

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Wildcat Reg Park Vision scorecards submitted)	(4 \$5,400,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	37
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	7
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	32

**Public Accessibility and
Population Use** (Consider
driving distance from population
centers and if there is proper
public access) 40

Cost of Funding (Consider
if it is a one-time cost or
ongoing) 6

**Historic and Cultural
Resources** (Consider
structures and other significant
cultural attributes of the
property) 6

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 24

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 14

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 12

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 12

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and a
vegetation features) 7

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

This property works well as open space!! The property is small (202 acres) but has a large conservation value due to its being adjacent to the large wildlife vcorridor which consists of Backcountry, Daniels Park, and Cherokee Ranch. Many animals, including a herd of 50-100 elk, are known to be in this area. Douglas County and/or HRCA should strongly consider a conservation easement for this property. Note: property is already conserved as open space. *I support use of county open space funds, to help support, in prtnerships With other entities, the cost of improvements. The extentand cost of trail rlated improvements should be reevaluated, however, to bring those costs down. They have aged to do this. *A conservation easement, held by DLC or other conservation organization, and where the county is parting to that and would have to approve any amendments to the easemetn is strongly recommended. This would provide the level of assurance that the HR community seeks to ensure the property is preserved in perpetuity. *A wildlife sutdy and expertise should be utilized to evaluate the location of the trail and associated improvements to minimize impact to the elk herd. They have agreed to this. *The trail alignment should be reevaluated to provide as direct a connection is possible, to the East-West Regional trail, as supported by the enabling Relutions.

80

Work between DOCO + HRCA needs to determkin these factors. No other partnerships yet. They really really should develop partnerships with multiple lots and trailheads. Both parking lots are on well traveled roads and adjacent to homes in Highlands Ranch, access would be easy and quick for any event on this property. HRCA is open to searching public partnerships, such as GOCO. Summary: I recomend a transfer of Wildcat property to the HRCA. I am intrigued with hte suggestion that HRCA fund a 50/50 partnership with the County. They are asking the county to fit the bill for all improvements in their appliation, but said at COSACmeeting they are willing to seek partnerships.

80

Before a deal can be finalized. 1) Protect the conservation values. It is a 200 acre open field in gently rolling terrain that will have a 3 mile trail and two parking lots and trailheads. Both parking lots are on well traveled roads and adjacent to homes in Highlands Ranch, access would be easy and quick for any event on this property. The proposed capital improvements will enhance public safety if the land is transfered to the HRCA. Considers fire safety and HRCA has trail rangers.

80

Via conservation easement or public/private agreement. Well located population use since this property is next to Highlands Ranch and is only 2+ miles from Castle Pines. It will have a concrete ADA-compliant 3 mile trail. HRCA says the new 3 mile trail will be open to all area residents, not just HRCA members. Open to all DougCo residents, will have adequate parking, toilets, ADA considerations, connection to the Ease-West Regional Trail. Public access would be allowed and trailheads improved and constructed.

2) A management plan to protect the wildlife. VERY HIGH one time cost: \$5.4M vs \$500k from earlier discussions. We were told earlier \$500k cost was just for trail. Seems particularly high for only 3 miles of trail. HRCA claims they need vehicle rated bridge on trail and multiple fire hydrants on trail. HRCA was challenged to consider just how much less (way less than \$5.4M) can they get by with and still meet the intent of this proposed project. HRCA has no real funding source, funding if granted, should be staggered so that the request does not overwhelm our annual funding for capital improvements, etc. It's a onetime ask. The extent of improvements is well above any open space for trail access.

3) An agreement on a recreation plan: a) trail alignment, b) cost+ No Significant historic or cultural resources. The property was a small part of the long ranching history in the area, but no historic structures or artifacts are on this particular property. Homesteader building is on the Backcountry property. Part of an historic ranch, though no historic resources are located on this property. Features of the trailhead + trail. (the \$5,329,947 proposal is not realistic.) None for Douglas County. HRCA says they will cover the management and maintenance costs since this proposal calls for the county to transfer ownership of this property to HRCA. 100% on HRCA; or 50/50 with Douglas County partnership. Management and maintenance would be provided by HRCA.

