

**Attachment A**  
**Revised and Expanded Work Program**  
**Western Nevada County**  
**Park and Recreation District Consolidation Feasibility Study**

---

Western Nevada County is served by 3 separate park and recreation districts: Bear River, Western Gateway, and Oak Tree. The unincorporated areas surrounding the Cities of Nevada City and Grass Valley are not served by an independent park and recreation district, with the cities acting as the de facto park and recreation service provider. As part of an effort to evaluate and identify strategies to improve park and recreation facilities and services in Nevada County (County), County staff engaged Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) to prepare a feasibility study evaluating the potential consolidation of park and recreation districts in the western portion of the County. The purpose of the consolidation feasibility study was to determine if consolidation was feasible with consideration to potential cost efficiencies and service delivery enhancements or impacts.

As part of the consolidation feasibility study efforts, EPS has met with staff of the County, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), and each park and recreation district to discuss and identify issues related to park and recreation service provision in the western portion of the County and to establish policy objectives for the District Consolidation Study. EPS also interviewed key representatives of each park district, as well as representatives of the Cities of Nevada City and Grass Valley, to understand each organization's operational structure, service delivery, and any constraints on service delivery.

Following these interviews and other technical efforts, EPS and County staff convened a community stakeholder meeting to provide an overview of the study process and key decision points and to solicit community input regarding parks and recreation facilities, amenities, and services in the County. Based on the outcomes of that community meeting, conversations with County staff, policymakers, as well as other key stakeholders, County staff indicated interest in revising the proposed work program. Initial findings indicated that full consolidation presents many challenges and, without substantially improved revenue potential, would not be likely to effect the desired service and facility delivery enhancements.

Therefore, EPS has provided a revised work program describing the remaining work efforts adjusted with consideration to initial outcomes. The work program includes a revised budget proposal reflecting unused budget allocation and additional resources needed to complete the revised work program.

As described further below, the revised work program offers a shift from a singular focus on the feasibility of consolidation to a broader evaluation of alternative governance scenarios. This work program also acknowledges the importance of the role the Cities of Nevada City and Grass Valley play in parks and recreation facility and service provision to unincorporated County residents and reflects the need to integrate those jurisdictions as part of the approach to improving park and recreation service delivery in the western portion of the County.

## Proposed Remaining Scope of Work

Leveraging work and research conducted to date, EPS will evaluate the viability of alternative governance structures for park and recreation service provision. This evaluation is expected to include the following elements:

- **Baseline Description.** EPS will offer a synopsis of the current parks and recreation service provision approach in the western portion of the County, focusing on key conclusions and issues regarding service provision. This synopsis will include the existing funding mechanisms and resources available to the individual park districts, which will assist in identifying order-of-magnitude estimates for funding needed to resolve existing service provision deficiencies.
- **Definition of Alternative Governance Structures and Case Study Examples.** EPS will summarize key elements, as well as the pros and cons, of up to 4 alternative governance structures. EPS will define the alternative governance structures based on case study research of similarly situated locales and how parks and recreation services are addressed. This case study research may include up to 3 phone interviews with representatives of selected jurisdictions. Informed by the case study research, EPS will work with County staff and other stakeholders to define the alternative governance structures suitable for evaluation. EPS anticipates the analysis will include the following governance structures:
  - District Consolidation or Partial Consolidation
  - District Reorganization (e.g., expansion or other adjustment of existing boundaries)
  - Joint Powers Authority
  - Park and Recreation Committee/Commission

EPS will prepare a brief description of each governance structure alternative and will include corresponding case study examples, as described above, for circulation to County and LAFCO staff, as well as policymakers and key stakeholders, to confirm the study direction. Subject to County input, park and recreation stakeholders may include the following organizations and entities:

- Western Gateway Park and Recreation District
- Bear River Park and Recreation District
- Oak Tree Park and Recreation District
- City of Grass Valley
- City of Nevada City
- Bear Yuba Land Trust
- Nevada Irrigation District

- League of Women Voters
- Various Youth Sports Leagues and Other Recreation Organizations

EPS anticipates that County staff will lead the outreach to these and other park and recreation stakeholders, as appropriate, soliciting input regarding the scope of alternative governance structures evaluated and relaying feedback and direction to EPS. To the extent that community input and feedback requires significant redirection or expansion of EPS's efforts, EPS may require additional budgetary resources.

