

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 <b>External</b> 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
<b>67</b>												<b>21.238</b>

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
<b>75</b>											<b>46.429</b>	

62%

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

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

Total Points	Criteria	Points	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 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	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
<b>75</b>											<b>50.571</b>	

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 Commissioner 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"><b>2024 - Parks Funding Requests</b> <b>Internal</b> <b>Criteria and Scoring</b></p>	<p><b>Project Name: Challenger Synthetic Turf</b> <b>Project Origin:</b> BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff <b>Requested Amount: \$1,200,000</b></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><b>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.</b></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 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

**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	<del>6</del> 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"><b>2024 - Parks Funding Requests</b> <b>Internal</b> <b>Criteria and Scoring</b></p>	<p><b>Project Name: Dupont Park LED Retrofit</b> <b>Project Origin:</b> BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff <b>Requested Amount: \$240,000</b></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><b>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.</b></p>
	<p><b>Estimated 60% energy savings. Reduced glare provides better on-field lighting.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></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

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

**Project Name:** Highland Heritage Reg Park Playground & Restroom Replacement  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff  
**Requested Amount:** \$2,750,000 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	10	I believe this will meet the needs of several people who visit the park. This includes families in the community and families who visit for sports. The new plans will give kids, adults and visitors more opportunities to access the equipment and restrooms than what is currently available.
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	I do believe this will be an excellent upgrade for this regional park. The Parks staff is aware of the need and there has been public comment on the lack of restrooms in this park, and those on the advisory board agree this a great project. It would be nice for the Parks Advisory Board to have access to resident comments, surveys or outreach efforts to appropriately answer this rubric question.
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 park site 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 Highlands Heritage park and 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	7	There will always be maintenance fees for restrooms, mulch and equipment, but replacing what exist at Highlands Heritage Park will help the equipment that is 20 years old and replacement parts that cannot be found. I think the base material for the park is great, however, I have seen it torn up at the Miller Activity Center (probably by older kids) and once part of it is torn, kids seems to keep picking at the material. I wonder how you fix torn base material or is mulch a better option? But this seems like an adequate score for what the county will be required to spend in the plans for this park.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	2	I did rate this a 2 verses a 5 because it is hard to fully approve the cost without estimates and comparison of bids from vendors. However, I believe that the parks staff will find the best cost from vendors and adequately choose and approved vendors at competitive rates for 2024. The project scope is clear and the plans look fantastic. It would be nice for the Parks Advisory Board to be able to have actual numbers for projects and vendor cost and even comparison cost if we are to feel confident giving our approval for large sums of tax payer money for projects.
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. It will be wonderful to have restrooms that are available year round and I believe that the updated park will actually draw more residents to this park.
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. I personally come from a different district almost weekly while my son is in soccer season. I have also walked the trails while practices happen. This is a fantastic park and location in highlands ranch.
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	I rated this a 0 because this is an existing park - however it could also be a 5 since the other divisions were most likely consulted in the original project
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: *HIGHWAY HOUSING PARK*  
Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff  
Requested Amount: *2.75*

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	10	<i>Expanding/expanding uses - inclusive use.</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	10	<i>"family need" - clearly addressing a missing need.</i>
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	<i>not negative - states pro.</i>
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	<del>10</del> 3	<i>maybe a little more a headache.</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	7	<i>new investment in new equipment should decrease costs</i>
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	<i>well done.</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	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	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	

~~52~~  
- 67% -

**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: Heritage Playground/Restrm**  
**Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff**  
**Requested Amount: \$2,750,000**

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	As a regional park, Heritage is utilized by a variety of users/groups. The new playground/restroom design includes significant upgrades including heating of restrooms for year round use, increased ADA accessibility, more shade, and replacement of a 22 year old playground structure.
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	See above.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	Not available/applicable.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	Not available/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	Parts for the 22 year old playground are no longer made or hard to obtain. Restroom redesign eliminates needs to winterize the facility which is currently dependent on water from the park's irrigation system. Restrooms are typically closed from Nov. to Apr. New Poured in Place surfacing will be easier to maintain.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	Parks staff utilized an architecture firm for redesign. The firm researched county population data to identify currently underserved age groups and abilities in order to incorporate changes into the new design.
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	High safety and responsible stewardship of County owned resources.
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	Regional park that draws from all commissioner 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	2	Not collaborative with Open Space and HP. But Parks represents 33%.
5	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 2 = Fees are minorly inflated 5 = Fees are equitable or N/A	5	Fees are not applicable to the replacement of the playground/restroom areas.