4) HRCA should have neighborhood planning meetings. Some connectivity for the property and proposed trail connections. The proposed 3 mile loop trail doesn't extend an existing regional trail (EW trail), but it connects and additional trailhead to the EW trail. The proposed 3 mile loop trail is connected to the East West trail on the East side, and will be connected to a trailhead on the West side. Network with the Backcountry. Trails have potential to connect to Ease-West regional trail. Wildlife corridor may be affected by trail alignment.

5) An alternative option would be to put a 5k trail somewhere else in the back country and leave wildcat undeveloped. This property is part of the large wildlife corridor including Backcountry, Daniels Park, and Cherokee Ranch. A large herd of elk (50-100) is known to be in this immediate area (this property and nearby in the adjacent part of Backcountry). The bridge over the gulch may be a concern, but is essential for public safety. Elk herd, local to this area, uses this property frequently and is enjoyed by area residents. Location of this proposed trail may negatively impact that herd.

32

The property is mostly open field adjacent to Highland Ranch homes on the North and the Backcountry Wilderness Area on the other sides. There are very few trees and scrub, and one small stream that is dry most of the year. The views in the area are of the hills on adjacent property, and the far off front range mountains. 100%!!

32

Can be seen from Monarch Bluff. Limited educational research opportunities. This is an open field that is small compared to the adjacent Backcountry Wilderness Area. Most of the animals and other features are on adjacent properties. Great access to the High School, and offers access for additional educational programs.

32

Has potential to be studied and used for educational purposes.

Missing scorecard from:

Patti Hostetler, Tom
Rundell, Kathie Shandro,
Elizabeth Snow

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Sandstone Ranch Survey (7 scorecards submitted)	\$250,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	40
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	54
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	36
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	55
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	30
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	41

Management and Maintenance Costs (Consider ongoing maintenance cost, staff, vendor costs, and equipment costs)	33
Network of Preserved Open Spaces (Consider trail connections, and wildlife corridors)	24
Wildlife Values and Critical Habitat (Consider the comprehensive plan section 9 wildlife resources, connection to other properties and important habitat)	13
Scenic Views from the Roadway (Consider geological, topographic and vegetation features)	12
Educational Research (Consider property data, geological, topographic and a vegetation features)	21

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- In general, funding for the cultural survey should be split between Historic Resources and Open Space.
- \$250,000 will pay for the full survey. 1. Must finish cultural survey to plan more trails. 2. Repair critical needs on historic structures.
- The cultural survey funding should come from Open Space.
- The repairs of historic properties costs should be from HP. Both are greatly needed at Sandstone.
- Will enable palm barn, Preservation & public access for Phase II. No funding request from COSAC. Just looking for support. Yet historic buildings may should be divorced from cultural survey.
- 80 Limited impact in this criteria.
- Historic Preservation & Open Space can partner.
- Historic Com.
- 80 Partner with historical preservation. Since this is regarding historical buildings that happen to be on an open space.
- Any empty building as noted by staff presents a problem.
- 80 Building is in bad shape, is visible from Ranch overlook-but there is no general public access to building.
- SE Douglas County not too far from Castle Rock.
- Sandstone Phase II
- Will support surveys needed to expand trails.
- 80 Location is visible from trails open to the public, but building is not open to general public.
- Substantial request from COSAC budget. Substantial ask, but highly recommended by staff, which is important.
- Minimal. Open Space takes care of Open Space. One-time (\$0 requested from OSNR) .
- 48 One-time cost of \$250k to address critical restoration needs identified in updated HSA.
- Important structures.
- Important to continue to maintain existing structures. Ongoing cultural resource surveys are a necessary part of preservation of Douglas County properties.
- Currently an area not surveyed.
- 48 Finish cultural survey before trail expansion.
- Built in 1870's.

- Fishy request by staff with established values.
Helps with a strategic plan to have scheduled maintenance.
Maintenance and restoration is critical to Douglas County owned properties.
- 48 Request is for one time cost only.
- Will enhance trail buildout.
As part of a larger project expansion of trails at Sandstone may connect to Pike Nat'l Forest.
- 32 Phase I trails are nearby, and ranch roads go near this barn.
-
-
- 32 Limited impact.
-
-
- Away from roadway.
- 32 Not visible from public roadways.
-
-
- Preserves history.
- 32 More historic resources adds to more educational resources.

