

2024 - Parks Funding Requests External Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: Soccer Complex Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities Requested Amount:									
			Jerrold Taylor	Karen Hickman	Hunter Richards	Larry Ziegler	Sean Duffy	Jessica Johnson	Luke Niforatos	Amanda Budimlyla	Collin Cacchione	TOTAL
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
12	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 4 = Fills minor need 7 = Fills moderate need 12 = Fills major need	12	10		11	12	12	10	12		11.28571
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	10	6		3	9	6	10	3		6.714286
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	10	10		4	9	10	10	10		9
8	Leveraging of outside funds and percentage of project covered by requested funds.	0 = No outside funding. 100% funded by Douglas County 2 = Minimal outside funding. ≥90% funded by Douglas County 4 = Moderate outside funding. 50% funded by Douglas County 8 = Substantial outside funding. ≤10% funded by Douglas County	0	0		2	0	0	4	0		0.857143
8	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 4 = Several group/user needs met 8 = Numerous group/user needs met	4	2		4	0	0	6	4		2.857143
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	2		3	2	2	3	1		2
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	1		1	2	1	0	1		1
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	2	2		3	2	2	3	2		2.285714

2024 - Parks Funding Requests External Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: Wildcat Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities Requested Amount:									
			Jerrold Taylor	Karen Hickman	Hunter Richards	Larry Ziegler	Sean Duffy	Jessica Johnson	Luke Niforatos	Amanda Budimlya	Collin Cacchione	TOTAL
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
12	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 4 = Fills minor need 7 = Fills moderate need 12 = Fills major need	12	12		6	3	3	6	4		6.571429
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	3		2	3	6	0	0		2
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	6		8	3	0	0	0		2.428571
8	Leveraging of outside funds and percentage of project covered by requested funds.	0 = No outside funding. 100% funded by Douglas County 2 = Minimal outside funding. ≥90% funded by Douglas County 4 = Moderate outside funding. 50% funded by Douglas County 8 = Substantial outside funding. ≤10% funded by Douglas County	0	4		1	0	0	0	0		0.714286
8	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 4 = Several group/user needs met 8 = Numerous group/user needs met	4	2		0	2	0	8	0		2.285714
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	0	2		2	0	0	0	0		0.666667
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	2	5		4	0	0	5	2		2.571429
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	1		0	0	0	1	0		0.428571
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	1		2	3	0	0	0		1
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	3		3	3	3	3	0		2.571429
67												21.238

2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: BAYOU LED Project Origin: Staff Requested Amount: \$240,000.00									
Page 1			Jerrold Taylor	Karen Hickman	Hunter Richards	Larry Ziegler	Sean Duffy	Jessica Johnson	Luke Niforatos	Amanda Budimiya	Collin Cacchio	TOTAL
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	9		9	8	8	8	5		8.142857
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	10		9	10	10	6	5		8.571429
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	0		1	5	2	3	0		2
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	3	0		0	2	2	0	0		1
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	7	8		7	7	8	10	8		7.857143
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	5		5	5	5	5	2		4.571429
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	4		5	5	4	5	2		4.285714
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	4		0	5	5	0	5		3.428571
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	2		2	0	1	0	5		1.571429
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
75											46.429	

62%

2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring	Project Name: HHRP Playground and Restroom Replacement Project Origin: Staff Requested Amount: \$2,750,000.00
--	--

Page 1	Jerrod Taylor Karen Hickman Hunter Richards Larry Ziegler Sean Duffy Jessica Johnson Luke Niforatos Amanda Budimlya Collin Cacchione TOTAL
--------	---

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	10		10	10	10	10	10		10
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	10		9	10	10	10	9		9.714286
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	0		0	0	3	3	0		1.285714
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	6	0		0	3	3	3	0		2.142857
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	5	10		7	7	7	7	7		7.142857
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	5		5	5	5	5	2		4.571429
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	2	5		4	5	5	5	4		4.285714
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	2		2	2	0	0	0		1
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5

