

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This chapter identifies an implementation strategy for funding the improvements recommended in the Leisure Services Plan. It includes a capital facilities plan and a Capital Improvement plan to increase capacity for the next twenty-five years. It also includes a general master project list which includes all projects ranging from projects funded in the 25-year plan, deferred maintenance projects, as well as a “wish list” developed by the maintenance staff.

7.1 CAPITAL PROJECTS

Below is a list of all projects in the General Master Project list along with potential development cost estimate which were developed by the consulting firm Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc. The City of Medford will confirm the figures upon upgrading the project’s priority into an active status from this general list of projects.

Implementation:

1. *Capital Projects*
2. *Non-Capital Projects*
3. *Preliminary Project Priorities*
4. *Project Actions*
5. *Project Costs*
6. *Funding Availability*
7. *Financing Strategy*
8. *Maintenance and Operations Impacts*
9. *Funding Sources*

Table 7.1
Estimated Cost for Capital Projects
Medford Planning Area

Map Key	Size (Acres)	Park	Opinion of Probable Cost
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS			
NP/OS-2	7.49	Table Rock Park	\$630,000
NP-4	3.00	Midway/Merriman Park	\$630,000
NP-5	8.55	Howard School Park	\$322,800
NP/SU-7	12.34	Railroad Park	\$85,800
NP-10	3.00	Ross Lane Park	\$1,230,000
NP-11	9.44	Jackson School Park	\$960,300
NP-13	3.00	Oak Grove School Park	\$1,230,000
NP-16	1.52	Alba Park	\$91,050
NP-17	8.56	Lewis Street Park	\$1,844,622
NP-18	2.16	Union Park	\$52,020
NP-19	4.56	Washington School Park	\$194,700
NP-21	3.00	Columbus Park	\$1,230,000
NP-25	2.29	Veterans Park	\$155,100
NP-24	8.45	Jefferson School Park	\$236,940
NP-28	3.00	Whittle Avenue Park	\$1,230,000
NP-29	4.56	Wilson School Park	\$69,300
NP-32	1.60	Earhart Park	\$21,000
NP-33	2.78	Roosevelt School Park	\$3,960
NP-34	13.26	Delta Waters School Park	\$420,000
NP-35	12.96	Kennedy School Park	\$577,500

Table 7.1 (continued)

Map Key	Size (Acres)	Park	Opinion of Probable Cost
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS (continued)			
NP-37	10.20	Donohue-Fronmayer Park	\$210,000
NP-38	1.15	Ruhl Park	\$15,180
NP-40	18.36	Holmes Park	\$171,300
NP-41	3.85	Hoover School Park	\$0
NP-43	3.00	Orchard Hill Park	\$4,620
NP-45	3.00	Cedar Links Park	\$1,230,000
NP-46	9.82	Lone Pine Park	\$426,975
NP-47	3.00	Brookdale Park	\$1,230,000
NP-48	1.60	Summerfield Park	\$315,000
NP-49	3.00	Country Club Park	\$1,230,000
NP-53	3.00	Orchard Park	\$1,230,000
NP-54	16.00	Oregon Hills Park	\$630,000
NP-56	3.00	Cherry Lane Park	\$1,230,000
NP-58	3.00	Oak Tree Park	\$1,230,000
NP/OS-60	165.58	Chrissy Park	\$315,000
		Subtotal	\$20,683,167
COMMUNITY PARKS			
CP-20	15.00	Sunset Park	\$4,200,000
CP-22	101.23	Bear Creek Park	\$8,929,140
CP-23	30.95	Fichtner-Mainwaring Park	\$842,820
CP/OS-26	132.72	Medford Sports & Community Park	\$18,000,000
CP-27	15.00	Hopkins Creek Park	\$4,200,000
CP-31	13.00	Hawthorne Park	\$701,590
CP-36	17.80	North Medford School Park	\$125,400
CP-51	15.00	Foothills Park	\$4,200,000
CP-55	15.00	Hillcrest Park	\$4,200,000
CP-57	15.00	Shamrock Park	\$4,200,000
		Subtotal	\$49,598,950

