

EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

MEMORANDUM

January 18, 2008

To: Board of Directors

From: Pat O'Brien, General Manager
Dave Collins, Bob Doyle, Mike Anderson, Rosemary Cameron, AGM's

Subject: January 23, 2008 Board Workshop

I. INTRODUCTION:

The Board of Directors typically holds five Board Workshops during the first half of each year to review and discuss the status of the District's ongoing initiatives and activities. One additional Workshop has been added in 2008 to provide adequate time for the Board to focus on the proposed 2008 Regional Park Bond Extension measure that may be placed before voters at the November 2008 election. The information in this memorandum outlines the status of several components of this measure and is intended to support the Board's review and discussion of this complex program.

This meeting is being held in a workshop format to promote full discussion of these matters by the Board. Board members are encouraged to comment on and discuss the topics; however, no formal actions will be taken at this meeting. Any items requiring formal Board action will be referred to subsequent regular Board Meetings for consideration.

Goals of the Workshop:

Over the past several years the Board has guided the District toward presenting a Measure to voters that would extend the successful 1988 Regional Park Bond, Measure AA. These efforts have intensified during 2007, and direction received from the Board and Legislative Committee during the year provided staff with guidance to assemble a draft structure for this measure. This work has included discussions with community members, stakeholders and other agencies, surveys, assessments of community needs, current and potential park projects, an update of the District's Master Plan Map of Existing and Potential Parklands, consultation with financial advisors and many similar preparatory activities.

*This workshop provides the first opportunity for the full Board to review and discuss the draft structure and detail of the entire measure. This meeting also marks the start of a public participation period to seek involvement from all members of our community on the bond proposal including the Local Grant Program and the draft District expenditure plan. **Staff is seeking Board member's comments and suggested changes to the program and project list prior to initiating the public process.***

The balance of this memorandum provides background information on the components of the proposed measure and highlights suggested points of focus for Board discussion.

2. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED MEASURE:

The fundamental proposal is to replicate and extend the successful 1988 Measure AA program. The Measure AA program authorized a total of \$225 million in bonding authority and was distributed by a formula providing 25% (approximately \$56 million) of the proceeds to cities and other local agencies within the District, and the balance (approximately \$169 million) to District Acquisition and Construction of Park Facilities on a 75%/25% basis (\$127 million and \$42 million, respectively). These funds have all been committed to projects and are nearly expended. In the process, the District was able to leverage these funds with grants and other sources, effectively doubling the bond investment in regional parks over the last 20 years.

To account for the effects of 20 years of inflation and to approximate the buying power of the original program, the 2008 Regional Park Bond measure is proposed to authorize a total bond amount of \$500 million. The 2008 proposal also replicates the distribution of funds: 25% to local agencies (\$125 million) with the balance being committed to District projects on a 75%/25% ratio, providing approximately \$281 million to parkland acquisition and \$94 million to park capital projects. During 2007, the total principal dollar amount and general concept of an “AA Extension” measure was tested by survey and found to be supported at a rate above 70% by voters in the community.

Similar to Measure AA, the two major components of the proposed measure (the Local Grant Program and the District Project List) will be authorized under and funded by the same bond program but administered by the District under different management policies tailored to the specific goals of each program. The next two sections of this report discuss the Local Grant Program and District Project elements of the proposed 2008 Regional Park Bond Extension.

3. LOCAL GRANT PROGRAM:

The Local Grant Program is proposed to mirror the original Measure AA program which, in turn, was modeled after State Park Bonds of the time. The basis of this program is a per-capita distribution to cities, recreation and park districts, and county service areas formed to provide recreation opportunities to local communities. As with the original Measure, the District proposes to retain responsibility for those few unincorporated communities not otherwise served by a park or recreation entity.

Two Local Grant Program attachments are included in this packet:

- Attachment A (Local Grant Program Policy Recommendations)**
- Attachment B (Local Grant Program, Allocation of Funds to Local Agencies)**

Grants to Local Agencies:

Attachment B lists the distribution of funds from the 1988 Measure and the proposed allocations for the 2008 Measure. The per-capita amount for local agencies under this plan is \$46.17. The population figures used for the current calculation were based on the most current Department of Finance information available, otherwise on census estimates. Annual updates from the Department of Finance are available each May; therefore, it is proposed that this draft schedule be updated with 2008 numbers when they are available and the updated list be used as the formal allocation formula for the proposed Measure.

Local Grant Program Administration:

The District's experience with the administration of the 1988 Measure has provided staff with the basis for an update of the policies for administration of the Local Grant Program to address, in advance, many of the details of this program. These draft policy elements will be used in development of the grant guidelines and grant contracts following voter approval of the measure. The draft policies have been discussed by the Legislative Committee of the Board and may be amended over the next several months. A list of policy issues and recommendations is attached to this packet as **Attachment A**.

