

Plan Implementation

The preceding pages have painted a vision for the future of Glendale's downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. This is designed to serve as a guiding structure for subsequent decisions. The Plan calls for a series of public actions and private opportunities. An implementation strategy for these is needed, including an on-going process for public participation. Once again, it needs to be emphasized that this implementation strategy most closely ties to "Alternative 1" of the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR). While "Alternatives 2A and 2B" were analyzed in the MEIR, they are not being considered for implementation.

FUNDING

It is one thing to envision a City's future. It is quite another to determine how to pay for it. Several important assumptions have been made in the preparation of the following funding strategy as set forth in the following charts and pages. The strategy assumes that the City will continue its "pay-as-you-go" policy and use other financing options. All estimates are made using 1996 dollars. Modifications to the funding plan may be necessary depending on future financial conditions and obligations. All necessary funding will come from existing sources. No new taxes are proposed to cover these costs. An annual review of the GDSP and the funding plan will be performed to ensure the accuracy of these cost estimates.

Chart A summarizes this strategy in terms of public actions. The strategy calls for the use of nine funding sources spread over a 15 year period. The total public funding needed for this Plan is projected to be \$108,366,000. It must be emphasized that this is an estimate only. More precise cost figures will be known once individual project business terms and designs are completed. Charts B, C1-C5 and D provide additional costing information as back-up to summary Chart A. The project schedule for public improvements is based on the City's ability to pay.

In addition to the public funding described above, there could be other Redevelopment Agency costs involved as well. These costs would be associated with potential business terms relating to specific private sector projects. For each of these projects located within the Redevelopment Project Area, there is the potential for the Agency to negotiate business terms with the developer through the use of a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) or similar instrument. This Agreement identifies the responsibilities of all parties, including costs. Potential Agency costs could include "write-down" of the cost of Agency owned land, assistance with parking and other infrastructure related costs, and assistance with various City fees. The terms of these Agreements are negotiated on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, it is not possible at this time to identify any of these costs. It should be noted that the Redevelopment Agency already owns a significant amount of the land needed for the Town Center project.

Certain of the projects have already been funded (total: \$13,815,000) by the City, while other funds (\$18,816,750) are programmed as part of the current five year planning process. These are identified in Chart C. The remainder of the funds will have to be budgeted over the next 15 years as part of the City's budget process. The fact that there are multiple funding sources and a lengthy implementation period serves to increase the feasibility of this funding strategy. There will be ongoing operational costs to the City as a result of these projects. Included will be such items as additional staffing, utility and maintenance costs. There is also some potential for off-setting revenue from some of the projects (e.g.

rental fees). After taking into account the potential revenue, it is projected that the GDSP related projects will result in increased operational costs of \$2,914,000 annually. Chart D summarizes these costs and revenues by project.

There are two very important factors relating to the private sector. The private sector will be expected to provide some of the funding for the public projects. This is based upon the assumption that these public projects (e.g. downtown parks) will increase the value of the private investment. Chart B identifies where private funding is expected. City revenues will be increased as a result of private projects. Property tax, sales tax and transient occupancy tax revenues will all increase. An analysis was done of the projected revenue over a 15 year period taking into account when the various projects were expected to be completed. This analysis concludes the following: property tax (tax increment in the Project Area) will increase a total of \$17,600,000 over the 15 year period with the annual increment expected to reach \$1,992,000 by the 15th year; sales tax is projected to increase a total of \$7,900,000 over the 15 year period with annual revenues of \$834,000 by the 15th year; transient occupancy tax is projected to increase a total of \$7,500,000 over the 15 year period with annual revenues of \$871,000 by the 15th year. These increased annual revenues are expected to help off-set the increased operational costs described above.