2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Fields #1&2 Replacement Project Origin: Staff Requested Amount: \$1,200,000.00									
			Jerrold Taylor	Karen Hickman	Hunter Richards	Larry Ziegler	Sean Duffy	Jessica Johnson	Luke Niforatos	Amanda Budimiya	Collin Cacchiore	TOTAL
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	10		9	7	10	10	8		9.142857
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	10		10	10	10	10	8		9.714286
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	0		6	2	3	0	0		2
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	0		0	2	3	6	0		1.571429
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	5	10		10	7	10	7	8		8.142857
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	2	5		5	2	5	5	4		4
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	2		2	0	2	0	0		1
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		5
75											50.571	

67%

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Challenger Park Synthetic Field Replacement
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$1,200,000 one time request

PAB Member:

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	8	These Fields are used for Baseball, Football, Soccer and some Lacross. Several teams and groups use these fields and so the frequency of use and numerous teams that access these fields warranted a score of 8.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	8	Most turf needs replaced every 12 years and this turf is at 15 years with a lot of wear and tear. The Parks staff is aware of the need and there has been public comment of how these fields look from those on the advisory board and other citizens in the community.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	There is no change due to this project request for funding being on an existing field and for replacement.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	There are no entrance fees - usage of fields may improve visitor spending in the area around Challenger fields. It is unclear if this rating is for facility or for possible economic spending in the community. (I will get clarity on this rubric question for the future)
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	8	There will be a decrease in maintenance fees once this is replaced because for several years there will not be a need for fillers and man-power to work on the fields. This seems like a normal replacement request.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	I believe that the standard cost for replacement will be adequate with approved vendors and competitive rates for 2024. The project scope is clear and quite simple for replacement and I am aware from other parks and schools on the need for replacement of turf because it simply does not last forever.
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	It is clear from photos, comments, and parks staff that this is a high need, as well as good stewardship of county resources.
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	4	This park will serve residents from all three districts.
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	N/A
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	N/A

2024 - Parks Funding Requests

**Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal

Criteria and Scoring

Project Name: *Chelton*
 Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
 Requested Amount: *1.2M*

PAB Member: *Duffy*

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	<i>10</i>	<i>all the users only -</i>
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	<i>10</i>	<i>spending well!</i>
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	<i>0</i>	<i>change w/ update is minimal</i>
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	<i>2</i>	
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	<i>7</i>	
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	<i>5</i>	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	<i>5</i>	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	<i>2</i>	
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	<i>0</i>	<i>N/A.</i>
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	<i>5</i>	<i>N/A</i>

2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Turf

Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff

Requested Amount: \$1,200,000

PAB Member: Karen Hickman

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	The fields are utilized by a variety of users.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	While the turf is in need of replacement, it fill a moderate need based on citizen comments. Based on the safety factor, it fills a major need.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	Not available or applicable
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	Not available or applicable
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	10	Major decrease in maintenance. Safety a huge factor. Water savings for synthetic turf notes as 100,000 gal. water/yr. Also long-term maintenance savings due to less repair.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	Photos provided as to issue. I also did a site visit.
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	Resources managed well. Especially the safety factor.
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	Appears balance throughout all commissioner districts as a regional park utilized by various citizen groups.
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	Not a collaborative effort with Open Space/HP. Score reflects 33% or Parks!
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	Public access fees are equitable or even N/A.