Three additional structural considerations affecting the Local Grant Program that are not included on the attached schedule warrant the Board's attention and are described below.

- ❑ **The Zoo:** Based on continuing discussion with the Board, the Oakland Zoo is included as a named project within the Local Grant Program at an amount of \$4 million. The Zoo was a named project in the 1988 Measure, and this proposal reflects the District's continuing commitment to this facility. The Zoo received their 1988 allocation in five payments over 15 years. A similar distribution would be proposed for funding from the 2008 Measure. Museums, recreational facilities and other facilities run by partnerships or JPA's were not included in the 1988 measure. Therefore, they are not included as named recipients of funding under the Local Grant Program, but may seek and would be eligible to receive funding in cooperation with cities named in the Measure. Additionally, after passage of the Measure, the District could decide to entertain proposals by other entities seeking to cooperate on projects having a nexus to projects on the District's proposed expenditure plan.

- ❑ **"Front Loading" of Local Grant Program Funds:** The 1988 Measure provided for the majority of funds to local agencies being available in the first two series (six years). This was possible because the District had no pre-existing general obligation debt and therefore had the capacity to issue sufficient bonds in the first two series to meet both the needs of the District projects and the Local Agency obligations. The District's debt capacity is now constrained by pre-existing Measure AA debt. District experience has also demonstrated that the local agencies' ability to expend their funds quickly was overly optimistic on the part of some agencies. Finally, the District's funding needs for District projects in the early years of the new Measure

are expected to be higher than in 1988. While staff is still recommending accommodation of some “front loading” of the Local Grant share, a specific financial model will need to be constructed over the next year that takes into account the debt capacity of the District, the anticipated expenditure rate of local and District funds, the anticipated growth in the assessed valuation of property within the District, and other factors.

Staff is recommending that the commitment to “front load” the Local Grant share not be made explicit in the ordinance, but rather be a stated goal that will be assessed following passage of the measure.

- ❑ **Inclusion of Administrative Costs:** The 1988 Measure AA assigned a 1.5% percentage for administration of the Local Grant program based on the state’s practice at the time. This amount was not sufficient to fund the District’s administrative expenses over the 20-year program, so the proposal for the 2008 Measure is to use a 5% figure, which more accurately reflects the expenses over the life of the measure and has been used in more recent State programs. Staff expenses for District projects are charged directly to those projects; therefore, an administrative percentage is not required for the District’s share of the measure. The dollar allocations to Local Agencies in Attachment 2 are calculated based on reservation of the 5% amount for District administration.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE DISTRICT’S EXPENDITURE PLAN AND PROJECT LIST:

District policy requires that the funds proposed for District projects be committed equitably between the three Metropolitan Planning Areas (Metro Areas) of the District, as defined in the District’s Master Plan. Based on the current populations of these Metro Areas, a breakdown of proposed allocations to District projects has been calculated and used as a framework for the District’s proposed project list. The Murray Township area of East Alameda County (including Livermore) was not in the District in 1988, does not currently contribute to or benefit directly from the AA program and, therefore, is not included in the proposed 2008 Measure. The Metro Area targets have been adjusted accordingly.

Tables 1a and 1b below summarize the overall use of proceeds, and the Metro Area allocations of the proposed measure.

Table 1a, Summary Use of Proceeds

Total Measure		\$ 500,000,000
Local Grant Program: (25% of total)		\$ 125,000,000
Zoo		\$ 4,000,000
Balance to Per Capita Local Grants		\$ 121,000,000
District Program: (75% of total)		
District Allocation	100%	\$ 375,000,000
Acquisition	75%	\$ 281,250,000
Capital Improvements	25%	\$ 93,750,000

Table 1b, Metro Area Allocations

			Acquisition	Development
Metro Areas (w/o Murray Township)			75%	25%
West Metro	39.2%	\$ 147,032,777	\$ 110,274,583	\$ 36,758,194
South Metro	27.8%	\$ 104,401,291	\$ 78,300,968	\$ 26,100,323
Diablo	33.0%	\$ 123,565,932	\$ 92,674,449	\$ 30,891,483
Total District Allocation	100.00%	\$ 375,000,000	\$281,250,000	\$ 93,750,000

Two suggestions pertaining to the structure of the District's share have been raised and are outlined below:

Future Adjustment of the Acquisition/Development Split: There has been an interest expressed in retaining Board authority for adjustment of the 75%/25% Acquisition/Development balance within the District's share to accommodate unforeseen events that may occur over the decades-long expenditure period. This new concept would need to be structured in a way that demonstrates the District's sound oversight and how this is required to better meet the long-term needs of our community. This could include requirements that such adjustments could only be enacted by a supermajority or unanimous action by the Board, could be limited as to when this could take place, i.e.; at 10-year intervals, and it could include a limitation on the maximum range of adjustment, possibly to a maximum of 5% or 10% shift (i.e. to 70%/30% or 65%/35%).