**FUNDING
CHART A**

Estimated Project Funding-Summary

Funding Source	Near Term	Mid Term	Long Term	Total
	[0-5 Years]	[6-10 Years]	[11 - 15 Years]	
CIP	\$11,632,250	\$8,013,000	\$21,250,000	\$40,895,250
GRA	\$9,781,000	\$8,358,000	\$12,375,000	\$ 30,514,000
CDBG	\$7,601,250	\$3,895,000	\$ -	\$ 11,496,250
20% Set Aside	\$5,253,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,253,000
Grants	2,702,500	\$5,030,000	\$ -	\$7,732,500
Prop A/C	\$250,000	\$122,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$1,372,000
Parking	\$8,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$8,000,000
Federal	\$2,253,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$2,253,000
MTA	\$800,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$850,000
Total	\$48,273,000	\$25,468,000	\$34,625,000	\$ 108,366,000

Projects Funding Sources

CIP - The CIP, or Capital Improvement Program, is financed through the Capital Improvement Fund. This fund includes non-restricted capital project revenue and is derived from Utility Users Tax, sales tax and Scholl Canyon rubbish fees. The Utility Users Tax is a 7% tax charged on cable television, natural gas, electric, water, and intrastate phone services; one-seventh of this revenue is placed in the Capital Improvement Fund. The City's share of sales tax revenue consists of an approximate charge of 1% on all retail sales within the City which is part of the overall 8.25% sales tax charged by the State. Of this amount, 50% is placed in the Capital Improvement Fund. Lastly, the City receives 40% of the gross revenues from the Scholl Canyon Landfill; 86% of which is utilized for the Capital Improvement Program.

CDBG - The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is administered by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development to support local efforts to revitalize neighborhoods. Each CDBG program expenditure must qualify according to one of the three National Objectives, which include: 1) benefit to low and moderate-income persons, 2) prevention or elimination of slums and blight and 3) meeting an urgent community need.

Federal - Funding provided by the Federal government through either special grants or program subsidies.

GRA Funds - Glendale Redevelopment Agency (GRA) Funds include revenue from tax increment generated and bond proceeds. Tax increment is revenue generated from the increase in property taxes from properties within the City's two redevelopment areas that have new construction or a change of ownership. Revenues are used for economic development related projects and activities and housing within the redevelopment areas.

MTA - The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is the County transportation operational and funding organization. Funds available through the agency include a variety of special transportation project grants administered by the MTA or funds budgeted by them related to specific services or projects they provide within the City.

Parking- The Parking Fund is an enterprise fund consisting of revenue from parking citations and parking meter, lot and garage fees. Revenues are allocated for parking enforcement and construction, maintenance and operation of parking facilities.

Proposition A Fund - Los Angeles County voters approved a 1/2 cent sales tax in 1980 to be utilized to maintain, improve or expand public transit, 25% of which is allocated to local agencies based on population.

Proposition C Fund - Los Angeles County voters approved a 1/2 cent sales tax in 1990 to be utilized to maintain, improve or expand public transit, 20% of which is allocated to local agencies based on population.

20% Set Aside - State law requires that 20% of all tax increment funding received by the Redevelopment Agency be used for low and moderate income housing projects.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The prioritization of projects, shown in Chart A, is a function of both the importance of projects to the community and the availability of funds. The combination of revenues from land sales and new tax revenues can then finance subsequent public elements of the plan. A significant factor within the control of the City is the disposal of publicly-owned property. New private development should be encouraged to occur on public property first to expedite the development and generate new property and sales tax revenues.

The 52 individual projects that are contained within the GDSP will each have their own specific implementation strategy. See Chart B for a list of the projects. For each public sector project, a project team will be established headed by a City staff member. In the case of those projects relating to the Pacific Edison Area, the Neighborhood Task Force will take the lead. The initial focus will be on the near-term projects (1-5 year time frame).

The private sector projects will follow a different course of action dependent on the market demand. As demands arise, some projects (or opportunities) will go through a request for proposal (RFP) process. Following a review of the proposals, the City Council or Redevelopment Agency will select a developer for the project. The negotiation of business terms and design review will precede actual project construction. Other projects may simply be proposed by the property owner and not require the RFP process. As with public projects, those identified for the near-term will be expected to be the first to go forward.

More detailed information on both public and private projects is contained in the Technical Document. This lengthy report is designed to support this Plan and is available in the Redevelopment Agency office. Once again, the strategic nature of the GDSP must be stressed. While the Implementation Technical Report provides a great amount of detail, final project specifics will be left to the negotiation of business terms, design review and public input.