<p align="center">2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring</p>	<p>Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Turf Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff Requested Amount: \$1,200,000</p>
<p>PAB Member: Karen Hickman</p>	<p align="right">page 2</p>
<p align="center">Individual Project Score</p>	<p align="center">Comments</p>
<p align="center">52</p>	<p>Keeping up with ongoing maintenance costs is a must. The City of Fort Collins indicated a short-fall of \$9.1M in 2021 and 2 years later it had risen to over \$12M. Not just day-to-day maint. but replacement/upgrades. Safety is a key factor.</p>

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Challenger Park Synthetic Turf Replacement
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$1,200,000

PAB Member: Luke Niforatos

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	This facility is used heavily, more than 100,000 people per field per year.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	The field is badly run down and appears to be unsafe. The field is bordering on unusability and it is heavily used.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	No data provided.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	6	More than 100,000 visitors per field per year implies positive economic implications for any investment we make to improve these fields.
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	7	Per staff, the current aged turf requires more expensive maintenance. These new fields will reduce costs in the years following their installation.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	

2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name:Challenger Field Replacement
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member: Jerrod Taylor

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	Several different user groups use these fields and need to have a safe place to play
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	Safe fields that are able to be used year round are something PAB has heard a lot about.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	No major change to the park
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	No major change, this replacement is for safety
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	5	no comment
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	no comment
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	Ensuring safe and useable fields is a great use of resources!
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	2	no comment
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	no comment
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	No fees

2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Turf

Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff

Requested Amount: \$1,200,000

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	9	
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	6	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	10	
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	

2024 - Parks Funding Requests

**Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Turf
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$1,200,000

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

57

Necessary upgrade and replacement.

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Dupont Park Sports Fields Lighting LED Retrofit
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$240,000 one time request

PAB Member:

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	5	I rated this a 5 because these fields are used for Baseball only and although serve several teams, the size cannot serve other types of sports teams.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	5	I rated this in the middle due to the Parks Staff believing this will serve the baseball teams visiting - so this may fill a minor need - however, I do not believe that then people from Louviers want this project. We were not given any citizen surveys or comments from the residents of Louviers. My concerns on the project are listed below.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	There is no change due to this project request for funding being on an existing field and for replacement.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	There are no entrance fees -
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	8	The Parks Staff believes this will be a decrease in maintenance fees of old bulbs to LED bulbs once they are replaced. They also believe replacement will reduce the man-power to work on the lights. I am not sure if this is necessary though to spend money now on this project - see notes below on the following rubric questions.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	2	I rated this a 2 because we were not given the current cost to replace an existing burnt out bulb verses an LED bulb. We were not given a current cost of electricity use for this field with the regular bulbs and what the reductions would actually be based on other baseball fields with LED lights (only an estimated 60%). Unfortunately, there was not any estimate on what the cost savings for long term use of bulbs would be verses just energy cost savings. I am not completely sure if this is a good use of money based on the information we were given to rate this project. I did speak to one resident of Louviers who did not see this as necessary for the town.
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	2	I rated this a 2 because do not fully know if this project is needed verses just an updated version. There was not a lot of information beyond the request for \$240,000, so I the commissioners need to decide if Parks is being fiscally responsible with this project. . There are only 2 homes that pack up to the park and so I do not see a need to focused LED lighting verses the current bulbs that project light a further distance. We also did not hear if this is a request from residence or teams. I believe that parks staff sees this as a way to reduce electricity cost and maintenance because LED should last longer than the current bulbs. They also shared that there is a need for large equipment and man-power to replace the current burnt out bulbs and they see this as a reduction in parks maintenance. The ROI for electricity will be two years - 60% energy savings. However, beyond this statistic, I do not see an actual need.
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	This park will serve residents from all three districts.
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	5	This is really a N/A - because it is already existing, but it does not seem to impede on the Open Space behind the park. Due to it existing - it would seem that all three divisions have been in agreement. This is also a confusing rubric number because it does not apply to existing parks.
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	N/A

2024 - Parks Funding Requests

**Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name: **DUPONT PARK**
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: **\$240,000**

PAB Member: **Dofm**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	8	
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	5	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	6 2	
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	7	
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	

2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

--

Individual Project Score	Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Dupoint Park LED Retrofit

Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff

Requested Amount: \$240,000

PAB Member: Karen Hickman

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	9	A variety of user groups could utilize the baseball field.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	Warriors Youth League indicated need.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	Not available/or applicable.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	Not available/or applicable.
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	8	Per presentation by Parks staff. New LED lighting will reduce electricity bills and future maintenance. Also provide less light pollution to adjacent property owners.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	Detailed and completed.
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	4	Responsible upgrade.
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	4	At this time, unclear whether other youth sports leagues, adult leagues or even Sterling Ranch could utilize the field.
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	Not collaborative with open space or HP. But represents 33% with Parks.
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	Public access fees are equitable or N/A.

