

Several funding approaches are suggested below for capital projects to close the 2.1 million dollar gap and to enhance park maintenance. Additional funding sources such as taxes or fees for parks and park maintenance, other than appropriate user fees, will not be considered until and unless the other methods have been fully explored and found infeasible.

1. **Reprioritization of park maintenance.**
 - A. Increase park maintenance budget.
2. **Improve park maintenance through improved management procedures and oversight.**
3. **Funding of expanded maintenance through savings as a result of upgraded infrastructure.**
4. **Local fundraising efforts. (Capital generation).**
5. **Regional and state grants.**
6. **Development partnerships with local groups.**
 - A. Project partnerships with local groups such as the Rotary Club and others.
7. **Lighting and Landscaping District.** One suggestion is to form a new Lighting and Landscaping district, which would be in addition to the existing districts that were established in 1988 and 1996.

The City should explore various alternatives and seek community input for suggestions on ways to address funding needs. Several of the large projects such as the Veteran's Memorial Building remodel, the Ohlone Greenway upgrade and Waterfront Trail connections are of community wide significance and will attract creative funding solutions and support.