<p align="center"><b>2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring</b></p>	<p><b>Project Name: Heritage Playground/Restroom Replacement</b>  <b>Project Origin:</b> BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff  <b>Requested Amount: \$2,750,000</b></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><b>Proper playground maintenance is crucial for ensuring the safety/longevity of play equipment. A well-maintained playground not only keeps kids safe, the new redesign also enhances their play experience with many new features!</b></p>
	<p><b>At 22 years old, it is time to replace the playground as it is close to the end of its useful life and replacement parts are hard to find or not available.</b></p> <p><b>As a regional park it is important to replace the existing restroom that can be utilized year round - not just between Nov. and Apr.</b></p> <p><b>The new design incorporates inclusive play amenities as well as other features to allow all age groups to collectively meet together.</b></p> <p><b>The City of Fort Collins is dealing with a \$12.1M shortfall in 2023 (prior \$9M in 2021) for upgrades to their park system. Ongoing upgrades/maintenance are needed to prevent same within the County.</b></p>

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

**Project Name: Highland Heritage Regional Park**  
**Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff**  
**Requested Amount: \$2,750,000**

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 area is highly utilized and the playground and restrooms need repair for families to continue using it. Given its central location and high level of visibility, renewing these facilities is important for Douglas County's brand and community enjoyment.
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	3	A better designed and more accessible park in the vicinity of properties would intuitively favorably impact property taxes.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	3	No estimate provided, but intuitively this will increase spending if the location is more desirable and drives more traffic. Given how centrally located this playground and park are, I believe this is likely.
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	Staff provided insight that the newer materials and design will reduce maintenance costs given the older facilities are requiring increased costs.
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	The plans and schematics are sufficient. I believe the commissioners should request designers to ensure all facets of the playground are high utilization and best in class. The outdoor fitness center may be a beneficial item to include, but I also wonder if other items are more utilized, such as a teeter-totter or something of that nature.
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

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

**Project Name:** Highlands Heritage Playground and bathroom 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	This would make the park more user friendly on a year round basis plus a play structure that is inclusive for children of all abilities is something that is needed more of in this county.
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	Inclusive play is a big movement and the PAB has heard several comments wanting more of these type of play environments. Also, having running water year round in a restroom facility seems like something that one of the most affluent counties in this nation should have, our residents dont want outhouses.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	No major changes to the park so no major changes expected
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	6	This could bring more people to the park with an inclusive play structure plus making it more user friendly year round
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 major impacts
5	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 2 = Adequate 5 = Detailed and Complete	5	Good planning by staff!
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 comment
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 are assesed

**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: Heritage Playground/Restrm**  
**Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff**  
**Requested Amount: \$2,750,000**

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	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	9	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	
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	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	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	

<p align="center"><b>2024 - Parks Funding Requests Internal Criteria and Scoring</b></p>	<p><b>Project Name: Heritage Playground/Restroom Replacement</b>  <b>Project Origin:</b> BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities, Staff  <b>Requested Amount: \$2,750,000</b></p>
<p>PAB Member: Larry Ziegler</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>Necessary replacement due to age of playground and the fact that restrooms will now be available year round.</p>

