

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

Bill No. 2016-16

Authorize Bond Reallocation

SPONSOR(S): Councilors Maestas, Trujillo and Dominguez

SUMMARY: The proposed bill would authorize the reallocation of 2012 GO bonds from their designated parks to other needs around the City. Funds would be taken from parks in which priorities have changed, and reallocated to other projects with high maintenance needs.

PREPARED BY: Jesse Guillen, Legislative Liaison

FISCAL IMPACT: No

DATE: March 22, 2016

ATTACHMENTS: Memo
Spreadsheet
Bill
FIR

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

TO: Public Works Committee (March 7, 2016)
Finance Committee (March 14, 2016)
City Council

FROM: Rob Carter, Parks and Recreation Department Director 

DATE: February 15, 2016

RE: 2012 Parks Bond Recommendations

SUMMARY:

When the 2012 Parks Bond was approved for \$8,000,000, a plan was submitted that included all the projects that were to be completed from this funding for Parks Improvements and Additional Parks. Some of these projects have been completed as of this date, but others were in progress or waiting to be started in May 2015. Projects were put on hold due to the removal of local crews from providing some of the improvements.

ISSUE:

After research by the Parks and Recreation Department staff and with input from PARC, there appeared to have been some projects that could be withdrawn from the funding due to a number of different reasons (ENN's, Historical Review, not enough funding, no interest in going further on specific project), thereby utilizing the funding for more pressing issues that were planned on the 2012 Parks Bond. The Parks that were identified to remove from the funding list are:

Cross of the Martyrs	\$ 15,035.44
Thomas Macione	\$ 8,063.79
GCCC Park	\$ 48,573.45
Escondido	\$ 13,976.26
Monica Lucero	\$ 43,660.14
Las Acequias Phase IV	<u>\$155,610.95</u>
Total:	\$284,926.03

Cross of the Martyrs- Erosion Control: due to historical regulations, we are unable to do any digging or construction within this park, so as not to disturb historical relics. No alternatives were possible for this project.

Thomas Macione- Drinking Fountain: it was decided by Parks Division staff and PARC members that a drinking fountain was no longer needed for this park.

GCCC Park- Prairie Dog Control Fence: this was to be buried in the ground to prevent Prairie Dogs from building tunnels in the park. This problem is no longer a problem and can be much more expensive than originally estimated.

Escondido- Improve existing drainage and add park furniture: after speaking to neighbors and inspecting the area, it was felt that this small pocket park had a decent drainage system and that the park was not highly used except after dark. The plan would be to continue to mow the area and to remove old concrete picnic tables.

Monica Lucero- Install large shade structure: it has been determined that there is already a medium shade structure in this park and there is no need for an additional one.

Las Acequias Phase IV- Develop a large open turf area: it was felt through ENN that the community did not want an additional park area, but to have improvements done to the existing park.

(attached please find a spreadsheet for the present bond allocation and balances)
The difference on the non-closed items (spreadsheet) is due to salary expenses paid to the Project Administrator for ENN's, advertising, and salary/benefits.

A portion of this reallocation would be transferred or added to the existing budgets for the following parks for completion of planned improvements:

Patrick Smith Park- Replace irrigation, level, grade, and reseed turf areas, and install security cameras- \$79,854.00

Las Acequias Park- Improve/replace pathway, add solar lighting, add playground equipment, and add 2- picnic tables- \$155,611.00