PUBLIC REVIEW

Ongoing public participation will be essential for the effective implementation of the GDSP. Each specific project will require its own public review process. Even though a Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) was completed for the GDSP, each project must also undergo analysis to determine its environmental impact. In order to begin this process, an "Initial Study" will be prepared for each project. This will be analyzed to determine whether or not additional environmental review is necessary. Several courses of action are possible depending on the results of this initial review including Negative Declaration, Focused EIR, Supplemental EIR, or full EIR.

The public needs to be actively involved in this process. Public notification procedures will be changed for all GDSP projects to ensure that the community has the opportunity to participate. For example, instead of notifying the public after the decision of the Environmental and Planning Board, the notification will go out prior to the Board's review. This change will allow the community to not only appeal the Board's decision (current practice) but also participate in the initial review.

The practice for developing notification lists will also be changed. In addition to all those that are legally required to be notified, a master list of individuals and organizations will be notified of each project. This list will include all homeowner associations, business organizations, community groups, and individuals who have requested to be notified. These groups and individuals will be encouraged to participate in the

review process.

In addition to the review of individual projects, there will also be the opportunity for an annual review of the GDSP. The MEIR establishes various performance standards related to environmental impacts, and it identifies mitigation measures in order for these standards to be achieved. As part of the GDSP implementation process, an annual review of these standards and mitigation measures will be very helpful. The more community participation there is in this process, the more effective it will be. The City Council will establish a process for this public review.

All of this is designed to ensure that this Plan, and hence the Greater Downtown area, is meeting the needs of our community. This goal has been one of the primary and original motivating forces for this strategic planning process and the resulting vision. The public's on-going participation in this Plan is vital for its successful implementation.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART B

Implementation Projects

Chart B Notes: The following assumptions were made in the development of Chart B.

1) The cost figures are in "1996 dollars."

2) The cost and timing assume a "pay-as-you-go" funding strategy. This would change if a financing strategy was used.

[a] Timing: Near Term 0-5 Years; Mid-Term 6-10 Years; Long Term 11-15 Years.

[b] This project could be moved to the "near" or "mid" term category if private funding is available as part of hotel or Town Center retail development.

[c] This project could be implemented sooner if additional funding becomes available or if traffic impact mitigation fees are used.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART C1

Capital Improvement Funds

Chart C1 Notes: The proposed near term projects of the plan will require a CIP investment of approximately \$6,206,500 in Years 2001-02. The proposed mid term projects of the plan will require a CIP investment of approximately \$1,602,600 per year for Years 2002-03 through 2006-07. The proposed long term projects of the plan will require a CIP investment of approximately \$4,250,000 per year for Years 2007-08 through 2011-12.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART C2

Redevelopment Agency Funds

Chart C2 Notes: The Redevelopment Agency currently estimates approximately an additional \$3,000,000 in unallocated tax increment funds each year, which is projected to increase as proposed projects are completed. Therefore, the proposed near term projects of the plan will require an investment of approximately \$2,456,000 of that \$3,000,000 in Year 2001-02. The proposed mid-term projects of the plan will require an investment of approximately \$1,672,000 per year for Years 2002-03 through 2006-07. The proposed long term projects of the plan will require an investment of approximately \$4,250,000 per year for Years 2007-08 through 2011-12.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART C3

Community Development Block Grant Funds

Chart C3 Notes: The proposed near term projects of the plan will require investment of approximately \$973,250 in CDBG funds in Year 2001-02. Pacific Park expansion is proposed to be completed by 2003. Therefore, the proposed mid term projects of the plan will require an investment of approximately \$9,147,500 in CDBG funds for Years 2002-03 and 2003-04.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART C4

20% Set Aside Housing Funds

Chart C4 Notes: Funding has not actually been programmed for this specific Adult Recreation Center/Senior Housing project, but the unallocated amount programmed for next 5 years for senior housing available for Adult Recreation Center/Senior Housing project is \$5,850,000. Funding has not actually been specifically programmed for Downtown housing development opportunities, but the unallocated amount programmed for next 5 years for moderate income first time home buyers projects is \$9,000,000.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART C5

Other Funds

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

CHART D

Operational Costs