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

**Project Name: Sterling Ranch Soccer Complex**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

**PAB Member:**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	I rated this at a 12 because it fills a major need in all three districts. I know from personal experience with my children playing soccer that there is need for more fields in Douglas County. I currently drive over 30 minutes multiple times a week to my sons practices with Real soccer club. This will allow for more tournaments in the area so that Douglas County can benefit from the economic advantage of outside teams and families coming to Douglas County.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	There has not been a feasibility study to see how this would impact property tax. However, I do believe it would negatively impact property tax due to the location and that there are few homes surrounding this area. The location is fantastic for these 4 fields and potentially more in the future.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	10	I rated this a 10 because of the economic benefit this soccer complex could have for Castle Rock, Highlands Ranch and Sterling Ranch (restaurants, markets, retail etc). There will not be a charge to enter the complex and I think it is important that these fields are open to the public and even other teams to use - not just Real Soccer.
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	I rated this a 0 due to the fact that the land is owned by Sterling Ranch and would be leased/donated to Real Soccer. Real Soccer would manage the fields and surrounding area, the cost for building is unclear - but it would be beneficial to do a partnership with Real soccer or for their club to find donors, and investors to fund completely or in partnership with Douglas County, with the understanding that if Real soccer does not continue to maintain the fields, they become the property of Douglas County. My understanding as of now is that the \$400,000 is to create a site map, survey, and plans for the complex. With this upfront expenditure - my rating should probably be a 2 - but I was a little unclear as to what the rubric was fully asking as it pertains to the project.
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	This soccer complex would serve several soccer group needs - especially the Real soccer club. Although these fields are primary for soccer, they could be lined for Lacrosse. Being open to the public will allow various residents to use these fields as well which would be fantastic to have this type of partnership.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	5	Real Soccer Club has said that they would maintain the complex, so there does not seem to be any DC maintenance required at this time.
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	There is a need county wide for more fields, Douglas County residents from all districts will use these fields and spend money in up to 2 districts.
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	I rated this a 1 because for what Real Soccer is asking for Douglas County to contribute, I felt the plans and cost were sufficient. If there were to be ongoing cost after the initial planning, it would be my recommendation that the Parks Advisory Board have more information on what specific cost Douglas County would be incurring and what specific items the county would be paying for in the project.
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	I rated this a 1 because the collaboration would be with parks and Sterling Ranch, I am not sure what Open Space is in the area would be.

3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	2	I rated this a 2 because the public may need to pay to enter for tournaments, but we do not have enough information. So, I should have rated this a 3 for N/A at this time.
---	----------------------------------	--	---	---

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests**

**External  
Criteria and Scoring**

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments



STEELE RANCH

400,000

2024 - Parks Funding Requests - External Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: <i>STEELE RANCH</i>	
PAB Member: <i>Douglas County</i>			Project Origin: <i>ADCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities</i>	
			Requested Amount: <i>400,000</i>	
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	9	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	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	100% funded by DC
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	0	
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	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	
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	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	2	
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	2	

2024 - Parks Funding Requests  
External  
Criteria and Scoring

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

PAB Member:

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

Seeking opportunity to study a  
potential win-win  
public private partnership -  
in an unoccupied area.

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

**Project Name: Real CO/Sterling Ranch**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

**PAB Member: Karen Hickman**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	10	Jason Spires from Real Colorado gave a presentation at the Apr. PAB meeting re: the need for additional even tournament type soccer fields. Other youth sports leagues have concurred via email outreach to the BOCC and at two Town Halls.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	6	Assumed it will elevate surrounding property values in nearby Louviers and even draw new businesses along the Highway 85 corridor which will spur economic development. Calc.used by Parks staff limits impact to with 1000' which isn't applicable or realistic in some cases.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	10	Per prior presentations estimated annual economic benefit \$40M. Real Colorado is part of the MLS Next League which currently has 8,000 players across the US and Canada. And runs programs for both boys/girls in the national ECNL. Ability to attract large tournaments.
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	This is an example of a criteria that doesn't apply to a design/planning request or the eventual funding request. At this point, the full \$400,000 funding request will be paid for through the SUT \$'s. But a "0" lowers the overall score for the request.
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	2	At this time since it isn't clear whether other sports youth leagues will definitely be allowed to utilize the fields, I gave a slightly lower rank. But I am 100% in favor of recommending design/planning \$'s be awarded.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	5	The proposed site will be totally maintained by Real Colorado.
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	While limited to a single sports, this complex would meet the needs of a variety of youth sports leagues throughout all commissioner districts in the county. Variety of age groups incl. as young as 3!
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	2	Adequate at this point due to design/planning \$ request only. Separately I requested staff provide a parcel map showing is approx. location which wasn't provided, but discussed and not yet firm.
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	Not also collaborative with Open Space and HP. Instead of a "0" score, I gave it a 3 (33%) as Parks is represented.
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	2	Fees are unknown currently due to design/planning \$ ask. Other youth sports leagues will be able to share the complex at this time, but cost not confirmed. Recommend that field rental fees for non-Real Colorado members be similar to those paid currently.

