

Chapter 8. Construction Phasing and Potential Funding Sources

This chapter describes alternatives for phasing project implementation and identifies planning and detailed design needs for Phase 2. This chapter also identifies alternatives for financing the costs associated with implementing the design elements and project scenarios presented in Chapters 3 and 4.

CONSTRUCTION PHASING

The approaches to phasing for the Jensen River Ranch Project are unlimited. Construction could be implemented in 1 year or phased in over 50 years. The most important factors that determine how quickly a project will be constructed are the current available funding, near-term projected funding, availability of staff for project management, and availability of staff for onsite maintenance and management once the project is constructed. Additional factors for phasing include the availability of plant material and construction windows related to weather and wildlife nesting.

Project-Specific Phasing Considerations

A number of considerations specific to the Jensen River Ranch Project may influence construction phasing.

- A phasing approach should be developed after the conceptual plan has been approved and before detailed design is completed. This phasing plan will help guide refinements to the conceptual plan and aid in preparing detailed design drawings (i.e., construction documents).
- A major component to the cost associated with earthwork is equipment mobilization and demobilization. Consequently, all earthwork activities associated with the project (e.g., oxbow and trail construction) should be implemented at the same time.
- Project phasing may be influenced by the overall irrigation strategy. If flood irrigation is selected as the most appropriate and efficient technique for the site, the phasing approach should consider the pattern and layout of flood irrigation cells or zones.

- Project phasing may be affected by available funds. For example, if restoration funds are secured that do not include trailway monies (or vice versa), these elements may or may not be able to be included in the same phase.

1.

PHASING APPROACH

Based on these considerations, we have identified one possible approach to phasing that could be implemented in three phases over the course of 6 years. This approach was developed as a basis for discussion and will be refined based on input from the Parkway Trust and the Conservancy. This phasing approach is described below and summarized in Table 8-1.

Phase 1 would focus on the western edge of the project site and would be a relatively small portion of the overall project construction cost. The areas selected for planting are generally independent of other design elements, and plant establishment begins in key visual buffer and habitat expansion areas. This phase would also include minor earthwork for construction of the Tom MacMichael Sr. Loop Trail from Woodward Park to the public use area. The existing fencing in the western one-third of the site would need to be relocated and new fencing installed to protect plants from grazing animals. Grazing and flood-irrigated pasture areas would be maintained throughout the remainder of the site.

Phase 2 would implement mass grading of the site for both habitat enhancement features and the remaining trails. Grazing and public access would be temporarily halted during earthwork activities. After earthwork was complete, disturbed areas would be planted and seeded.

Phase 3 would complete the remaining planting and irrigation elements. Maintenance would be on-going throughout the construction phases; however, monitoring could begin at this time for all phases of planting.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

To date, the Jensen River Ranch Riparian Restoration Project has been funded through federal, state, and private sources. It is anticipated that additional funding sources for implementing design elements outlined in this plan will be needed. It is likely that implementing design elements cannot be met through a single source of funding but will require a combination of sources. The following discussion outlines various sources of funding that could be used to implement habitat restoration and public access design elements. This section demonstrates that there is a range of alternatives and is intended to stimulate others to identify additional creative ideas for funding. Because the potential design elements are likely to be implemented over time, entirely new funding sources may emerge. Moreover, a funding source that currently is not practical may become feasible at a later time for particular types of projects.

Table 8-2 lists potential federal, state, and private programs that provide support for habitat restoration and recreation projects in the Central Valley. This list is based on best available information and should be verified with appropriate agencies as specific plans and projects emerge. These programs would be the most likely sources of support for land acquisition, habitat restoration and enhancement projects, and recreation and education-facilities development. However, these programs are not likely to be a strong source of financial support for on-going administration, operations, and maintenance. Local funding sources, including general obligation bonds, local sales tax increases, and revenue bonds, are frequently used to fill in funding gaps for on-going activities. Other more creative sources of funding may include onsite concessions, such as horseback riding stables or donations in the form of in-kind services.