

# Memo

**To:** Members, Board of Supervisors  
**From:** Rich Gordon~~  
**Date:** 9/6/2004  
**Re:** Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force Final Report

---

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt the final report of the Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force.

The Board may also choose to begin implementation of the report by taking the first steps to form the Park and Recreation District described in the report. In order to implement the report, the Board would need to allocate funds for a fiscal study and preparation of materials to place the issue of District formation and fee assessment on the ballot. The cost of this action has been estimated at \$50,000. The Board could allocate funds in total or issue a matching challenge to the Parks Foundation and the community by agreeing to provide a portion of the \$50,000 if the balance can be raised from other sources.

## **BACKGROUND:**

In October 2002, the Environmental Services Agency presented to the Board of Supervisors for its acceptance a Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment that outlined a series of types of parks, facilities, and programs that might be contained in a park system designed to serve the local residents much as a city park system would do. The Assessment described the types of parks and facilities needed to serve current residents and additional facilities that would be needed to serve residents as additional housing is built. The area studied included the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, Miramar, El Granada, and Princeton.

The Assessment was based on the results of a random telephone poll and a series of public meetings and stakeholder interviews. The options for a level of development were defined, two of which related to the number of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The Board of Supervisors accepted the midcoast park and recreation needs assessment and authorized the establishment of a development fee for park and recreation purposes. The fee is \$1.17 per square foot and collection of the fee began on March 31, 2003. Through the end of July 2004, \$150,000 has been collected.

The Board of Supervisors also authorized Supervisor Richard Gordon to form a Task Force to develop an implementation strategy for the needs assessment. The Task Force was asked to address several

- issues: park acreage standards per 1,000 residents; priorities for acquisition and development; possible location of facilities; how to finance the system; and how to govern the system.

Supervisor Gordon invited Toni Taylor (Half Moon Bay City Council), Dwight Wilson (Cabrillo Unified School District), Bern Smith (San Mateo County Park and Recreation Commission), and Sandy Emerson (Midcoast Community Council) to serve on the Task Force. Mary Bums (Director of San Mateo County Parks Division), Rollie Wright (Half Moon Bay Park and Recreation Director), and Deborah Hirst (Legislative Aide to Supervisor Richard Gordon) provided staff support to the Task Force.

The Task Force met on 11 occasions from January 2003 to September 2003. The meetings of the Task Force were open to the public and public comment periods were provided at each meeting.

The Task Force identified priority sites for specific park and recreation developments. The Task Force developed an estimate for the costs of developing each of these sites and an estimate for annual operation and maintenance costs. The Task Force also explored various governance models and is recommending the establishment of a Park and Recreation District with funding to be provided via a local tax. The District would also have the authority to charge fees and to seek grants and other funding sources.

The final report of the Task Force was circulated to the Half Moon Bay City Council, the Cabrillo Unified School District Board, the Midcoast Community Council, and the San Mateo County Park and Recreation Commission. It was unanimously endorsed by each of these bodies.

The report was not previously presented to the Board of Supervisors as any action toward implementation of the report would require an expenditure of funds which seemed a challenge given the budget constraints faced by County government. The Task Force was re-convened on August 9, 2004 to discuss this situation. The Task Force requested that the final report be presented to the Board of Supervisors. The Board would then be able to consider the implications of the report in light of other developments regarding park and recreation services on the Midcoast and in light of final budget considerations for 2004/05.

#### **INTERVENING DEVELOPMENTS:**

There continues to be a strong desire for park and recreation services on the Midcoast.

The El Granada Sanitary District has taken the first steps to become a Community Service District. This would allow them to provide park and recreation services in addition to their current responsibilities. It is anticipated that if the El Granada Community Service District is formed that it would work closely with the private nonprofit entity, Midcoast Parklands, which manages Quarry Park for the Joint Powers Authority composed of the County of San Mateo and the Cabrillo Unified School District. The Local Agency Formation Commission is expected to consider within the next several months the request of the El Granada Sanitary District to expand services.