- Future Adjustment of Metro Area Allocations:** The expenditure period for the Measure may extend to 30 years. For this reason, it has been suggested that the Measure include a provision to adjust the Metro Area allocations to reflect possible future changes in population throughout the region. Should this be an interest that the Board supports, staff recommends:
 - The assessment and adjustment (if necessary) occur following each 10-year census.
 - Variances of less than .2% between Metro Areas not require adjustment.
 - No Metro Area allocations are reduced as a result of this process.
 - Interest earned on the bonds would be used, as earned, to re-balance the allocations by applying it to Metro Area(s) that have increased in population relative to the others.
 - That this provision be consistent with and/or subordinate to all regulatory requirements or limitations.

Both of the above proposals are intended to apply only to the District's share of the bond proceeds and it would need to be clearly stated that these provisions would not affect the Local Grant Program allocation of funds.

The Board is requested to discuss these provisions at the workshop. Should it be considered beneficial, staff recommends that the concepts be included as part of the next survey process to determine any effect that they may have on voter support.

District Project List:

During 2007, information was compiled from a number of sources to serve as the basis for the District's proposed bond measure project list. These included:

- Board Workshops and Legislative Committee meetings where Board members, as representatives of their communities, identified projects that were of high priority interest to constituents, preserved or protected valuable natural and cultural resources, necessary to pursue the District's mission, are at risk, or otherwise appropriate to consider for the bond measure expenditure plan.
- Meetings with stakeholders, holding public hearings and inviting public input to accomplish an update of the District's Existing and Potential Parklands Map, which added seven potential park sites to better serve the community and reflected changes in urban expansion and public interests in the 10 years since the last such update.
- Meetings with stakeholders and public agency representatives at community breakfasts, liaison meetings, conferences, ad-hoc forums and informal conversation inviting submission of their interests as they relate to the Proposed Bond Measure.
- A Review of existing District parks and projects at the staff level to determine the unfunded priorities that would be suitable for consideration in an expenditure plan.

Based on this information a draft project list is being constructed that addresses identified priorities and meets the tests of the allocation formulas for the overall Measure and the Metro Areas as described in Section 2 above. Even with \$375 million committed to District projects, this draft list will not meet all the needs that have been identified through this process; however, it will meet the tests of equity, balance and significant funding commitments to high-priority District projects as they are anticipated for the next 25 years.

The draft list will be presented to the Board and discussed at this workshop. It is suggested that the Board discuss the list and provide comments regarding any adjustments that may be desired prior to soliciting public and stakeholder involvement over the next several months. This list is a starting point and further adjustments to amounts, projects, and project descriptions are anticipated. The Board will have further opportunities to propose adjustments based on continuing review and public input before the expenditure plan is brought for formal consideration as part of the initiating ordinances for the measure in June and July 2008.

5. PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS:

Following Board consensus that the draft project list is ready for public review, staff will begin a three-month period of soliciting public input on the proposed bond and the draft expenditure plan from District residents, stakeholders, elected officials and public agency staff. Staff proposes to publicize the program and solicit input through the media, Regional in Nature, our web site, public hearings, liaison committee meetings, ad-hoc discussions and at Board meetings in February, March and April 2008.

All comments received will be made a part of the public record and provided to the Board for their review. In May, staff intends to present a review of the comments received and any suggested modifications to the expenditure plan to the full Board at either a Board workshop or regularly scheduled Board meeting. Prior to July, the final draft of the Measure will be tested by survey and brought before the Board of Directors for formal action directing placement of the Measure on the ballot for the November election.

The size of the District and the diversity of its communities and their interests suggests that the standard process of holding public hearings favors individuals who have the motivation and ability to attend; therefore, public hearings alone do not provide adequate opportunity for public input. It is suggested that to attract the broadest spectrum of public involvement, in addition to the outreach described above, the Board hold an open public hearing at all Board meetings starting in February and continuing through March. It is also suggested that all comments, in person, in writing, by phone, e-mail or other means, be encouraged and that such input become part of the formal public record of the hearings. To accommodate individuals who cannot conveniently attend a regular Board meeting, but still wish to address the District directly, we are suggesting that up to three public hearings be scheduled in the evening, one in each metro area of the District; tentatively at the BART Headquarters, East Contra Costa County, and in Fremont.

The Board is asked to review and comment on the proposed public review process.