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

PAB Member: Karen Hickman

**Project Name: Real Colorado/Sterling Ranch Soccer Complex**

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

**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

43

**100% in favor of recommending design/planning \$'s for this project. Recommend that design plan includes a transportation study due to current limitations of Moore Rd.**

**Unclear whether recent discussions re: a county-wide sports field complex would be in lieu or in addition to this complex. The proposal by Real Colorado at Wildcat is in addition to this request.**

**As previously discussed, I don't believe that the external scoring matrix works for a funding request for design/planning \$'s. Instead after the presentation, questions by PAB, and collective discussion amongst PAB members, each member should simply indicate a "thumbs up" or "thumbs down."**

**Or the scoring matrix should be changed slightly to allow for a N/A (not applicable) on certain criteria so as not to affect the total score.**

**As discussed, the 1000' radius used by Parks staff to determine property tax revenue isn't realistic for many projects.**

**Another article in 3/2020 by the NRPA discusses the complications of determining property tax revenue including multi-family housing impact, regional vs. community impact, and even trying to simply determine the center of a project.**

**Unclear whether any of the 33 studies cited tried to determine the commercial/economic impact as is the case with this request.**

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

**Project Name: Sterling Ranch Complex**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

**PAB Member: Luke Niforatos**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	10	This fills a gap in field availability in the rapidly growing Sterling Ranch and surrounding community which is largely young families who will use this. It is somewhat geographically removed from other population centers like Castle Rock and further North.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	10	None provided at this time. Positive impact on property taxes is likely given enhanced development and opportunities for families.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	10	No estimate provided at this time. These fields would be sure to bring outside spending. A presentation was referenced by the board vice chair that estimated up to \$40 million in potential spending from visitors.
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	4	Outside funding potential was presented to the board.
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	6	Information provided suggests REAL Soccer and other outside groups may use these fields.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	5	This is a feasibility study so no ongoing maintenance at this time.
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	This creates balance of recreation opportunities by meeting an unmet need in Sterling Ranch and surrounding communities.
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	3	
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	

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

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

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

**Project Name: Sterling Ranch Soccer Complex**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

**PAB Member: Jerrod Taylor**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	The PAB has heard about lack of usable fields in the county. This plus the fact that it would be a major facility for Sterling Ranch leads to this score
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	10	The potential for property tax increase is high as this facility could bring in other businesses to the area
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending		The ability to hold tournaments here could lead to substantial visitor spending in the area.
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	Design being funded by county, but future phases could have partner funding
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	Serves mainly the soccer community, but possibility of other sports being served with final design
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	5	Real will maintain the fields once built, great deal for the county
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	This would fill a need in the western portion of the county and would serve all commissioner districts
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	Feasibility study is adequately planned
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	No comment
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	Fees unknown at this time

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

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

--

Individual Project Score	Comments

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

**Project Name: Real CO/Sterling Ranch**  
**Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities**  
**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

**PAB Member: Larry Ziegler**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	11	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	4	
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	2	
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	
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	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	
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	3	
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	
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests**

**External**

**Criteria and Scoring**

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

**Project Name: Real Colorado/Sterling Ranch Soccer Complex**

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

**Requested Amount: \$400,000**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**41**

**Joint effort to explore new soccer field possibilities.**

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

**Project Name: Wildcat Reserve Regional Park Complex**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$92,000-250,000**