A private nonprofit group, Coastside Preservation and Recreation, Inc., has secured land on Etheldore between Virginia and Vermont in Moss Beach. This land for Moss Beach Park was donated by a long-time Moss Beach resident with the stipulation that the land be used in perpetuity as a public park. Coastside Preservation and Recreation has \$75,358 (as of August 24, 2004) and will be building the first phase of a community park with a major volunteer effort between September 29, 2004 and Sunday, October 3, 2004. Moss Beach Park has indicated that they would like to be considered for a grant of funds from the development fee. It is likely that they will make a specific request in the very near future. County Counsel has indicated that the development fee could be spent on a private entity under specific conditions. Allocating development fee funds to Moss Beach Park would be a major policy decision as there are other groups who would be expected to request these funds and the

Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force reports envisions using the development fees to match local taxes collected by the proposed Park and Recreation District.

The Montara Water and Sanitary District has indicated that they might be interested at some future point in using their powers for park and recreation purposes. The District is presently heavily involved in the requirements of assuming full responsibility for water services and does not appear to realistically have capacity at current to expand services. Any service expansion would most likely be at quite some distance in the future.

Meanwhile, Supervisors Hill and Nevin have been working with a Task Force looking at the formation of a county-wide mechanism for raising funds to support park and recreation services. One possible vehicle is the creation of a county-wide park district. Numerous questions have been raised about how this would be accomplished and it appears that it is necessary to secure special legislation as one issue is the possible overlap of park and open space districts. A Midcoast Park and Recreation District might add another layer of complexity to the formation of a county-wide park district.

It is not immediately clear how these various developments interface with the strong conviction of the Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force that there should be a locally controlled and funded park and recreation district for the entire unincorporated Midcoast.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

The Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force requests that the Board of Supervisors adopt the final report of the Task Force. Such an action would signal that the County of San Mateo supports the conclusions of the Task Force and is supportive in concept of the locations and services proposed for a new Park and Recreation District.

Further, the Task Force requests that the Board of Supervisors initiate the process of district formation by allocating \$50,000 for the studies and reports required to move this matter to the ballot. The Board could fund this full amount or issue a challenge to the community and the San Mateo County Parks Foundation to raise a designated matching amount.

The Board could also request further consideration by staff of the relationship of this effort to the various intervening developments (El Granada Sanitary, Montara Water and Sanitary, Moss Beach Park, and a county-wide park district with assessment). This matter could also be forwarded to LAFCO for consideration of how best to meet the park and recreation needs of the Midcoast.

It has been some time since the initial polling on the strength of support for park and recreation services on the Midcoast. The Board could also seek to find a way to measure community support prior to the expenditure of funds.

**VISION ALIGNMENT:**

The recommendations of the Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force align with the County's Shared Vision 2010 goal to preserve and provide people access to our natural environment (#13, #14, and #15). The recommendations give the County an opportunity to continue working responsibly, effectively, and collaboratively with local government to develop strategic approaches to issues affecting the County (Vision Statements #20 and #22). The initiation of the process to form a new Park and Recreation District to elect local representatives and raise local funds on the coast aligns with Vision Statements #23, #24, and #25 in working across boundaries to preserve and enhance the quality of life and to invite residents to accept individual responsibility for contributing to that quality of life.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The impact of moving forward with implementation of the Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force recommendation could be as high as \$50,000 depending on how the Board structured such an expenditure. It would appear that the only source of funds would be County general fund reserves. County Counsel has provided an opinion that the Development Fee could not be used for the purpose of attempting to form a Midcoast Park and Recreation District.

Attachment: Final Report

# Memo

To: .Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force  
From: Rich Gordon  
Date: 10/23/2003  
Re: Distribution of Final Report

---

I received no requests for modification of the final draft of the report of the Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force; Therefore, enclosed you will find copies of the now final version of the report.

There is one change. You will note that the proposed district is now called a "Park and Recreation District". I was advised by County Counsel that even though state law identifies these entities as "Recreation and Park Districts", we do not have to use that name. Recalling comments at our last meeting, I made the editorial change for the name of the district.

As was agreed, each of you now needs to present the report for comment to your respective elective and appointed bodies. I would request that you notify Deborah Hirst in my office when these presentations are agendaized. We will use our e-mail list to notify everyone of the schedule of presentations. Once all of the groups have commented on the report, I will schedule it for presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

County Counsel has indicated that it would be possible to have an election which gave voters options on fund level. There are some technical issues related to this, but we can discuss those at a future time. It may also be possible in some very limited ways to use some of the development fee to support the creation of the district. Again, we can discuss this once the report has been reviewed by all of the bodies.

Thank you for your efforts to date and for your willingness to carry this report back to your organization.