6. RELATED UPDATES:

Surveys:

Staff has notified Dr. Manross of SRI that he should be prepared to field a survey between this workshop and the February 15th Legislative Committee meeting to provide current information on several critical elements of the proposed Measure. These include testing the sensitivity of voters to: the current economic news, the draft measure as it is currently envisioned, the total authority requested under the measure, flagship projects or elements of the expenditure plan, regional differences in priorities between communities, and other topics. This will be one of the last opportunities to seek information on the community's preferences prior to drafting the formal documentation and ordinances necessary to take the Measure to the ballot. Should there be specific interests in addition to the ones above that Board members would like tested, this workshop will be the best opportunity to provide that information to staff. In June, a final tracking poll will be undertaken to provide information to the Board on the level of voter support for the Measure and to allow the Board to make a final Go/No-Go decision on placing the Measure before voters in November.

2008 Measure AA Refunding Bonds:

Following the prior direction of the Board, staff is moving forward with preparations to re-finance a portion of existing Measure AA bonds to lower the interest rate and reduce the cost to taxpayers. This action will be nearly identical to the successful 2006 refunding process; therefore staff is proposing to use the same finance team (KNN as Financial Advisor, Jones Hall as Bond Counsel, RBC Dain Rauscher as Underwriter, and Orrick Herrington and Sutcliffe as Disclosure Counsel) to structure and accomplish the sale. This recommendation will be presented to the Finance Committee in January and brought to the Board for action in February. The sale of bonds will take place before mid-year 2008 to ensure placement on the 2008/09 tax rolls.

Next Steps:

Staff will continue preparations for this Ballot Measure and will be guided by regular discussions at the Legislative Committee, consideration of formal actions by the full Board in regular session, and by discussions that take place at this and future Board Workshops. Ballot language and the required ordinances will be drafted over the coming months and will be reviewed with the Board. The upcoming workshops, beginning with the February 13, 2008 meeting, will be organized as in previous years; however, the format is flexible and can accommodate continued discussion of the proposed Measure should the need arise.

AA Extension Local Grant Program Policy Discussion
Board Workshop
January 23, 2008

	A	B	C
1	Policy Question	Discussion	Initial Policy Position
2	<p>Expiration of Funds - What should be the District's policy for expiration of the grant program and un-used grant funds?</p>	<p>State Park Prop 40 Per Capita Program allows applicants 3-years to sign a master contract and 5 additional years to complete all expenditure of funds. Unexpended funds are returned to the legislature. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program required applicants to sign a master contract within a few months and on a sliding scaled based on total grant amount authorized expenditure of 50% of the funds in the first 3-years of the program. The remaining funds were to be spent within a total of 6-years. The District has extended the 1988 AA funds 11 times. What should be the dead line for expenditure? Should unused grant funds be returned to the Board for appropriation to other projects?</p>	<p>Staff is recommending that applicants be allowed 3-years to sign a master contract and that 7 additional years be available to expend funds. Applicants would have access to all of their funds after 3 years. After a total of 10-years, applicants would returned to the District Board of Directors with requests for extensions.</p>
3	<p>Unincorporated Parts of the Counties - How should the Board award District managed funds from the unincorporated areas of the two counties?</p>	<p>The District is the only recipient of county wide funds from State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program. The counties received no funding from Prop 40 Per Capita Program. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program negotiated to give funds from the unincorporated areas of the counties to local cities. Potential applicants for project that best serve the recreational needs of the unincorporated areas include: the District, cities, parks and recreation districts, CSA's, LLD's, CDA's, Irrigation Districts and more.</p>	<p>Staff will return to the Board for award of funds to individual projects. Board will use funds for District sponsored projects or award grants based on which county the project is located in and the urgency of project, project readiness and amount of public recreation provided.</p>
4	<p>Construction on School Property - Can Local Grant funds be used to build facilities on school property or property owned by anyone else?</p>	<p>State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita and 1988 AA Local Grant Program allow development on property leased for 10 or 20 years based on the grant amount. Schools often want to share access to projects. What should the minimum amount of recreational access be for project on leased property?</p>	<p>Recreation activities should have priority starting at 3:00 p.m. week days and all day on the weekends.</p>
5	<p>Advanced Payment - Should the District provide advance payment of bond funds?</p>	<p>State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program allows 10% advance for preparation of bid documents & permits, and up to an 80% advance with proof of an awarded construction contract. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program allowed 10% advance for project planning. State has experienced great difficulty with advances. It is cumbersome for applicants to track interest earned on advances. Loss of control over grant process.</p>	<p>No advance payment of bond funds to local entities.</p>

AA Extension Local Grant Program Policy Discussion
Board Workshop
January 23, 2008