**PAB Member:**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	4	I rated this a 4 because we heard from several coaches from baseball and soccer teams that there is a need in Douglas County for more baseball and soccer fields. However, from the majority of the residents in Highlands Ranch who came to the Advisory Board Meeting, as well as the 900+ signatures obtained from residents near this area - the vast majority did not want this regional park complex in this specific area. Several people said they liked the idea, but not the location and thought it would better serve families in Douglas County if it were built near Lone Tree or Castle Rock. When I looked at the plans, I really liked the idea of all the partnerships and what this complex could offer Douglas County. But after visiting the Wildcat open space and hearing the 33 testimonies from residents with support from 100s more, I wonder if this would be received better in another location in Douglas County. It was mentioned that there are 54 other pieces of land that Douglas County owns that might be looked at for this project.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	I rated this a 0 because we do not have enough information. Although parks staff informed me that in general property values increase when a park is near by or back up to residential housing, there was no information on a regional park complex. Also, after listening to dozens of residents speak about how their view would be impacted, and that the premiums on their homes that backed up to the Wildcat open space would be affected, I do believe that for some, this could have a negative affect on their property values - especially due to potential restaurants and the 10,000 person amphitheater. It was clear from the signs, cheering, large number of residents who voiced opposition to this project and spending money on a feasibility study, that this is not what is wanted by the community and residents.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	I this a 0 because we do not have enough information. Although some of the potential plans were to put in two restaurants, many residents said that this location is not good for trying to create a regional park for sports due to the lack of surrounding restaurants and any hotels. Their main concern was that having a complex that is intended to bring people from outside of Douglas County and even the state for tournaments and use of the fields would negatively impact the subdivisions and a location closer to the highway would be better suited for such a project.
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	I rated this a 0 due to the fact that the land is owned by Douglas County but we do not have enough information to know any more about the funding. Even if there is potential for public partnerships that would pay for the baseball, soccer, swimming pool, and restaurants - this is unclear at the moment. Also, if these partnerships were to not continue this would be a large cost to Douglas County to continue to maintain. From hearing from some coaches who testified, they would be satisfied with having baseball and soccer fields and a large pool anywhere in Douglas County, they are not animate it needs to be in this location.
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	0	I rated this a 0 because Douglas County does not have contracts with any of the potential partnerships for this project, so it is hard to say what group(s) this would serve. The overwhelming census from the residents that came to the Parks Advisory Meeting was that this would not meet a need in their community, and on the contrary would be a detriment to the neighborhoods syringing the 600+ area of open space. Although the potential for a regional park complex like the preliminary plans showed would be wonderful in Douglas County, I do not believe this is the best location for such a large complex.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	0	I rated this a 0 because we do not have enough information and beyond a feasibility study, it would still be unclear what Douglas County would be responsible for and if a partnership did not work out, there would be a higher cost to maintain the complex by Douglas County.
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	I rated this a 2 because more than half of the complex would only be utilized by the district is rest in (restaurants, pickle ball courts inside and out, and trials) the other half which would be fields and the swimming pool would be used by Douglas County residents in more than one district if their kids at practices across district lines. I also rated this a slight imbalance because of the residents in this district that are opposed to such a large complex in the Highland Ranch subdivision. It does seem like if it were in Lone Tree then I-25 corridor would allow for all three districts to utilize a complex more abundantly and efficiently
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	0	I rated this a 0 because we do not have plans, cost, or even estimates on the cost of this large project. I also rated this a 0 because after hearing from so many Highlands Ranch residents it did not seem like a good use of money to spend up to \$1000 per acre for a feasibility study that the majority of citizens do not want
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	I rated this a 0 because we did not hear anything from Open Space to the Historical Preservation Boards. There was also concern that the Golden Eagles in the area that are nesting are federally protected and so this feasibility study should not move forward until more is understand from Open Space and the 1940 bald and golden eagle federal act.