Table 7.1 (continued)

Map Key	Size (Acres)	Park	Opinion of Probable Cost
SPECIAL USE AREA			
SU-9	3.90	Santo Community Center	\$584,100
SU-12	1.00	Liberty Park	\$575,100
SU-14	1.75	Carnegie Building	\$330,000
SU-15	0.24	Vogel Park	\$3,300
SU-39	19.00	Eastwood Historic Cemetery	\$33,000
SU-50	1.50	Phoenix Road Park	\$846,900
SU-59	2.00	South Fork Larson Creek Park	\$800,850
SU-62	1.00	Middle Fork Larson Creek Park	\$530,250
		Subtotal	\$3,703,500
LINEAR PARK			
LP-30	5.63	Biddle Road Pathway	\$210,474
LP-52	8.79	East McAndrews Pathway	\$9,900
		Subtotal	\$220,374
NATURAL OPEN SPACE/GREENWAYS			
OSG-1	NA	Bear Creek Greenway	\$0
OSG-3	3.13	Bear Creek Greenway Park	\$0
OSG-6	36.09	Railroad Park Greenway	\$756,582
OSG-8	43.87	Bear Green Greenway	\$798,000
OSG-42	8.20	Lazy Creek Greenway	\$56,100
OSG-44	6.30	Larson Creek Greenway	\$610,500
OSG-61	1700.00	Prescott Park	\$650,100
		Subtotal	\$2,871,282.00
MAJOR FACILITIES			
		Water Park (Feasibility Study & Design)	\$264,000
		Nature Center	\$231,000
		Pathway Development	\$2,787,840
		Subtotal	\$3,282,840

7.2 NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

These non-capital projects are programs and services prioritized according to the criteria listed below.

- 1 = High priority Projects to complete in the next 6 years
- 2 = Medium priority Projects to complete in the next 12 years
- 3 = Low priority Projects to complete if funding becomes available

Table 7.2
Non-Capital Project Priorities (Programs and Services)
 Medford Planning Area

Action	Priority
TRAILS, PATHWAYS, AND BIKEWAYS	
Provide maps and public information relating to natural areas	1
Provide hiking and bicycle maps to facilitate trail use	1
Develop a financial feasibility study for trail acquisition and a detailed trails plan identifying specific routes, trail types, and opportunities for pathway development	1
PARK FACILITIES, PLANNING, AND DESIGN	
Implement and develop ADA transition plan	2
Develop a financial feasibility study and master plan for a new waterpark at Hawthorne Park	1
Develop a joint master plan for Alba Park and Carnegie Building	2
Develop a long-term plan to decommission Jackson Pool	2
Demolish and relocate the Youth Activity Center	1
Update the Santo CC master plan to incorporate a gymnasium and Youth Activity Center	1
PUBLIC INFORMATION/PROGRAM MARKETING	
Provide public information (brochures, flyers, etc.) emphasizing benefits of parks and recreation	1
Provide public information (brochures, flyers, etc) to promote the developmental assets associated with youth programming	1
Create a workshop kit for program marketing to use at community open houses, community events, etc.	1
Provide printed maps at trailheads and public counters	1
Provide public information (brochures, maps, signage) in Spanish	2

Table 7.2 (continued)

Action	Priority
PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	
Offer additional aquatics programs	1
Offer additional instructional classes	1
Offer additional special interest programs	1
Offer additional outdoor/interpretative programs	1
Offer additional special events	2
Offer additional adult and youth sports	1
Offer senior programs	2
Offer additional teen programs	1
Provide staffing for teen center at Santo CC	1
Provide staffing for mobile art and playground program	1
Provide a park host at Prescott Park	2
MAINTENANCE	
Develop an integrated pest management plan	1
Develop a maintenance management plan	1

7.3 PRELIMINARY PROJECT PRIORITIES

The total cost for all the improvements identified in Table 7.1 is approximately \$80.360 million. This is more than the City can, or will, finance in the near term. To be able to direct funding toward the most significant projects in terms of meeting community needs, all projects were prioritized, with the most important SDC eligible capital projects identified in the 25-Year Capital List (see Table 7.6). Additional SDC eligible projects will be implemented secondarily, using funds other than System Development Charges. Projects identified as non-SDC eligible projects were then rated from highest to the lowest priority, and will be completed only as additional funding becomes available.