Missing scorecard from:

Jennifer Drybread

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Greenland Townsite (8 scorecards submitted)	\$25,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	34
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	32
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	46
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	37

X

Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing) 40

Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property) 42

Management and Maintenance Costs (Consider ongoing maintenance cost, staff, vendor costs, and equipment costs) 31

Network of Preserved Open Spaces (Consider trail connections, and wildlife corridors) 18

Wildlife Values and Critical Habitat (Consider the comprehensive plan section 9 wildlife resources, connection to other properties and important habitat) 13

Scenic Views from the Roadway (Consider geological, topographic and vegetation features) 9

Educational Research (Consider property data, geological, topographic and a vegetation features) 28

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- Small turn off site with signage. 40 ft x 200 ft of County owned property.
Parcel is under a conservation easement.
Is this available per the conservation easement?
Should this site be at the trailhead and dog park?
Review easements (conservation + historical?) uncleared of direct relation to Open Space.
Project could enhance the recreational features of the Greenland Ranch area.
- 80 Condition of Greenland townsite buildings won't have major impact here.
Partnership with Larkspur. Non-identified. We can partner with Historic Preservation. Larkspur Historical Society, Historic Preservation Board.
Partnerships should be explored.
Townsite more of a historical impact vs natural. Partnership with historical preservation.
- 80 Public Improvement Historic Society, Historic Preservation.
A traffic pull out area on Noe Road is an unsafe area. People will park there no matter what.
Ensure no expectation of parking area/pull off at intersection at Noe road turn.
Visitation and public safety would be considered in sign placement.
Buildings are in poor condition and (I think) public has access to the outside of these buildings.
- Promotes usage.
Unknown-have not ever seen anyone stop and look at the Post Office.
Accessibility may be a problem.
The Greenland Townsite is one of the rare widely accessible historical locations in Douglas County. Interpretive signage would benefit everyone who stops there. Great idea! Not super accessible. Not near existing trailhead or dog park. May be difficult to understand this is a public site. Low visitation is envisioned. The site is for removed from population centers.
- 80 While it's in the Southern part of the county, these buildings are just off I25.

- One-time ask, but value of \$25k of total COSAC budget.
Minimal.
- Appreciate the improvement but \$? Would a lower \$ prove effective?
Consideration for parking, not just sign. Staff supportive, which helps.
Important to highlight & educate. Does signage cost this much? This, exp as not intended for parking, just a "pull through". Valued if better developed, concerned about \$.
- One-time. Low-
cost project is proposed.
- 48 Cost is low - one time cost.
More broad based signage.
Excellent historical education opportunity.
Historic. Greenland area was economic driver of Douglas County. Could full historic town restoration be a bigger vision?
Proposed are 2 signs about the history of the Townsite and 1 for the Greenland area.
- 48 One-time ask, without maintenance?
Unknown Historic Preservation maintains this site.
Great project which encourages additional public education.
Low cost for management and maintenance.
- 48 Unknown, but should be low. This proposal is just for one time costs.
- Yes-Connects to Greenland Open Space.
Sort of on Front Range Trail Route, but not new connection.
- 32 Greenland is part of huge area of conserved adjacent properties.
- None-dirt road.
Will the signs include information on nature & wildlife?
Minimal wildlife impact is anticipated. Historical
- 32 buildings have limited impact on wildlife and habitat.
- No scenic views.
Minimal impact.
- 32 Can see from I25.
Promotes history.
Potential is limited due to no parking.
Interpretive signing expected.
Signage could highlight topographic and vegetation features.
- 32 Important location from frontier days.

Other Comments not under Criteria

Recommended is that the signage that speaks to the open space, wildlife and natural resources come from the open space capital account. This would pay for one sign, approximately \$8k. Other partnerships should be explored to pay for the two signs that speak to the history of the area.