	A	B	C
1	Policy Question	Discussion	Initial Policy Position
6	Grants to Non-Profits - Should the Board award District managed funds to non-profits?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program awards grants to cities, special parks and recreation districts and regional park districts. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program awarded grants to cities, special parks and recreation district and qualifying county services areas. The District will retain the authority spend local grant funds or award grants for the benefit of the unincorporated parts of the counties. It is in the public interest to allow a wide variety of applicants for these funds. However there is concern about having non-profits ultimately responsible for projects.	Board will only award grants to government agencies. However, non-profits may partner with government agencies to operate projects and provide services.
7	Private Business Use - Can facilities be used for private business use or exclusive use by non-profits?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Programs allows limited private use. 1988 AA Local Grant Program allowed 10% private use. Private use is not in the interest of the bond measure. Restriction could limit concession stands operations and projects such as the Ardenwood produce stand which was funded by AA Local Grant.	No use by private firms. Use only by non-profits that provide services to the public at the site. The Board may consider allowing Grant Applicant's proposals for private use on a case-by-case basis.
8	Operation by Non-Profits - Can projects be operated and maintained by non-profits?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program allows non-profits to operate bond funded projects. 1988 AA Local Grant Program did not address non-profits. Partnership with non-profits for day care centers and concessions are appropriate if they earn less than the cost to operate and maintain the project.	Approve use by non-profits that provide services to the public at the site. Non-profits must not generate more revenue than is require to maintain and operate the project.
9	Libraries, Museums & Classrooms - Can Local Grant funds be used to build libraries, museums or classrooms?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita and 1988 AA Local Grant Program require the applicant to certify that the project is consistent with the applicants parks and recreation plan. AA listed street and auditorium projects as specifically ineligible.	School classrooms are ineligible. Libraries and museums are eligible as long as the project is consistent with the applicants parks and recreation plan.
10	Historic Preservation - Can Local Grant funds be used for historic preservation?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program requires projects to provide recreational activities. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program allowed for historic preservation on sites list on an historic register. Should the completed project be required to be open to the public?	Historic preservation is eligible. Historic preservation projects do not need to be open to the public.

AA Extension Local Grant Program Policy Discussion
Board Workshop
January 23, 2008

	A	B	C
1	Policy Question	Discussion	Initial Policy Position
11	Public Access - Should bond funded projects be open and available to the public?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program requires development projects to be open and in good condition for public use. 1988 AA Local Grant Program did not specifically require projects to be open to the public. Does it make sense to require acquisition or historic preservation projects open to the public?	Completed projects must meet the goals of the project application. Acquisitions must have permanent control of property for parks and recreation purposes. Service yards and support facilities that serve recreation are eligible.
12	Fund Eligibility - When should expenditures be eligible for reimbursement?	Eligibility for State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program starts from the date bond funds are appropriate by the legislature. Eligibility for the 1988 AA Local Grant Program started when the applicant executed a master contract agreement. Having a consistent eligibility date helps the applicants and the District maintain consistent implementation of the program and allows applicants the ability to use AA funds on projects that are already underway.	Expenditures should be eligible from the date the Board authorizes the Local Grant Program, but agencies will not be able to receive reimbursement until they have signed a master agreement and received an approved project application. Date could be set as early as January 1, 2009.
13	Fund Availability - When will funds be available to local agencies for expenditure on projects?	Based on the size to the allocation to the applicant, the 1988 AA Local Grant Program made funds available approximately half of the funds available during the first year of the program. The remaining funds were made available three years later. State Parks made all funds under Prop 40 Per Capita available at the start of the program.	The District should limit the amount of funds available in the first year to approximately 50% of the funds. Most applicants do not spend there funds in the first three year. In addition this will contractually protect the District from over committing bond revenue.
14	CEQA Costs - Will the District fund the cost of CEQA which is required at the time of application?	The costs for CEQA planning and preparation are eligible under State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program and the 1988 AA Local Grant programs. However a complete CEQA document is needed as part of the project application package.	CEQA expenditures during performance period are eligible but will only be approved for reimbursement with project application approval.
15	Planning Costs for Withdrawn Projects - How should the District handle the cost of CEQA planning or design for projects that are withdrawn?	Under State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program Individual projects are not approved by State Parks until CEQA is approved. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program required the return of money used on planning for terminated projects. CEQA and engineering studies that do not become construction project are specifically ineligible under AA Local Grant Program. Studies that do not become capital projects are also not eligible for the use of bond funds.	If the project is terminated by the grant applicant, any grant funds received for design or CEQA planning must be returned to the District.