These priorities reflect current and anticipated financial resources and community needs. In implementing projects, the City will retain the maximum degree of flexibility to adjust priorities for park development and open space acquisition as new and unforeseen opportunities and funding present themselves.



7.4 PROJECT ACTIONS

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

- **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.
- **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 costing more than \$25,000) to existing facilities.
- **Minor Improvements:** This includes minor repairs or improvements to existing sites (work costing less than \$25,000).
- **Other:** Work by other agencies or work associated with other issues, such as transportation improvements, mitigation, and storm water detention, is noted in this category.

Table 7.3
All Projects in General Master Project List
 Medford Planning Area

	Facility	Administration	Planning/ Master Planning	Acquisition	Development	Major Rehabilitation.	Minor Improvements.	Other
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS								
NP-2	Table Rock Park	X	X		X			X
NP-4	Midway/Merriman Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-5	Howard School Park	X				X		
NP-7	Railroad Park	X				X		
Np-10	Ross Lane Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-11	Jackson School Park	X				X		
NP-13	Oak Grove School Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-17	Lewis Street Park	X	X		X			
NP-16	Alba Park	X	X			X		
NP-18	Union Park	X	X			X		
NP-19	Washington School Park	X				X		
NP-21	Columbus Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-24	Jefferson School Park	X				X		
NP-25	Veterans Park	X	X			X		
NP-29	Wilson School Park	X				X		
NP-32	Earhart Park	X	X				X	
NP-33	Roosevelt School Park	X					X	
NP-34	Delta Waters School Park	X			X			
NP-35	Kennedy School Park	X			X			
NP-37	Donohue-Fronmayer Park	X				X		
NP-38	Ruhl Park	X					X	
NP-40	Holmes Park	X	X			X		
NP-41	Hoover School Park							X
NP-43	Orchard Hill Park	X					X	
NP-45	Cedar Links Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-46	Lone Pine Park	X				X		
NP-47	Brookdale Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-48	Summerfield Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-49	Country Club Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-53	Orchard Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-54	Oregon Hills Park	X	X		X			
NP-56	Cherry Lane Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-58	Oak Tree Park (P)	X	X	X	X			
NP-60	Chrissy Park	X	X		X			

(P) = Proposed

Table 7.3 (continued)

Facility	Administration	Planning/ Master Planning	Acquisition	Development	Major Rehabilitation.	Minor Improvements.	Other
COMMUNITY PARKS							
CP-20	Sunset Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
CP-22	Bear Creek Park	X			X	X	
CP-23	Fichtner-Mainwaring Park	X				X	
CP-27	Hopkins Creek Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
CP-26	Medford Sports Complex	X			X		
CP-31	Hawthorne Park	X				X	
CP-36	North Medford Park	X				X	
CP-51	Foothills Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
CP-55	Hillcrest Park (P)	X	X		X		
CP-57	Shamrock Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
SPECIAL USE AREAS							
SU-9	Santo Community Center	X				X	
SU-12	Liberty Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
SU-14	Carnegie Building	X				X	
SU-15	Vogel Park	X	X				X
SU-39	Eastwood Historic Cemetery	X				X	
SU-50	Phoenix Road Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
SU-59	South Fork Larson Creek Park (P)	X	X	X	X		
SU-62	Middle Fork Larson Creek Park (P)	X	X	X	X		

(P) = Proposed

Table 7.3 (continued)