3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	0	I rated this a 0 because we do not have any information. I also believe for more than half of what potentially would be in this complex it would not be equitable for most residents in Douglas County. Already, if you live outside of certain districts or specific area you have to pay more to swim, and indoor pickle ball courts are not inexpensive for the general public and families. I would also assume that most of the concerts at the amphitheater would have a cost similar to Fiddlers Green and for many families, this is not equitable with where the current economy is right now. Again, it was good to hear from so many citizens and how they feel this would negatively impact Highlands Ranch and the Wildcat Reserve Open Space. Most people would like public trails to use, but maintain the natural environment of the open space.
---	----------------------------------	--	---	--

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests**

**External  
Criteria and Scoring**

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments



2024 - Parks Funding Requests - External Criteria and Scoring			Project Name: <i>WILDCH</i>	
PAB Member: <i>DUFFY</i>			Project Origin: <i>BCCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities</i>	
			Requested Amount: <i>250,000</i>	
Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	3	question is need in general vs. need in this property.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	not clear if it would increase, decrease?
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	3	perhaps but guess some
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	100% county funded study
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	2	maybe different sports but not much else.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	0	fully executed by DC.
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	0	adds another 6 District 1
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	0	1 rough impact plan process for feasibility study public input is lacking.
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	3	all input from all sectors needed.
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	N/A

2024 - Parks Funding Requests

External  
Criteria and Scoring

PAB Member:

Project Name: WILDEAT

Project Origin: BCCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities

Requested Amount: 7350,000

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

This project seems needed  
In a study of sports need  
broadly - not just the property -  
very concerned about public input  
in this project so far - if  
study goes forward, please  
mandate extensive stakeholder  
process.

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

**Project Name: Wildcat Regional Park**  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount: \$250,000**

**PAB Member: Karen Hickman**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	Fills major need. Numerous youth sports leagues/others indicated need. Even opposition indicated great project just possibly not the right location.
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	3	Unclear whether there will be any impact on property taxes.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	6	Unclear total impact of visitor spending. Will depend on final design.
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	4	At this point, again due to design/planning phase, outside funding not clear. But appears that numerous partnerships are being discussed.
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	2	Design/planning \$ request only. But I am 100% in favor of recommending design/planning \$'s be awarded.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	2	At this point, it isn't clear whether DC will have any ongoing maintenance. If yes, appears to be minimal.
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	Development of this regional park will draw from all commissioner districts throughout the County. Including various youth sports leagues.
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	Due to design/planning \$ funding request, plans are adequate at this point.
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	Unclear whether final design will be collaborative with all 3. But at least 2 divisions.
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	Assumed as a regional park, access fees will be equitable or N/A.

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests**

**External**

**Criteria and Scoring**

PAB Member: Karen Hickman

**Project Name: Wildcat Regional Park**

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

**Requested Amount: \$250,000**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

39

100% in favor of recommending design/planning \$'s for this project. Recommend that design plan includes alt. plans incl. more natural/open space or possibly sale of parcel in order for the County to purchase alt. space.

As previously discussed, I don't believe that the external scoring matrix works for a funding request for design/planning \$'s. Instead after the presentation, questions by PAB, and collective discussion amongst PAB members, each member should simply indicate a "thumbs up" or "thumbs down."

Or the scoring matrix should be changed slightly to allow for a N/A (not applicable) on certain criteria so as not to affect the total score.

As discussed, the 1000' radius used by Parks staff to determine property tax revenue isn't realistic for many projects.

Another article in 3/2020 by the NRPA discusses the complications of determining property tax revenue including multi-family housing impact, regional vs. community impact, and even trying to simply determine the center of a project.

The County originally discussed their desire in '96 to have 200+ acres put aside for a regional park. It was conveyed in 2011 and the resolution/agreement indicates that the parcel can be utilized for various types of park amenities including sports fields.

I did a site visit of this parcel after the Town Hall meeting of 6/27 in order to better understand the perspective of the residents in opposition from The Hearth. There does appear to be extensive grading work needed and other challenges.

But again, it is time to let the process play out and either determine whether the project can proceed or other alt's. be determined.

