

Appendix J - Prioritizing Park Development

Setting Priorities for the Development of Undeveloped and Partially Developed Parks

The Parks and Recreation Department developed criteria to analyze the relative need, opportunities, and constraints for developing undeveloped parkland. The process is intended to be flexible to respond to changing conditions and new opportunities. This process will be revisited annually, as part of the budgeting and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process, and whenever a significant event occurs.

The analysis presented here is considered a “baseline” of information and is used to demonstrate the use of this tool for prioritizing completion of the undeveloped and partially developed parks.

In determining priorities for park development projects, the Parks and Recreation Department considers the following criteria:

- A. Demonstrated Need**
Does it fill a gap in an already underserved area? Does it fill a priority need identified in the 2005 Parks and Recreation Survey or in other sources?
- B. Development Constraints**
Is the site ready for design and development with no significant physical or legal constraints?
- C. .25 Cent Sales Tax Analysis**
Does it meet an unmet ballot measure commitment?
- D. Known Collaborative Opportunity**
Is there a high potential for partnership or other collaboration? (This could involve acquisition, maintenance, and fundraising).
The department is open to creative suggestions.
- E. Maintenance Dollars Identified**
Have maintenance dollars been identified and earmarked for this project?
- F. Population Served**
Does the area have a high percentage of low-income residents and/or children, youth, and seniors? Is the area high density?
- G. Revenue Potential**
Will the development have revenue potential (example: rental of fields)? Will it contribute to the economic vitality of the city by bringing in ‘outside’ money?
- H. Development Efficiency**
Will development be more efficient/cost-effective if timed with other public projects?
- I. Environmental Constraints**
Are there environmental constraints on the property that would need to be mitigated?
- J. Project Status**
Is the project partially built?

Draft Prioritization of Undeveloped and Partially Developed Parks

Undeveloped Parksites	Date Acquired	Type of Park/ Acres	A Demonstrated Need	B Development Constraints	C .25 Cent Sales Tax Analysis	D Known Collaborative Opportunity	E Maintenance \$ ID'd	F Population Served	G Revenue Potential	H Development Efficiency	I Environmental Constraints	J Project Status	Priority Grouping
Area III	1997	City-191		- (3)							- (12, 15)		V
Alpine	1998	Pocket-0.3											III
Dakota Ridge	2000	Pocket-3	+ (1)		+ (6)								I
East Boulder Phase 2	1985	Com-12	+ (2)					+ (10)			- (12)	+ (16)	II
Eben G. Fine East	2001	Pocket-0.5											III
Elks	1999	Neigh-7.9	+ (1)		+ (6)					+ (11)	- (13)		II
Foothills Phase 3	1985	Com-8.5						+ (10)			- (12)	+ (16)	II
Heatherwood	1985	Neigh-5		- (4)	+ (6)								II
Hickory (portion)	1999	Pocket-0.7											III
Holiday	2003	Pocket-1.1	+ (1)			+ (7)		+ (9)					I
Mesa Memorial	2002	Pocket- 1.7											III
Sinton	1993	Pocket- 0.5											III
Valmont	1997	City - 115	+ (2)	- (5)		+ (8)		+ (10)			- (12)		IV
Violet	1987	Neigh- 7.2	+ (1)		+ (6)					+ (11)	- (13)		II
W of Justice Center	1972	Pocket- 2.5									- (14)		V

Note: Shaded areas are a negative, all others are positive.

Chart Legend:

- A Demonstrated Need**
 - (1) Underserved area within city limits on Service Area Map
 - (2) High recreation facility need- multipurpose fields (programmable)
- B Development Constraints**
 - (3) Area III - not available for development
 - (4) Not in city limits
 - (5) Access road not ready
- C .25 Cent Sales Tax Analysis**
 - (6) Neighborhood parks needed to comply with sales-tax ballot language
- D Known Collaborative Opportunity**
 - (7) Neighborhood cost-sharing proposed
 - (8) BVSD partnership proposed
- E Maintenance Dollars Identified**
 - (none identified at this time)
- F Population Served**
 - (9) High level of affordable housing, families with children
- G Revenue Potential**
 - (10) Sports field rentals
- H Development Efficiency**
 - (11) Floodplain work will prepare site for park development
- I Environmental Constraints**
 - (12) Prairie dogs on site
 - (13) Floodplain work needed prior to park development
 - (14) Environmental hazards
 - (15) Threatened and endangered species
- J Project Status**
 - (16) Significant portion of park built

Draft Prioritization Results (Baseline Information)

Priority Group	# of pluses	# of minuses	Funding Plan
Priority Group I (at least one plus and 0 minuses)			
Holiday Pocket Park	3	0	Fiscally Constrained
Dakota Ridge Pocket Park	2	0	
Priority Group II (at least 1 plus and only 1 minus)			
Elks Neighborhood Park	3	+1	Action Plan
Violet Neighborhood Park	3	+1	
East Boulder Community Park Phase 2	3	+1	
Foothills Community Park Phase 3	2	+1	
Heatherwood Neighborhood Park	1	+1	
* Completion of any Priority Group II park assumes that the "minus" listed can be resolved. Park site can potentially move to Priority Group I if "minus" is resolved and funding identified.			
Priority Group III (0 pluses and 0 minuses) - in alphabetical order			
Alpine Pocket Park	0	0	Action Plan
Eben G. Fine East	0	0	
Hickory Pocket Park	0	0	
Mesa Memorial Pocket Park	0	0	
Sinton Pocket Park	0	0	
<i>Note: Could move up to Priority Group I with an identified collaborative opportunity.</i>			
Priority Group IV (at least 2 pluses)			
Valmont City Park	3	2	Action Plan
<i>Note: Partial development will be considered.</i>			
Priority Group V (1 minus and 0 pluses or more than 1 minus)			
West of Justice Center	0	1	Vision Plan
Area III City Park	0	3	