Facility	Administration	Planning/ Master Planning	Acquisition	Development	Major Rehabilitation.	Minor Improvements.	Other
LINEAR PARKS							
LP-30	Biddle Road Pathway	X			X		
LP-52	East McAndrews Pathway	X				X	
NATURAL OPEN SPACE/ GREENWAYS							
OSG-1	Bear Creek Greenway	X					X
OSG-3	Bear Creek Greenway Park	X					X
OSG-6	Railroad Park Greenway	X	X		X		
OSG-8	Bear Green Greenway	X			X		
OSG-42	Lazy Creek Greenway	X			X		
OSG-44	Larson Creek Greenway	X			X		
OSG-61	Prescott Park	X	X	X	X		
MAJOR FACILITIES							
	Water Park (P)	X		X			
	Nature Center (P)	X		X			
	Pathway Development (P)	X	X	X	X		

(P) = Proposed

7.5 BASIS FOR ESTIMATING COSTS

Development costs can vary widely depending on the location, facility type, construction method, off-site costs, quality of development, and other constraints on the project. For purposes of estimating cost, the following assumptions were made:

- **Land Acquisition:** The cost of land will vary widely depending on its location within the Medford community. For development, land prices were estimated at \$200,000 per acre. In some areas of the City, land acquisition could well exceed this amount.
- **Development:** Potential costs were established for each element of park development for each park site. These costs include street improvements but not other off-site costs.



- **Design:** The figures assume a project designed by a professional design firm and bid through a competitive public bidding process.

7.6 CAPITAL COSTS

Table 7.4 represents an informal summary of probable construction costs of high priority projects. For convenience, the projects are divided into categories based on the purpose of the expenditure.

Table 7.4
Summary of Probable Cost for Highest Priority Projects
 General Master Project List*

Item	Cost
1) Land Acquisition	\$28,864,000
2) Planning	\$634,000
3) Development	\$31,847,000
4) Major Rehabilitation	\$3,310,000
5) Minor Park Improvements	\$544,000
6) Other	\$28,000
TOTAL	\$65,227,000

* General Master Project List includes the approved 25-year project list, deferred maintenance projects, needed capital projects, and a general “wish list” by the maintenance staff.

A detailed opinion of probable costs for each of the projects is found in Appendix G.

7.7 CURRENT & PROJECTED FUNDING AVAILABILITY

The current & projected appropriation and/or balances from available funding sources are listed in the following table:

**Table 7.5
Funding Sources**

Summary of Funding Sources (Five Years)	
Funding Source	Amount
SDC- Park Dedication Fund (Carry-over from '04 - '05)	\$3,666,488
Park Dedication Fund: Lodging Tax, Car Rental, License Fee (Dedicated to Revenue Bond payments)	\$0
Revenue Bond- (2)	\$5,456,200
SDC's (1 million annually) (1)	\$5,000,000
General Grants (anticipate \$25,000 annually)	\$125,000
CDBG Grants (anticipate \$25,000 annually)	\$125,000
Donations (anticipate \$25,000 annually)	\$125,000
Total Revenue	\$14,497,688
(1) SDC estimate based on new fees	
(2) Revenue bond is paid by a portion of the City business license tax, transit lodging tax, and car rental tax.	

7.8 FINANCING STRATEGY

The following 25-Year Capital plan was adopted 1/19/2006, funded by a 3-step SDC fee increasing over three years. An SDC fee for single family residences of \$2,544 starts at 80% of this amount in '06, moves to 90% in '07, and 100% in '08.

Table 7.6
25-Year Capital Plan
City of Medford

Item	Cost
2007 - 2012 Budget	
Neighborhood Park	\$1,860,000
Community/Urban Park	\$2,718,765
Recreation Facilities	\$444,300
Sub-total:	\$5,023,065
2012 - 2017 Budget	
Neighborhood Parks	\$1,200,000
Community/Urban Parks	\$3,000,000
Recreation Facilities	\$549,000
Sub-total:	\$4,749,00
2017 - 2022 Budget	
Neighborhood Parks	\$1,860,000
Community/Urban Parks	\$2,589,300
Recreation Facilities	\$596,700
Sub-total:	\$5,046,000
2022 - 2027 Budget	
Neighborhood Parks	\$1,207,500
Community/Urban Parks	\$2,589,300
Recreation Facilities	\$889,000
Sub-total:	\$4,685,800
2027 - 2032 Budget	
Neighborhood Parks	\$2,835,000
Community/Urban Parks	\$0
Recreation Facilities	\$1,916,420
Sub-total:	\$4,751,420
25-year Compliance Costs	\$1,575,000
TOTAL	\$27,822,500

