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April 24, 2014
Presentation Items

• Project background
• Water quality and recreation maps
• Conservation Finance Options report with Q&A
• Action Planning, Part II
Project Background
The Lake Worth Greenprint

Objectives

1. Develop a long-term vision for a Lake Worth open space network, and involve stakeholders in the decision-making process.

2. Build upon plans already complete or underway, e.g. trail alignment study for Lake Worth, Lake Worth Vision Plan, and the Lake Worth CIIP.

3. Identify lands most important for lake water quality, as well as other related community driven open space/conservation goals.

4. Help the city and stakeholders evaluate the relative importance of undeveloped land in the watershed.

5. Evaluate tools that can be used to protect Lake Worth’s water quality.

6. Provide education about voluntary conservation easements (CEs) and their tax advantages to potential partners to make CE opportunities more widely understood and employed where appropriate.
Greenprinting Process

Current Conditions Analysis

Goal Setting & Public Engagement

Economic Benefit Study

GIS Data Collection & Mapping

Conservation Finance Resource Options Report

Action Planning / Recommendations

Communications Strategy
Mapping Results
Lake Worth Greenprint - High Priority Water Quality Zones

Relative Weighting by Function

Nutrient uptake
- Riparian vegetation 20%
- Wetlands 13%
Erosion prevention
- Steep Stream banks 11%
- Erodible Soils 11%
- Steep slopes 11%

Multiple Benefits
- Canopy Cover 15%
- Native Vegetation 4%
- Floodplains and Buffers 15%
Stewardship Opportunities

Stewardship Opportunities for Agricultural Land Uses

Stewardship Opportunities Existing and Future Development
Relative Weighting based on Outdoor Recreation Preferences Survey
June 2013

- Gaps in Pedestrian-Accessible Lakeshore: 14%
- Fitness Zone Priority Neighborhoods: 14%
- Wildlife Viewing: 12%
- Opportunities for Shoreline Fishing: 12%
- Scenic Views from Lake Worth Parks: 12%
- Suitable Locations for Camping: 9%
- Recreation Opportunities Close to Lake Worth: 8%
- Opportunities for Lakeshore Non-Motorized Boat Access: 7%
- Gaps in Lakeshore Motorized Boat Access: 7%
- Planned Parking Improvements: 2%
- Planned Playground Improvements: 2%
### Connectivity Needs and Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity Needs (40%)</th>
<th>Connectivity Opportunities (60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>Existing parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned developments</td>
<td>Vacant lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Children under age of 19</td>
<td>Undeveloped riparian corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Low income households</td>
<td>Floodplains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to schools</td>
<td>East / west road corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to residential areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to places of worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connectivity Needs**

- [Image of Connectivity Needs map]

**Connectivity Opportunities**

- [Image of Connectivity Opportunities map]
Conservation Finance Resource Options
• **15+ years of experience** in developing, passing, and implementing funding measures for parks and conservation.

• **82 percent success rate** in passing 400+ ballot measures generating $35 billion for parks and conservation around the country.

• **Nation’s foremost experts** on how local and state governments finance parks and conservation.

• **Research capability** to develop and analyze data on funding options, economic benefits, and fiscal impacts.
Finance Options for Lake Worth

- Model programs
- Other communities
- Local finance options
- State funding programs
- Federal conservation funding
Finance Resource Options

- A funding quilt is the diverse set of reliable, long-term funding sources that come together to achieve land conservation objectives.
- Local, state, federal and private sources of funding all have a role.
- Every funding quilt is unique and evolves over time due to changing fiscal and political fortunes.
Sources of Public Land Conservation Spending 1998 - 2008

- Federal: 40%
- Local: 41%
- State: 19%

[Diagram showing the distribution of funding sources]
Texas Funding Quilt

Sources of Public Land Conservation Spending 1998 - 2008

- 62% Local
- 35% State
- 3% Federal

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND
LAND FOR PEOPLE
Why Local Funding is Essential

• Local funding is the foundation of any long-term land conservation efforts, including those to protect drinking water sources.