Monica Lucero Park- Improve irrigation system- \$11,000.00

La Resolana Park- Arroyo stabilization- \$120,350.00

Herb Martinez Park- Resurface basketball courts- \$5,000.00

Reflection of Change in Scope of Work with Reallocation

Patrick Smith Park-	Remaining Budget:	\$ 62,919.00
	Reallocation:	<u>\$ 16,935.00</u>
	New Total:	\$ 79,854.00
Las Acequias Park-	Budget for Phase IV:	\$155,610.95
	Reallocation to Phase III:	<u>\$155,610.95</u>
	New Total for Phase IV:	\$0
Monica Lucero Park-	Budget:	\$ 54,660.14
	Reallocation:	<u>\$ 11,000.00</u>
	Reallocate to other Parks:	\$ 43,660.14
La Resolana Park:	Budget:	\$ 91,584.42
	Reallocation:	<u>\$ 28,765.58</u>
	New Total:	\$120,350.00
Herb Martinez Park:	Budget:	\$ 0
	Reallocation:	<u>\$ 5,000.00</u>
	New Total:	\$ 5,000.00

All other projects planned for the 2012 Park Bond that would continue as planned would include:

- Water History Park
- Salvador Perez Park
- Dancing Ground Phase II
- GCCC Skatepark
- Arroya Sonrisa Park

There still could be some money left over from the Parks bonds once all construction is completed. Once the final amount is calculated, I would plan to bring recommendations for additional park improvements from the remaining amount, back to the City Council for approval.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve as presented.

2012 Parks Bond	Bond Allocation	Over Budget	Under	Remaining Budget	Closed Projects
GCCC Park	\$54,605.00			\$48,573.45	
Adam Armijo	\$19,589.00	-\$7,141.30			closed
Cross of the Marytrs Park	\$17,474.00			\$15,035.44	
W. De Vargas Park	\$136,513.00		\$266.02	\$266.02	closed
Franklin Miles Park	\$163,815.00	-\$427.19			closed
Herb Martinez Park	\$32,763.00	-\$950.97			closed
John F. Griego	\$111,394.00		\$3,897.20	\$3,897.20	closed
Las Acequias	\$163,815.00			\$155,610.95	
Los Milagros	\$80,410.00		\$4,506.83	\$4,506.83	closed
Monica Lucero Park	\$60,066.00			\$54,660.14	
Patrick Smith Park	\$160,539.00			\$62,919.31	
Ragle Park	\$611,576.00		\$1,467.14	\$1,467.14	closed
Thomas Macaione Park	\$8,737.00			\$8,063.79	
Trail Head Cameras	\$19,658.00	-\$4,622.93			closed
Colonial Prisma	\$273,025.00		\$203.46	\$203.46	closed
Los Hermanos Rodriguez	\$21,842.00		\$2,607.36	\$2,607.36	closed
La Resolana	\$98,288.00			\$91,584.42	
Rancho Siringo 1	\$163,815.00	-\$1,098.07			closed
Escondido Park	\$21,842.00			\$13,976.26	
Arroyo Sonrisa	\$19,658.00			\$17,709.81	
Over Budget				-\$14,240.46	
Total	\$2,239,424.00	-\$14,240.46		\$466,841.12	

1 **CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO**

2 **BILL NO. 2016-16**

3 **INTRODUCED BY:**

4
5 Councilor Joseph M. Maestas

6 Councilor Ronald S. Trujillo

7 Councilor Carmichael A. Dominguez

8
9
10 **AN ORDINANCE**

11 **AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2012 GENERAL OBLIGATION (GO) BOND**
12 **PARKS AND TRAILS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO REALLOCATE \$311,354**
13 **CURRENTLY DESIGNATED FOR VARIOUS CITY PARK IMPROVEMENTS TO**
14 **OTHER CITY PARKS WITH HIGH MAINTENANCE NEEDS.**

15
16 **BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE:**

17 **Section 1. Authority**

18 A. Section 11-9.1(E) SFCC 1987 requires that any reallocation of proceeds from a
19 voter-approved general obligation bond that deviates materially from the information provided to
20 the electorate by the city of Santa Fe shall be voted upon by the governing body through the
21 adoption of an ordinance.

22 B. The governing body, through the adoption of this ordinance, authorizes the
23 reallocation of funds from the 2012 parks bond as specified in Section 3 of this ordinance.