The total cost for the 25-year Parks Master Plan was initially estimated to be \$118,951,250, requiring an SDC fee for single family residence of \$5,900. This is far more than the City will or can finance through SDC fees. The City adopted a reduced project list totaling \$27,822,500 by eliminating a standard for Special Use Areas and linear parks; eliminating 5 Neighborhood and 2 Community Parks; eliminating 5 Adult Baseball/softball fields, 2 Football fields, 9 Soccer Fields, and 1 Gymnasium; and by not including Community Centers, an Aquatic Center, and many proposed trails. These eliminated facilities may be developed using alternative funding sources or developed with an increase to current SDC rates.

The 25-year plan funds five new Neighborhood Parks, three utilizing existing park land. It also funds the completion of three existing and unfinished Neighborhood Parks. One additional new Neighborhood Park, Summerfield Park, is funded in the current budget, and should be constructed in the fall of 2006.

The plan also completes one existing Community Park, funds the development of one Community Park on existing park land, and funds the acquisition and development of two new Community Parks.

The following recreational facilities are funded by the 25-year plan:

- (18) Youth Baseball/Softball Fields (\$628,200)
- (8) Adult Softball Fields (\$1,006,200)
- (10) Soccer Fields (\$1,941,800)
- (2) Gymnasium Basketball Courts (\$1,500,000)
- 2.45 miles of trails (\$1,126,000)

Summary of Costs for SDC Eligible Growth Required & Deficiency Projects

Item	Cost
1) SDC Eligible Growth Cost	\$23,940,720
2) Park SDC Deficiency	\$3,881,780
TOTAL	\$27,822,500

As the City's population increases, new facilities must be built to maintain the City's current level of park, recreation and leisure services. Growth required facilities that were not built in the past become deficiency projects which can no longer be funded through park SDC funds. The 25-year cost of deficiency projects totals \$3,881,780, which, when spread out over a 25-year period, will require \$155,271 per year to complete. This is considered achievable anticipating grants, donations through the Parks and Recreation Foundation, volunteer efforts, as well as non-SDC funding sources both existing and proposed such as the Car Rental Tax, the Park Utility Fee, and a \$10,000,000 bond which is assumed in the park SDC methodology.

This Leisure Service plan contemplates all future park funding needs, both required and hoped for. It includes current maintenance and deferred maintenance from past funding shortfalls; replacement of aging facilities; upgrades needed to reduce maintenance costs; and new facilities expected of a vital and contemporary park system. The Parks and Recreation Department proposes a number of innovative funding strategies for the creation and maintenance of a park system the citizens of Medford have envisioned and need for their health and welfare.

7.9 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS IMPACTS



The City's current ('05-'06) parks maintenance budget is roughly \$1,868,000. Adding new park sites and facilities to the existing inventory will substantially increase maintenance costs. The projected cost for grounds and facilities maintenance will be analyzed prior to each specific project approval decision, with a staff summary report prepared. This will ensure that life-cycle operational costs of the proposed project are clearly stated as part of the park policy deliberations and that appropriate levels of maintenance are planned and budgeted.

Table 7.12 illustrates the expected cost of maintaining the proposed system listed for two different levels of maintenance.

