

Facts

- APRC funding needs are clear right now. This funding need is based on the longstanding support from citizens. This support is included in the origins of the Commission in the City Charter and in vote after vote directing the Commission to steer towards a robust parks system. Now we have that robust system and it requires our traditional level of funding to maintain. For the past three years, that traditional amount of \$2.09/thousand of assessed value has been whittled away.
- Initiative route to get on ballot is challenging.
- No guarantee that if we wait for CC process, that we will even end up with any funding measure on the Nov ballot
- If CC process does lead to ballot measure, there is no guarantee that it would include dedicated funds for APRC.
- If there is no funding measure approved this year, we will go into the next biennium budgeting process with almost certainty of further significant cuts in our budget.
- More reductions would mean major cuts to programs, major cuts to park maintenance staff or a combination of the two.
- If CC takes the lead and if past experience is any indication, APRC may have little or no input into the form of the measure.
- CC has made zero commitment to any APRC funding level
- If we don't like the measure and want to put a separate measure on the ballot in November, it will require gathering signatures and more importantly, it would be confusing to voters if there were two competing funding measures on the ballot, assuming CC is in fact ready for a November ballot initiative.
- Going the district route may be less confusing to voters as it would be crystal clear that the only property tax APRC would receive would be via the district. No double dipping would be possible (not that that has occurred in the past, notwithstanding the accusations on social media).