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

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

**PAB Member:**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	6	This project has significant groups against it who are advocating passionately. In my personal research, a 2012 HRCA survey indicated a majority of Highlands Ranch residents do not want a new recreational facility, but last year's HRMD survey indicates a majority do support more facilities. This proposed feasibility study should deploy a targeted survey to the households directly impacted by this development to determine if there is public support for this project. I think determining the public support is a critical assessment that needs to be made, and the voices who cannot be heard in public hearings need to be given a hearing
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	No estimate provided at this time. But this will impact properties surrounding, whether good or bad I believe this should be studied.
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	No estimate provided at this time. I would estimate that we can expect more spending in the area.
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	No information provided at this time.
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	8	This proposed project would, if built as proposed, meet the needs of many different users and groups, with a wide array of sports and other opportunities. Public input aside, this area is bustling with families and children who need these facilities and currently have to drive longer than they should to access them.
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	0	No estimate provided at this time.
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 is an area with a gap in sports and parks availability, meeting this need could bring more balance across the county, since families have to drive to other districts for these services as was dicussed by several individuals in public comment.
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	0	
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	

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

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

--

--	--

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

**Project Name:** Wildcat Regional Park  
**Project Origin:** BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities  
**Requested Amount:**

**PAB Member:** Jerrod Taylor

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	I think it is important to note that the community surrounding the purposed area is very passionate about not developing this area. But, with what the PAB has heard over the last year, this would fill a major need for many user groups and something that I believe many residents in this county would support
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	0	Just too early rate a potential property tax impact without knowing exactly what could go in the space
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	0	Too early to tell potential impacts without know what could be in the space
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	The current feasibility study is fully funded by the county. Any additional asks in the future could include partner funding
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	While I think that this could potentially impact many, many user groups, it is hard to determine without seeing actual plans
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	0	unknown at this time
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	This area has the possibility to pull in users from all over the county, but too early to tell full potential impact.
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	1	I believe that it is adequete for a feasibility study, but staff should prepare to answer some of the questions brought up by the community and PAB
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	No comment
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	Fees not known at this time

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

PAB Member:

**Project Name:**

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

**Requested Amount:**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**2024 - Parks Funding Requests**

**External**

**Criteria and Scoring**

PAB Member: Larry Ziegler

**Project Name: Wildcat Regional Park**

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

**Requested Amount: \$250,000**

page 2

Individual Project Score

Comments

**28**

**Could be used to explore all design concepts for a County owned parcel.**

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

**Project Name: Wildcat Regional Park**  
**Project Origin: BOCC, Advisory Board, Public, Other Municipalities**  
**Requested Amount: \$250,000**

**PAB Member: Larry Ziegler**

Total Points	Criteria	Points	Score	Comments
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	6	
10	Estimated impact on property tax	0 = No impact 3 = Minimal impact 6 = Moderate impact 10 = Substantial impact	2	
10	Estimated visitor spending	0 = No visitor spending 3 = Minimal visitor spending 6 = Moderate visitor spending 10 = Substantial visitor spending	8	
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	1	At this point, again due to design/planning phase, outside funding not clear. But appears that numerous partnerships are being discussed.
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	0	
5	Ongoing maintenance implications for Douglas County	0 = Fully maintained by DC 2 = Partially maintained by DC 5 = No DC maintenance	2	
5	Creates a balance of recreation opportunities throughout the County by Commissioner District	0 = Creates major imbalance 2 = Creates minor imbalance 5 = Creates balance	4	
3	Sufficiently detailed project scopes, plans, and cost estimates. Application is complete	0 = Insufficient and Incomplete 1 = Adequate 3 = Detailed and Complete	0	
3	Collaborative project with Parks, Historic Resources, and Open Space	0 = Not collaborative 1 = Collaborative with 2 Divisions 3 = Collaborative with all 3 Divisions	2	
3	Public access fees are equitable	0 = Fees are not equitable 1 = Fees are minorly inflated 3 = Fees are equitable or N/A	3	