# **Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force**

## **Final Report**

**October 2003**

### **INTRODUCTION:**

A Task Force convened under the direction of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors has spent the past nine months, studying issues related to the needs for parks and recreation activities on the midcoast. This is the final report of the Task Force.

The Task Force recommends that a Midcoast Park and Recreation District be formed with funding from a local tax mechanism. Action by the Board of Supervisors to authorize the required study for a tax mechanism and to initiate the formation of such a district would be the necessary next steps.

This report is being circulated to the Half Moon Bay City Council, the Cabrillo Unified School District Board of Trustees, the San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Midcoast Community Council for comments. Those comments will be attached to this report prior to submission of the report to the Board of Supervisors.

### **BACKGROUND:**

In October 2002, the Environmental Services Agency presented to the Board of Supervisors for its acceptance a Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment that outlined a series of types of parks, facilities, and programs that might be contained in a park system designed to serve the local residents much as a city park system would do. The Assessment described the types of parks and facilities needed to serve current residents and additional facilities that would be needed to serve residents as additional housing is built. The area studied included the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, Miramar, El Granada, and Princeton.

The Assessment was based on the results of a random telephone poll and a series of public meetings and stakeholder interviews. The options for a level of development were defined, two of which related to the number of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The Board of Supervisors accepted the midcoast park and recreation needs assessment and authorized the establishment of a development fee for park and recreation purposes. The fee is \$1.17 per square foot and collection of the fee began on March 31, 2003. Through the end of August 2003, nearly \$25,000 has been collected.

The Board of Supervisors also authorized Supervisor Richard Gordon to form a Task Force to develop an implementation strategy for the needs assessment. The Task Force was asked to address several issues: park acreage standards per 1,000 residents; priorities for acquisition and development; possible location of facilities; how to finance the system; and how to govern the system.

Supervisor Gordon invited Toni Taylor (Half Moon Bay City Council), Dwight Wilson (Cabrillo Unified School District), Bern Smith (San Mateo County Park and Recreation Commission), and Sandy Emerson (Midcoast Community Council) to serve on the Task Force. Mary Bums (Director of San Mateo County Parks Division), Rollie Wright (Half Moon Bay Park and Recreation Director), and Deborah Hirst (Legislative Aide to Supervisor Richard Gordon) provided staff support to the Task Force.

The Task Force met on 11 occasions from January 2003 to September 2003. The meetings of the Task Force were open to the public and public comment periods were provided at each meeting.

The Task Force identified priority sites for specific park and recreation developments. The Task Force developed an estimate for the costs of developing each of these sites and an estimate for annual operation and maintenance costs. The Task Force also explored various governance models and is recommending the establishment of a Park and Recreation District with funding to be provided via a local tax. The District would also have the authority to charge fees and to seek grants and other funding sources.

#### **PRIORITY SITES:**

The Task Force began by reviewing the Needs Assessment Report and worked to link the needs identified in the report to possible sites and locations. The Task Force identified the following types of activities as having the highest need:

- Playing fields with an emphasis on soccer fields
- Mini-parks with a neighborhood location
- Passive recreational green spaces
- Community Center

For each of these four activities specific locations were identified. Emphasis was placed on siting parks throughout the midcoast. Research was conducted including meetings with San Mateo County Airport officials, Federal Aviation Administration, Peninsula Open Space Trust, and local recreation and sport groups.

The attached chart (Attachment A) provides details on the sites identified. The Task Force believes that this package of locations would best meet midcoast park and recreation needs for the immediate and long term.

The Task Force recognized that one of the highest community priorities (86%) identified in the needs assessment was for open space. It was noted that since the community poll was taken in August 2001, an additional 4,709 acres of open space have been preserved by POST (Raricho Corral de Tierra at 4,200 acres and the O'Neil property at 460 acres) and the County of San Mateo (Mirada Surf at 49 acres). The Task Force also noted a strong desire for hiking trails. The Task Force believes that this need will be met through efforts underway to complete the Coastal Trail, expand the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and provide a pedestrian/bicycle route on the abandoned Highway I segment at Devil's Slide upon completion of the Devil's Slide Tunnel.

While the Task Force chose to focus on the next highest priorities (lower than the number one priority for open space), the Task Force did not address what had been seen as a key issue in the needs assessment: acreage standards for community parks. During the needs assessment process, there was much debate (and no conclusion) on the level of parkland that should exist per capita. The Task Force did not engage in this debate and made no conclusion on acreage standards. Instead the Task Force pragmatically identified sites for specific activities.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Two of the identified sites are presently in public ownership as park land (Quarry Park and Mirada Surf). For the other sites, there may be charges for acquisition or land lease. These costs have not yet been estimated.