- **Evaluate Alternative Governance Structures.** Based on the determinations above, EPS will evaluate each alternative governance structure. For each alternative, EPS anticipates offering the following information:
  - Description of alternative and potential change from the baseline condition in the western portion of the County.
  - Proposed structure of service provision change—i.e., would it apply to recreation facilities, services, or both?
  - Consideration of pros and cons with regard to parks and recreation service provision.
  - Consideration of role of other entities that could influence recreation services (e.g., Bear Yuba Land Trust, Nevada Irrigation District).
  - Funding mechanisms available to augment parks and recreation services or facilities, and attendant prospects and processes to implement each mechanism identified (e.g., sales tax, parcel tax, etc.). Where possible, this evaluation will include a rough order-of-magnitude estimate of revenue potential relative to anticipated funding needs.
  - Management and governance framework.
  - Process and timeframe considerations.
  - Examples of other jurisdictions employing model.

This evaluation will include a meeting with County LAFCO representative to validate initial findings and confirm process and timeframe considerations.

EPS will synthesize the results of the above analytical elements into a PowerPoint format for purposes of presentation to community stakeholders. EPS will prepare presentation materials for and will participate in a community meeting to present the findings of the analysis and solicit input from stakeholders.

Following the community meeting, and with consideration to community input received, EPS will prepare a draft report documenting the analysis outcomes for County staff review. The report will establish options and alternatives for consideration and will document key funding sources needed, process considerations, and other elements pertinent to determining a path forward. It is important to note that this work program does not anticipate that this report will establish a recommended course of action; rather, it will provide a framework for policymaker consideration and future decision making.

It is also important to note that this Scope of Work does not anticipate significant analysis changes or edits as a result of the community meeting. If significant changes or additional analysis are required, EPS may require additional budget resources.

Upon receipt of comments from County staff, EPS will prepare a final report for consideration by the County Board of Supervisors. EPS will prepare presentation materials and will be available to attend one County Board of Supervisors' hearing.

## Schedule

EPS understands the County intends to present the final report to the County Board of Supervisors on October 22, 2019. To meet this timeline, EPS proposes the following project schedule for key deliverables and presentations:

- **Prepare and deliver stakeholder presentation—mid-August.** EPS will review draft presentation materials with the County, then deliver a stakeholder presentation in mid-August.
- **Prepare draft report for County review—late August to early September.** EPS will prepare a draft report and submit it to the County for review in late August or early September.
- **Prepare final report and deliver to County Board of Supervisors—October.** Based on the County's comments on the draft report, EPS will prepare and deliver a final report to the County in early October. EPS will present the findings and observations of the final report to the County Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, October 22, 2019.

## Budget

EPS has a remaining budget allocation of approximately \$6,000. EPS anticipates completion of the above-described work effort will require a budget of approximately \$27,500. EPS therefore requests a budget extension of **\$21,500** to complete this work program. This budget is based on the assumption of 2 report iterations and EPS's attendance at 1 community workshop and 1 Board of Supervisors' meeting.

EPS charges for its services on a direct-cost (hourly billing rates plus direct expenses), not-to-exceed basis; therefore, you will be billed only for the work completed up to the authorized budget amount. Travel, data, or reproduction expenses will be billed at cost, and invoices are submitted monthly and are payable on receipt. If additional work or meetings are required, EPS will request authorization for additional budget with the understanding that terms will be negotiated in good faith.