• External funding – federal, state, private—can be an important, but secondary, means of completing a land conservation project.

• Competition for external funding is fierce and may not be reliable due to ever-changing state and federal budget circumstances.

• Provides a ready match to leverage other sources.
Local Texas Conservation Success

- 1996 - 2013
- 99 local government measures
- 89 passed (90% success rate)
- Over $1 billion
Key Questions in Approaching Conservation Finance

- Jurisdiction
- Funding Mechanisms
- Amount (and duration)
- Voter Support/Tax Tolerance
- Purposes/Uses of Funds
- Timing (choice of election date)
- Management/Accountability
- Opposition
Watershed Jurisdictions Considered

- City of Fort Worth
- City of Lake Worth
- Town of Lakeside
Funding Mechanisms

Local Public Finance Options in Texas for Watershed Protection & Parks

- Bonds (90 of the 99 measures)
- Sales Tax (9 measures)
- Property Tax
- Parkland Dedication / In-Lieu Fees
- User Fees / Utility Rates
- Oil & Gas Lease Revenue
- Tax Increment Financing
Bonds

- Most common source of conservation funding
- Can be used for watershed acquisition now, while land is still available
- Majority voter approval required
- Costs are spread out over a long time horizon
- Bond proceeds may not be expended for maintenance and operations
- Interest increases the total cost.
## Potential Bond Issue

### Fort Worth Bond Financing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Servce</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>$2,407,278</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>$4,012,129</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>$5,618,981</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>$8,024,259</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>$12,036,388</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.
2014 Net Taxable Value = $414,423,851,142

**Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $95,559.**

### Lake Worth Bond Financing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Servce</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$80,243</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>$160,485</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>$240,728</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$401,213</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>$561,698</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.
2014 Net Taxable Value = $348,042,641

**Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $57,054.**

### Lakeside Bond Financing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Servce</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$8,024</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$16,049</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$24,073</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$40,121</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$80,243</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.
2014 Net Taxable Value = $100,200,066

**Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $154,832.**

---

**The Trust for Public Land**

**Land for People**
Sales Tax

• Majority voter approval required

• Can be used both for acquisition and maintenance purposes

• Sales tax revenues can fluctuate with changing economic conditions.

• Not widely used for open space funding

• Each of the municipalities in the study area is currently at the maximum allowable sales tax levy
Economic Development Corporation

- Lake Worth and Lakeside each have an EDC
- Funded by sales tax revenue
- Can fund projects such as parks, museums, sports facilities and the development of water supply facilities or water conservation programs
Property Tax

- Can be used both for acquisition and maintenance purposes
- Funding level may be altered or eliminated based on annual budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Current M &amp; O Rate</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity</th>
<th>Maximum @ $20/Avg Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>0.6759</td>
<td>0.1241</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>0.14804</td>
<td>0.65196</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>0.37926</td>
<td>0.42074</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Revenue Options

- Parkland Dedication / In-Lieu Fees
- User Fees / Utility Rates
- Oil & Gas Lease Revenue
- Tax Increment Financing
- State Conservation Programs
- Federal Funding
Voter Support of Conservation Purposes

- Drinking Water: 89%
- Water Quality/Rivers/Streams: 87%
- Natural Lands/Areas: 84%
- Wildlife: 84%
- Preserve Historic Lands: 78%
- Public Access (water): 75%
- Farms/Ranchland: 75%
- Park Improvement (General): 74%
- Scenic Views: 72%
- Open Space: 71%
- Acquisition of Specifically Named Parcel/Area: 69%
- Bike, hike, walk, ride trails: 69%
- Land for Parks/Brownfield Redevelopment: 61%
Action Planning: From Brainstorming to Feasibility

- Indicate the 10 best ideas.
- Indicate the 10 worst ideas.
Action Planning: From Brainstorming to Feasibility

• For 3-5 best ideas, please write in the margins:
  – Who will do it?
  – How can it be done (orchestrated and paid for)?
  – When can it be completed?
• Add any new ideas (to back).