An estimate has been made for the cost of improving the identified sites. That estimate is for \$10 million (Attachment B).

Assuming that a new Park and Recreation District contracts for services with the City of Half Moon Bay and does not attempt to establish its own staff infrastructure, it is believed that the annual operating costs for the identified facilities would be \$700,000 per year.

#### **GOVERNANCE MODEL:**

The Task Force explored several options for governance, but concluded that the formation of a Park and Recreation District made the most sense. This district would serve all of the unincorporated area between the city limits of Half Moon Bay and Pacifica. It is recommended that such a district be formed with a governing board that is locally elected on the midcoast. It is further recommended that there be a five member district board with each member representing a district evenly divided based on the most recent census.

#### **FUNDING MECHANISM:**

The Task Force recommends that the initial acquisition, improvements, and ongoing maintenance of the District be financed by means of the new District's taxing authority. A detailed discussion of the options for financing is attached (Attachment C).

The new District can choose to utilize one or a combination of three funding mechanisms: a Special Tax; a Melio-Roos Community Facilities tax; or a Special Benefit Assessment tax (probably a Landscape and Ughting Act mechanism). Each approach has advantages and disadvantages and all require one or another method of voter/property owner approval.

All options require an initial expenditure of as much as an estimated \$50,000 for the retention of legal and financial experts to analyze the affected properties and make recommendations on the rate and method of apportionment of the tax.

Once a local tax mechanism is selected the County of San Mateo could make the development fee available to the district and could remain available to provide in-kind support. Additional income for the district could be generated by fees and grant seeking efforts could secure public and private funds to support specific prc-ects and activities,

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

The Board of Supervisors would need to take the necessary steps to form a Park and Recreation District. The first step in this process is an application to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

Enabling legislation for Recreation and Park Districts is Public Resources Code Sections 5780 through 5791.75. The code permits a five member board of directors with powers to establish, acquire, construct, improve, maintain and operate recreation facilities and services, including, but not limited to parks and open space, parking, and transportation. The formation process may be initiated by adoption of a resolution of application to LAFCO by any county or city that contains the territory, or by petition signed by 25% of the registered voters in the subject territory. The application must state the proposed method of financing, the proposed name for the district, the method of selecting initial board members (elected or appointed), and whether the district will have the power of eminent domain.

Upon filing of the application with LAFCO, the executive officer must notify the Director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation and the Director shall have sixty days to comment on the application. LAFCO shall conduct a noticed public hearing and may either approve, modify, or deny the application. If approved, LAFCO would also adopt terms and conditions for the proposal and establish a sphere of influence. The proposal would

then be scheduled for a conducting authority (protest) hearing and proceedings would be terminated' if a majority of property owners owning a majority of the assessed value of the subject territory submit a protest. Otherwise an election would be called and formation would require a simple majority of the qualified voters of the district voting in the affirmative. If a funding mechanism is a condition of approval, the election would also include the funding measure which would be subject to the provisions of Proposition 218. Formation would only be complete if the measure for formation is approved by simple majority and the funding measure passes with two-thirds voter approval.

In 1994, the County took steps to form a Community Services District on the coast. Two measures for park development were placed on the ballot. The vote to form the District was successful, but the vote on a tax assessment failed. The District was never formed.

The Granada Sanitary District is taking steps to seek re-organization as a Community Services District with expanded powers for park and recreation services. These expanded services would be for their service area in Half Moon Bay and El Granada. If LAFCO grants CSD status to the Granada Sanitary District, it would have an impact on the proposal for a midcoast Recreation and Park District.

It is not clear how a tax vote would fare on the midcoast at this time. The needs assessment and public opinion survey done in 2001 indicated that there would be support for a tax measure. That polling is somewhat dated at this time and there is no current poll data on this subject. Further, the Montara Sanitary District has recently expanded to assume responsibility for water delivery. With that expansion comes a new fee for those who get water from the Montara Sanitary and Water District. This new fee could have an impact on a parcel tax vote in Montara for a Park and Recreation District. It should also be noted that the Cabrillo School District has on three occasions in the last year and a half been unable to pass a parcel tax measure in support of education.