AA Extension Local Grant Program Policy Discussion
Board Workshop
January 23, 2008

	A	B	C
1	Policy Question	Discussion	Initial Policy Position
16	Payments to Escrow - Should the District make 100% payments directly to escrow?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita allows up to 90% of the grant amount to be deposited directly to escrow. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program allowed for up to 90% of grant funds to be deposited into escrow. Many granting agencies including WCB and the Coastal Conservancy prefer funds go directly to escrow. District will review all documentation prior to payment to escrow.	Allow up to 100% of grant to escrow for acquisitions.
17	Less than Fee Title - Should the Local Grant Program fund acquisition through less than fee title, such as easements and/or license agreements.	State Park Prop 40 Per Capita Program allows the acquisition of property through license agreement. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program allowed any interest that accomplished the goals of the project. Permanent rights would be most appropriate use of bond funds. Conservation easements can be cumbersome and costly to administer. Agricultural easements are not part of the programs mission and involve private exclusive use.	Only allow the acquisition through fee title, except for trail easements.
18	Review of Construction Documents - Should the District review the grant applicants construction documents.	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program does not require design review. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program required review of plans and specification by the District. Design review is of limited value for projects that are not on District land or operated by the District. Staff will inspect projects to insure that they meet the bond requirements of the program.	No design review unless project is on EBRPD property.
19	Review of Acquisition Documents - Should the District review the grant applicants acquisition documentation prior to escrow?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program does not require review of land acquisition documents prior to acquisition. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program required review of acquisition document prior to opening escrow. Review of acquisition documents by the District's Land Department could be useful especially for agreements involving less than fee title.	The District will review land acquisition documentation prior to the opening of escrow.
20	Audit of Each Project - Should the District audit each project at close out?	State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program does not require the audit of each project at close out. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program requires an audit by the District's Finance Department prior to final payment of the grant. State Parks controllers office audits projects within the three years after the project is completed. It is difficult to conduct an audit years after the project is completed.	The District should audit each project at close out.

AA Extension Local Grant Program Policy Discussion
Board Workshop
January 23, 2008

	A	B	C
1	Policy Question	Discussion	Initial Policy Position
21	<p><u>Board Approval of Every Project</u> - Should the Board approve each of the individual Participating Entity's projects?</p>	<p>For State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program staff at the State Parks issue approval of individual project applications. In the 1988 AA Local Grant Program the Board appropriated funds to each of the applicants individual projects. The Board will approve the master agreement amount to be given to each agency. Can staff implement the program per Board approved guidelines?</p>	<p>Pending the Board approval of the Local Grant Program Guidelines and the final grant amount, staff will administer the Participating Entities project applications per the approved guidelines. The Board will assign a project number for each agency and staff will use subproject numbers to budget and track the Participating Entity's individual projects.</p>
22	<p><u>Grant Sign</u> - Should the District require the installation of grant acknowledgement signs for complete projects?</p>	<p>State Parks required the installation of signs under Prop 12, but withdrew the requirement for Prop 40. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program required the installation of signs. Signs are cumbersome and expensive to install. May be of limited value to the public or the District.</p>	<p>Grant acknowledgement signs should be required.</p>
23	<p><u>Status Reports</u> - Should the District require semi-annual status reports?</p>	<p>State Parks Prop 40 Per Capita Program requires semi-annual progress reports for approved project applications. The 1988 AA Local Grant Program did not require regular status report updates. Reports are a good way to insure that applicants are attentive to projects and provides information regarding planned cash flow.</p>	<p>Require semi-annual status report updates from applicants on approved project application and plans for unused grant funds.</p>