<p align="center">2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring</p>	<p>Project Name: Dupont Park LED Retrofit Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff Requested Amount: \$240,000</p>
<p>PAB Member: Karen Hickman</p>	<p align="right">page 2</p>
<p align="center">Individual Project Score</p>	<p align="center">Comments</p>
<p align="center">47</p>	<p>Per Park staff presentation: LED lights have a longer lifespan lasting 4 times as long as traditional bulbs. New lights can be mounted on existing poles eliminating need for pole replacement.</p>
	<p>Estimated 60% energy savings. Reduced glare provides better on-field lighting.</p> <p>While only the Warriors Youth Sports League utilizes the baseball field, they are part of the Arapahoe Youth Sports League and tournament games are played there.</p>

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

**Project Name: Dupont Park Sports Fields
Lighting LED Retrofit**
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$240,000

PAB Member: Luke Niforatos

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	8	The field is not located close enough to the surrounding community for light pollution for the current lights to be a concern to the surrounding community. The cost savings, however, are significant so this project does have an impact for the county and will increase the quality of play for teams who I am told use this field nearly every day out of the week.
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	6	This meets an operational and budgetary need for the county but to my understanding this is not a significant demand from the community.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	Potentially reduces light pollution for neighborhoods though this is minimal.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	10	This is the primary purpose of this upgrade, which will reduce energy costs for the field by 60% according to the provided estimate.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	0	Not applicable.
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	

2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Dupont Lighting

Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff

Requested Amount:

PAB Member: Jerrod Taylor

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	10	This increases the safety of the fields by providing better lighting, and also prevents light spill which is less disruptive to surrounding neighbors
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	10	Safe and usable fields are very important to our groups and citizens
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	No major changes to park
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	3	No major changes to park
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	7	The use of LED lights is cheaper for the county in the long run as this will provide better energy use and longer lasting lights
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	No comments
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	No comments
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	5	No comments
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	1	No comments
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	No public access fees

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name:
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount:

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests - Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Dupoint Park LED Retrofit

Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff

Requested Amount: \$240,000

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
10	Project Impact. Meets the needs of a variety of users and groups	0 = Singular group/user needs met 5 = Several group/user needs met 10 = Numerous group/user needs met	9	
10	Meets public demand based on citizen comment, survey results and outreach efforts	0 = Does not fill any need 3 = Fills minor need 6 = Fills moderate need 10 = Fills major need	9	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	1	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	
10	Request reduces financial investment for the County, including utility, material, and labor costs	0 = Major increase in maintenance costs 3 = Minimal increase in maintenance costs 5 = Neither increases nor decreases maintenance costs 7 = Minimal decrease in maintenance costs 10 = Major decrease in maintenance costs	7	
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	
5	Request demonstrates safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources	0 = Resources are managed poorly 2 = Resources are managed satisfactorily 5 = Resources are managed excellently	5	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Comissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	0	
5	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 2 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 5 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests
Internal
Criteria and Scoring**

Project Name: Dupont Park LED Retrofit
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff
Requested Amount: \$240,000

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

43

Necessary upgrade and replacement.

Real Soccer/Sterling Ranch Design \$'s - \$400,000

Joint effort to explore possibilities.

Wildcat Design \$'s - \$250,000

Could be used to explore all open spaces in the county.

LED Retrofit Lighting for the Dupont Park Baseball Field - \$240,000

Excellent opportunity to upgrade and draw in more participants.

Highlands Ranch Heritage Regional Park Playground/Restroom Replacement - \$2,750,000
Necessary.

On Wed, Jul 24, 2024