**Table 7.7
Maintenance and Operations Impacts (Current & Proposed)**

Item	Acres or Size	Current Land Level A	Current Land Level B	25-Year Plan Increased Acres Level A	25-Year Plan Increased Acres Level B
Existing Active Acres	334.7	1,441,672	\$2,007,900	1,441,672	\$2,007,900
Existing Passive Acres	1,797.6	\$359,118	\$898,795	\$359,118	\$898,795
Proposed Active Acres	77.00	N.A.	N.A.	\$331,716	\$462,000
TOTAL		\$1,800,790	\$2,906,695	\$2,132,506	\$3,368,695

(1) Level A: Current level of maintenance \$4,308 per developed acre; estimated \$200 per acre for open space.

(2) Level B: Proposed level of maintenance \$6,000 per developed acre; estimated \$500 per acre for open space.

The projected maintenance and operating costs listed in Table 7.12 have been derived using existing data (maintenance costs per developed acre) and typical maintenance costs for similar facilities from other known communities.

To address the additional maintenance requirements, the City has imposed a utility tax to pay for the ongoing maintenance and operations of the City's right-of-way landscaped areas. This may be expanded to other parks sites in the future.

7.10 FUNDING SOURCES



The following are possible funding sources for acquiring, developing and maintaining parks and other recreational areas.

1. **General Fund:** This is one of the City's primary source for operating revenue. Most of this revenue comes from taxes levied on property. During the last fiscal year, the City appropriates approximately \$21 million from this source. In a typical year, the General Fund represents about 50% of the City's total operating budget.
2. **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-third's majority approval by the voters. Major disadvantages of this funding option are the high approval requirement and the high interest costs.
3. **Special Serial Levy** - This is a property tax assessed for the construction and/or operation of park facilities. This type of levy is established for a given rate for 3-5 years and requires a simple majority of voter approval. The advantage of this levy type is there are no interest charges.
4. **Revenue Bonds:** These bonds are sold and paid for from the revenue produced from the operation of a facility. The City currently does not have any recreational facilities funded through revenue bonds, but anticipates funding part of the Medford Sports Park in this manner.
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 Kiwanis, Lions, and Rotary Clubs, often fund small projects within the community (e.g. playground improvements).
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.
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. Lifetime Estates** - This is an agreement between a land owner where the City gives the owner the right to live on the site after it is sold.
- 9. System Development Charges (SDC) (also referred to as the Park Dedication Fund)** - SDC's are fees imposed on new development because of the impacts it has on the City's infrastructure. Since Park SDCs are paid by new residential development, the fees are meant to fund capacity enhancement park projects. The City of Medford regularly updates its SDC methodology and increases the SDC rate for all housing units.
- 10. Certificates of Participation** - This is a lease-purchase approach where the City sells Certificates of Participation (COPs) to a lending institution. The City then pays the loan off from revenue produced by the facility or from its general operating budget. The lending institution holds title to the property until the COPs are repaid. This procedure does not require a vote of the public.
- 11. Public/Government Grant Programs:**
 - 11a. HUD Community Development Block Grants (CDBG):** 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.
 - 11b. Oregon Parks & Rec. Grants:** These grants are available to local Oregon government agencies offering public outdoor park and recreation areas and facilities in keeping with the objectives contained in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. Ten percent of the grants are in the form of small \$50,000 grants, with the remaining funds for larger projects up to \$500,000.
 - 11c. 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 Oregon State Parks. 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.

11d. TEA3 (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act): Through the years, Oregon has received considerable revenue for trail-related projects. Originally called the *Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)*, this program funded a wide variety of transportation related projects. In 1998, the program was modified some and is now referred to as TEA21.

TEA3 is the third iteration of this transportation vision. Funding for this had been reauthorized by the Federal Government through FY 2004. These funds generally can be used for landscape and amenity improvements related to trail development. Applicants must provide matching contributions of at least 50 percent.

- 12. Exactions:** Costs of necessary public improvements can be passed onto the adjacent landowners.
- 13. 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. 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:

- 1. 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 Jackson County, School Districts, surrounding communities, and various other private groups.
- 2. Private Grants and Foundations:** Private grants and foundations provide money for a wide range of projects. They are sometimes difficult to find and equally difficult to secure because of the open competition. They usually fund unique projects or ones of extreme need.