Board Workshop, January 23, 2008

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1					Alameda County				
2	1988 MEASURE AA				2008 PROPOSED MEASURE AA EXTENSION				
3			1988		2007				
4	1988 AA Local Grant		Population	1988 Allocation	2008 AA Local Grant	Population	2008 Allocation	Participating Entity	Data Source
5	CITIES				CITIES				
6	Alameda	75,900	\$2,173,101	Alameda	75,254	\$3,474,667		2007 DOF Estimate	
7	Albany	15,900	\$455,235	Albany	16,764	\$774,036		2007 DOF Estimate	
8	Berkeley	106,800	\$3,057,803	Berkeley	106,347	\$4,910,309		2007 DOF Estimate	
9	Dublin	22,050	\$631,316	Dublin	43,630	\$2,014,507		2007 DOF Estimate	
10	Emeryville	4,930	\$141,151	Emeryville	9,163	\$423,079		2007 DOF Estimate	
11	Fremont	165,200	\$4,729,858	Fremont	211,662	\$9,772,969		2007 DOF Estimate	
12	Newark	39,400	\$1,128,065	Newark	43,693	\$2,017,416		2007 DOF Estimate	
13	Oakland	357,800	\$10,244,208	Oakland	415,492	\$19,184,314		2007 DOF Estimate	
14	Piedmont	10,450	\$299,195	Piedmont	11,055	\$510,437		2007 DOF Estimate	
15	Pleasanton	48,500	\$1,388,608	Pleasanton	68,755	\$3,174,592		2007 DOF Estimate	
16	San Leandro	67,100	\$1,921,147	San Leandro	81,466	\$3,761,491		2007 DOF Estimate	
17	Union City	50,100	\$1,434,418	Union City	72,297	\$3,338,135		2007 DOF Estimate	
18	Cities Subtotal		964,130	\$27,604,104	1,155,578		\$53,355,953	2007 DOF Estimate	
19	HARD				HARD				
20	HARD	214,753	\$6,148,615	Hayward	147,845	\$6,826,377	HARD	2007 DOF Estimate	
21				Ashland*	21,431	\$989,523	HARD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007	
22				Castro Valley*	59,049	\$2,726,441	HARD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007	
23				Cherryland*	14,261	\$658,466	HARD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007	
24				Fairview*	9,760	\$450,644	HARD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007	
25				San Lorenzo*	22,570	\$1,042,114	HARD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007	
26				Mt. Eden	875	\$40,401	HARD	HARD info from Alameda County	
27	HARD Subtotal		214,753	\$6,148,615	275,791		\$12,733,967		
28									
29	UNINCORPORATED EBRPD				UNINCORPORATED EBRPD				
30	Dublin Area	100	\$2,863						
31	Fremont Area	1,000	\$28,631						
32	Pleasanton Area	1,694	\$48,501						
33	Unincorporated EBRPD Subtotal		2,794	\$79,995	11,534		\$532,554	EBRPD	Remainder
34									
35	District Subtotal (Alameda)		1,181,677	\$33,832,714	Subtotal		1,442,903	\$66,622,474	
36									
37	NON-AA DISTRICT				NON-AA DISTRICT				
38	LARP	59,843	N/A	Livermore	82,845	\$0		2007 DOF Estimate	
39	Other	80	N/A	Other	400	\$0		Updated from 1998 AA	
40	Non-District Subtotal		59,923		83,245		\$0		
41									
42	ALAMEDA COUNTY TOTAL		1,241,600		1,526,148			2007 DOF Estimate	
43									
44	* Census Designated Place (CDP)								
45									
46	1988 MEASURE AA				2008 PROPOSED MEASURE AA EXTENSION				
47			1988		2007				
48	1988 AA Local Grant		Population	1988 Allocation	2008 AA Local Grant	Population	2008 Allocation	Participating Entity	Data Source
49	CITIES				CITIES				
50	Antioch	54,200	\$1,551,806	Antioch	100,150	\$4,624,178	Antioch	2007 DOF Estimate	
51	Brentwood	3,204	\$91,734	Brentwood	48,907	\$2,258,160	Brentwood	2007 DOF Estimate	
52	Clayton	6,725	\$192,544	Clayton	10,781	\$497,786	Clayton	2007 DOF Estimate	
53	Concord	108,900	\$3,117,927	Concord	123,519	\$5,703,184	Concord	2007 DOF Estimate	
54	Danville	27,495	\$787,212	Danville	42,601	\$1,966,996	Danville	2007 DOF Estimate	
55	El Cerrito	23,150	\$662,810	El Cerrito	23,194	\$1,070,926	El Cerrito	2007 DOF Estimate	
56	Hercules	12,600	\$360,752	Hercules	23,975	\$1,106,986	Hercules	2007 DOF Estimate	
57	Lafayette	22,550	\$645,631	Lafayette	23,953	\$1,105,970	Lafayette	2007 DOF Estimate	
58	Martinez	29,850	\$854,638	Martinez	36,179	\$1,670,476	Martinez	2007 DOF Estimate	
59	Moraga	15,850	\$453,803	Moraga	16,165	\$746,379	Moraga	2007 DOF Estimate	
60	Oakley	12,400	\$355,026	Oakley	31,906	\$1,473,181	Oakley	2007 DOF Estimate	
61	Orinda	17,350	\$496,750	Orinda	17,517	\$808,804	Orinda	2007 DOF Estimate	
62	Pinole	15,250	\$436,624	Pinole	19,234	\$888,082	Pinole	2007 DOF Estimate	
63	Pittsburg	43,000	\$1,231,137	Pittsburg	63,004	\$2,909,054	Pittsburg	2007 DOF Estimate	
64	Pleasant Hill	36,254	\$1,037,992	Pleasant Hill	33,117	\$1,529,095	Pleasant Hill R.P. D.	2007 DOF Estimate	
65	Richmond	81,500	\$2,333,435	Richmond	103,828	\$4,794,001	Richmond	2007 DOF Estimate	
66	San Pablo	21,450	\$614,137	San Pablo	30,965	\$1,429,732	San Pablo	2007 DOF Estimate	
67	San Ramon	30,400	\$870,386	San Ramon	58,035	\$2,679,622	San Ramon	2007 DOF Estimate	
68	Walnut Creek	62,500	\$1,789,444	Walnut Creek	65,384	\$3,018,944	Walnut Creek	2007 DOF Estimate	
69	Cities Subtotal		624,628	\$17,883,788	872,414		\$40,281,556	2007 DOF Estimate	