The Task Force believes that, if possible, the public vote on a tax mechanism should provide two funding options. The first would be the tax necessary to complete all of the projects identified by the Task Force. The second would be for approximately one-half of the projects (eliminating the community center). With a funding level option the public could support the formation of a district and indicate a level of funding support for the district.

## **CONCLUSION:**

The Midcoast Park and Recreation Task Force feels strongly that there are major unmet needs for recreation and park services in the unincorporated midcoast communities. The Task Force believes that the proposal for a combination of sites, a locally elected governing board for a Midcoast Park and Recreation District, and a local tax to pay for these services is solid. The Task Force recognizes that local political and economic factors may come into play relative to our recommendation. In spite of these factors, the Task Force feels strongly that the local community should be given an opportunity to fulfill its recreation and park needs.

For this reason, the Task Force recommends the formation of the Midcoast Park and Recreation District

**ATTACHMENT A  
Midcoast Park T2sk. Force - Site Worksheet  
Final Report**

Site	Description / Size	Ownership	APN	Zoning/General Plan Designation	Potential Use / Usability	Issues	Opportunities	Cost Estimate
<b>Active Recreation Fields</b>								
Farallone View Site	Adjacent to school and alpaca farm.  Part of Corral de Tierra.  2.5 acres	Peninsula Open Space Trust	036-320-110	GP-Pub. Rec; Z-PAD	Possible Active Recreation Field Site	Need sit including what type of support facilities (restrooms, parking) necessary. Also need analysis and cost of how to connect to school.		
Airport	Flat area adjacent to terminal  Apx. 6.9 ac.	County of San Mateo (COP #72)	037-292-030	GP-General Industrial; Z-M-1	Soccer Fields and support facilities	Cost of fair market value; cost and size of support facilities; FAA approval; utilities costs.	Large, flat site with good access. May accommodate at least 2 athletic fields.	
Farallone View Site	Adjacent to school and alpaca farm.  Part of Corral de Tierra.  2.5 acres	Peninsula Open Space Trust	036-320-110	GP-Pub. Rec; Z-PAD	Possible Mini Park Site	Adjacent to play field, but school has playground adjacent to site; not centrally located to the population in Montara		
Bypass Lands	300 foot right of way	CalTrans	No APN	GP-OS; Z-RMICZ (North); GP-PubRec; Z-RM/CZ (Mid); GP-Med.Density Res.; Z-R-1/S-17 (South)	Trail use. Community Park or regional park.	Included in GGNRA Boundary Expansion bill. One vacant house on the property.		
Moss Beach Park	SEC of Virginia and Etheldore  Moss Beach  30,000+- sq. ft.	Krober, Clifton and Theodore  Coastside Preservation and Recreation Inc.	037-142-010  037-142-020	GP-Med.Density; Z-R-1/S-17	Existing developed community park and active play area with strong community support	Need cost estimate from Moss Beach Park operators for completion of the project	PLN2001-00594: Coastal Development Permit for the installation of three additional play structures.	
Quarry Park	Stable area. 1 acre  39.674+- acres	County of San Mateo, but operated by Midcoast Parklands  (COP #2568)	047-340-010, 040	GP-OS; Z-COSC	Up-grade of play area including safety and ADA improvements	Need project description and cost estimates from Mid Coast Park Lands		
Miramar	None identified					No publically owned land available in this commun		

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Midcoast Park Task Force - Site Worksheet**

**Final Report**

11/11/2011 10:11 AM

Bumham Strip	Area along Highway 1 in El Granada 3a. 6.196+- acres 1h. 5.24+- acres	3a. Harbor District 3b. Various private owners	3a. 047-262-010 3b. 047-251-040, 060, 070, 100, 110, 120, 140, 150, and 160	GP-OS; Z-COSC	Consider informal turf areas attend of Portola			
Mirada Surf East	Flat area adjacent to school 33.63 acres	County of San Mateo (COP #2675)	047-330-010	Hammerhead: OP-OS; Z-RM/CZ Lower Portion: OP-OS; Z-RMICZ		Culvert and habitat Issues		
Etheldore and Hwy 1 Triangle	6.72 acres	County of San Mateo	037-291-010	GP-OS; Z-RM/CZ		Huge riparian zone; cost of land acquisition		
Farallone View	See above							
TransBy-pass	See above							
Mirada Surf	See above							
Athletic Fields								Approx. \$1 million per field
Community Center								~4.9 million
Mini Parks								Aj. prox. \$250,000
Informal Turf Areas								
Trail Heads								\$5-10,000 unless restrooms included