24 **Section 2. Legislative Findings**

25 A. The 2012 Parks Bond was approved by voters in the amount of \$8,000,000 on

1 March 6, 2012.

2 B. Many of the projects that were to be funded have been completed. Others
3 projects are in progress, or are waiting to be started.

4 C. A reallocation of bond funds is requested because of changes in priorities and
5 needs for the affected city parks.

6 **Section 3. Reallocation**

7 A. The parks and recreation department shall remove the following parks from the
8 current funding list:

9	(1)	Cross of the Martyrs	\$ 15,035.44
10	(2)	Thomas Macione Park	\$ 8,063.79
11	(3)	GCCC Park	\$ 48,573.45
12	(4)	Escondido Park	\$ 13,976.26
13	(5)	Monica Lucero Park	\$ 54,660.14
14	(6)	Las Acequias Phase IV Park	<u>\$155,610.95</u>
15			\$295,926.03

16 B. The funds specified above shall be reallocated or added to existing funding for
17 improvements and additions as follows:

18	(1)	Patrick Smith Park	\$ 16,935.00
19		Replace irrigation, reseed turf areas, and install security cameras.	
20	(2)	Las Acequias Park	\$155,610.95
21		Improve/replace the pathway, add solar bollard lighting, add playground	
22		equipment, and add two (2) picnic tables.	
23	(3)	Monica Lucero Park	\$ 11,000.00
24		Improve the irrigation system.	
25	(4)	La Resolana Park	\$ 28,765.58

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Arroyo stabilization.

(5) Herb Martinez Park \$ 5,000.00

Resurface basketball courts. _____

\$217,311.53

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



KELLEY A. BRENNAN, CITY ATTORNEY

X Check here if no fiscal impact

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Expenditure Classification	FY _____	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

Personnel*	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Fringe**	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital Outlay	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Land/ Building	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Professional Services	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
All Other Operating Costs	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total:	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

* Any indication that additional staffing would be required must be reviewed and approved in advance by the City Manager by attached memo before release of FIR to committees. **For fringe benefits contact the Finance Dept.

2. Revenue Sources:

- a. To indicate new revenues and/or
- b. Required for costs for which new expenditure budget is proposed above in item 1.

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Type of Revenue	FY _____	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Total:	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____

3. Expenditure/Revenue Narrative:

Explain revenue source(s). Include revenue calculations, grant(s) available, anticipated date of receipt of revenues/grants, etc. Explain expenditures, grant match(s), justify personnel increase(s), detail capital and operating uses, etc. (Attach supplemental page, if necessary.)

As a reallocation, no additional funding is required from the City.

=====

Section D. General Narrative

1. Conflicts: Does this proposed bill/resolution duplicate/conflict with/companion to/relate to any City code, approved ordinance or resolution, other adopted policies or proposed legislation? Include details of city adopted laws/ordinance/resolutions and dates. Summarize the relationships, conflicts or overlaps.

This bill is pursuant to Ordinance #2015-24 that requires the adoption of an ordinance by the Governing Body to authorize the reallocation of bond funds approved by the voters.

2. Consequences of Not Enacting This Bill/Resolution:

Are there consequences of not enacting this bill/resolution? If so, describe.

Funding for unneeded or unwanted park improvements will remain, while those improvements deemed more important will not have the required funding to complete.

3. Technical Issues:

Are there incorrect citations of law, drafting errors or other problems? Are there any amendments that should be considered? Are there any other alternatives which should be considered? If so, describe.

None identified.

4. Community Impact:

Briefly describe the major positive or negative effects the Bill/Resolution might have on the community including, but not limited to, businesses, neighborhoods, families, children and youth, social service providers and other institutions such as schools, churches, etc.

By adopting this bill, the public will have assurances that the funds they approved through the 2012 GO Bond will be spent in the way they approved. Funding will be moved from projects that neighborhoods do not need or want, to those that have more tangible value to the public.