Board Workshop, January 23, 2008

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
70	Contra Costa County								
71									
72	UNINCORPORATED, CSA's / CSD's / RPD's				UNINCORPORATED, CSA's / CSD's / RPD's				
73	Alamo CSA R-7A	13,018	\$372,720		Alamo*	17,520	\$808,943	Alamo CSA R-7A	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
74	Ambrose R. P. D.	14,500	\$415,151		Bay Point*	24,144	\$1,114,789	Ambrose R. P. D.	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
75	Clyde CSA M-16	450	\$12,884		Clyde*	778	\$35,922	Clyde CSA M-16	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
76	Crockett CSA P-1	3,250	\$93,051		Crockett*	4,437	\$204,867	Crockett CCSD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
77	Discovery Bay CSA M-8	4,200	\$120,251		Port Costa*	260	\$12,005	Crockett CCSD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
78	El Sobrante CSA R-9	12,257	\$350,931		Discovery Bay*	10,070	\$464,957	Discovery Bay CSA M-8	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
79	Green Valley	1,405	\$40,227		El Sobrante*	13,746	\$634,688	El Sobrante CSA R-9	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
80	Kensington CSD	5,350	\$153,176		Green Valley	1,475	\$68,116	Green Valley R.P.D.	Updated from 1988 AA
81	Montara Bay CSA M-17	10,000	\$286,311		Kensington*	5,534	\$255,519	Kensington CSD	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
82									Converted to Bayview-Montalvin & T
83					Bayview-Montalvin*	5,611	\$259,074	Montara Bay CSA M-17	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
84					Tara Hills*	5,978	\$276,019	Montara Bay CSA M-17	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
85	Pleasant Hill Area	3,185	\$91,190		Pleasant Hill Area	4,459	\$205,883	Pleasant Hill R.P.D.	Update from 1988 AA
86	Rodeo CSA R-10	8,400	\$240,501		Rodeo*	9,774	\$451,290	Rodeo CSA R-10	2000 CDP Updated to 2007
87	CSA's / CSD's / RPD's Subtotal	76,015	\$2,176,393		Subtotal	103,786	\$4,792,073		
88									
89	UNINCORPORATED EBRPD				UNINCORPORATED EBRPD				
90	Bethel Island	1,750	\$50,104						
91	Blackhawk	5,000	\$143,156						
92	Brentwood Area	2,500	\$71,578						
93	Brentwood R. P. D.	3,203	\$91,705						(Absorbed by City of Brentwood)
94	Canyon	200	\$5,726						
95	Clayton Area	1,500	\$42,947						
96	Concord Area	3,000	\$85,893						
97	Danville Area	1,500	\$42,947						
98	Diablo	1,000	\$28,631						
99	Lafayette Area	100	\$2,863						
100	Marsh Creek Area	515	\$14,745		Balance of the County	66,141	\$3,053,897	EBRPD	Remainder
101	Martinez Area	8,450	\$241,933						
102	Moraga Area	100	\$2,863						
103	Other Far East County	2,500	\$71,578						
104	Richmond Heights East	3,350	\$95,914						
105	Richmond Heights North	2,350	\$67,283						
106	Rollingwood / Willart R.P.D.	2,254	\$64,535						(EBRPD retained 1988 funds)
107	San Ramon Area	1,000	\$28,631						
108	Tassajara Area	2,000	\$57,262						
109	Walnut Creek Area	10,085	\$288,745						
110	West Pittsburg	550	\$15,747						
111	UNINCORPORATED EBRPD Subtotal	52,907	\$1,514,786		Subtotal	66,141	\$3,053,897		
112									
113	ALL UNINCORPORATED Subtotal	128,922	\$3,691,179		Subtotal	169,927	\$7,845,970		2007 DOF Estimate
114									
115									
116									
117	CONTRA COSTA TOTAL	753,550	\$21,574,967		CONTRA COSTA	1,042,341	\$48,127,526		2007 DOF Estimate
118	ALAMEDA COUNTY TOTAL	1,181,677	\$33,832,714		ALAMEDA COUNTY	1,442,903	\$66,622,474		2007 DOF Estimate
119	DISTRICT TOTAL	1,935,227	\$55,407,681		DISTRICT TOTAL	2,485,244	\$114,750,000		
120									
121									
122									
123									
124									
125									
126									
127	* Census Designated Place (CDP)								