**ATTACHMENT B**

**MIDCOAST RECREATION AND PARK  
ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATIONAL COSTS**

*(DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY ACQUISITION OF LAND LEASE COSTS)*

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>LOCATION SIZE</b>	<b>DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>EST. COST</b>
Community Park	Airport - SE	3 to 4 soccer fields	\$1,500,000
	6 - 7 acres	Parking and restrooms	\$500,000
		<b>misc. site amenities and improvements</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>
Neighborhood Park	Adj. To F.V. School 2.5 acres	<b>One soccer field, restrooms, parking</b> misc. costs and site amenities	\$500,000 \$100,000
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>
Quarry Park Impr.	El Granada 39+ acres	upgrade play area misc. improvements	\$125,000 \$125,000
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
Mirada East	El Granada 33+ acres	small turf and play areas misc. improvements	\$300,000 \$100,000
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$400,000</b>
Burnham Strip	El Granada 6+ acres	informal turf areas, restrooms and parking misc. improvements	\$750,000 \$100,000
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>
Community center	Moss Beach	10,000 s. f. facility, playground	~\$3,500,000
	Etheldore Triangle	parking, picnic areas and misc. impr.	\$1,000,000
		<b>sub total</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>

**TOTAL** \$9,100,000  
*INFLATION AND MISC. COSTS* **\$900,000**  
**GRAND TOTAL** \$10,000,000

**ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS AT BUILDOUT**

Developed Parks	\$	500,000.00	includes operational costs and equipment depreciation
Community Center	\$	175,000.00	includes operational costs and equipment depreciation and one full-time staff person
Miscellaneous	\$	25,000.00	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>700,000.00</b>	Does not include any administrative or overhead costs

## ATTACHMENT C

Following is a summary of possible funding mechanisms that would be available to the proposed District, including some of the advantages and disadvantages of each. These mechanisms are evaluated keeping in mind the need to fund three different operational components: (1) ongoing operational expenses, (2) ongoing maintenance activities, and (3) acquisition of property and construction of improvements..

1. Special Taxes Levied Under Government Code Section 50075.

Special taxes enacted under Section 50075 may be enacted for any purpose, including services, maintenance and acquisition and development of property. Special taxes must be applied uniformly to all taxpayers or all real property, except that unimproved property may be taxed at a lower rate. (Pub. Resources Code section 5789.1.) Any increase in taxes to fund the services of a new district would be subject to the an appropriations limit (the Gann limit), which would be set during LAFCo proceedings. A measure to adjust the Gann limit, if made necessary by a new tax, could be coupled with a tax measure. The procedures for enacting a special tax are fairly straightforward.

Advantages of using Section 50075 include the relative simplicity of establishing the tax, and its usefulness in funding ongoing items, such as program services and maintenance. Disadvantages include the two-thirds voting requirement and its very limited usefulness in funding capital expenditures.

2. Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act (Government Code section 53311 et seq.).

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act provides the most comprehensive framework for funding the operation of the proposed district. A Mello-Roos District is a funding mechanism, not a separate legal entity. The funding vehicle used by the Act is a special tax, and bonded indebtedness can be incurred for some purposes. The Act can be used to fund “[r]ecreation program services” (Govt. Code section 53313(c)), “maintenance of parks, parkways and open space” (Govt. Code section 53313(d)), and “the purchase, construction, expansion, improvement, or rehabilitation of any real or tangible property” (Govt. Code section 53313.5). A special tax may be levied to fund ongoing recreation program services, and maintenance services. (Govt. Code sections 53313(c) and 53326.) Bonds can be issued to fund acquisition and development, and special taxes levied to pay the principal and interest of the debt. (Govt. Code sections 53326 and 53358.) The Act is very flexible in terms of tax formula; as long as there is a reasonable basis for the formula, it may be based on a variety of factors, including density of development, square footage of construction, acreage or zoning, and need not be apportioned on the basis of benefit to any property. (Govt. Code section 53325.3.) A two-thirds vote is required on both the imposition of taxes and the authorization of incurring bonded indebtedness. (Govt. Code sections 53326 and 53358.) The Act also authorizes a vote to change the appropriations limit (the Gann limit). (Govt. Code section 53325.7.)