Missing scorecard from:

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Prairie Canyon Ranch Survey (8 scorecards submitted)	\$65,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	27
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	30
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	44
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	36
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	35
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	46

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 24

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 18

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 16

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 15

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and a
vegetation features) 25

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

Property is already preserved.
Important cultural resources that need further protection. Identifies
needs. Opens the space to the public. Necessary pre-
requisite before considering opening PCR to open to the public. Property is
80 already conserved.
None specified.
Great if covered by Historic Preservation. Not
considering historic resources as an external partner. Historic
Preservation has already been granted \$760k per year for projects such as
these. Historic
80 Preservation + Open Space.

Has to do with a historic survey, not public safety.
Will be considered in survey.
80 Structural integrity of Prairie Canyon's barn has some issues.
None specified
Location in SE Douglas County.
This may rank low, but is a required project to open Prairie Canyon Ranch to
more public access.
A major focus of the survey is to increase public use of the property. The
property is far from population centers.
80 Limited public access today.
Minimal.
Cost to improve Highway 83 is very high. Perhaps wait to see if CDOT could
contribute.
One-time ask.
One time cost for the survey.
48 \$65k one time cost.

This site is loaded with cultural & historic.
Further protection of cultural resources is extremely important.
Artifact heavy.
Project: Full Cultural Resource Survey. The hope is that this survey would be the
first step toward better conservation of historical structures and PUBLIC
ACCESS i.e. Trails! Hooray! Prairie Canyon Ranch would be a fantastic public
resource if opened for hiking, biking, equestrian.
Want to survey cultural resources, not historic structures.
Major focus of the survey.
48 Ranch buildings and items stored within have frontier era historical value.

- None specified.
 Cost to ensure property remains in a positive natural state is important.
 Potential added costs if/when artifacts are found. Will
 48 be considered in survey.
- None specified.
 Great connection to Castle Wood Canyon. Will
 be considered in the survey - possible access to Castlewood Canyon.
 Limited public access and trails today. But property location next to Castlewood
 32 Canyon presents future opportunities.
- None specified.
 Increased use of land.
 Will be considered in the survey.
 When combined with adjacent properties (Castlewood Canyon), there is a large
 32 wildlife benefit.
- None specified.
 Will be considered in the survey.
 32 Along CO hwy 83, set back from road.
- Grant potential for discovering & education.
 Unknown. May not want to make easily accessible to public.
 Survey will increase property data, vegetation and topographic data.
 32 Lots of historical interest in PCR facilities, especially ranch buildings and items.

Other Comments not under Criteria

This is a cultural resource survey, and is a prerequisite before other improvements. Consider a partnership with the DC Historic Preservation Board. The survey for access, trails and parking could be paid for by open space. A survey of the historic resources could be paid for by HPB or other sources.

Missing scorecard from:

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
High Line Canal Conservancy Funding Resource Mgt Plan (ER) (7 scorecards turned in)	\$15,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	47
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	48
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	40
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	48
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	35
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	28

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 24

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 16

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 24

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 15

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 24

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- Request is for conservation plan-800 acres of open space.
Enhance habitat and native vegetation planning to care for challenged tree canopy.
The plan will study enhancing habitat and native vegetation that will survive with less water.
Plan will outline next steps to enhance natural resources and habitat along DC segment.
550 acres of open space in Arapahoe, Adams all protected with conservation easements but not in Douglas county-why not? Improves habitat and native plants through better management.
- 80 Ask is 3% of the conservation plan, partnerships from all the other municipal & county partners.
Collaborative effort with 14 agencies.
Requested is 3% of the total cost of the management plan.
Great collaborative project.
- 80 Collaborate with 14 different agencies. Steering committee has 5 agencies. DC request is \$15k-only 3% of total cost!
Not addressed in the conservation plan, although framed throughout the canal.
Plan for tree hazard mitigation and fire safety. Addresses a likely public safety issue.
Looking at fire safety.
- 80 Removal of hazard trees and fire mitigation needs identified.
HLC is enjoyed by many users - 1 million trail users per year, 340K residents withing 1 mile.
A regional amenity that will consider population use in the study.
1 million trail users per year currently.
- 80 Well used by hikers, cyclists, equestrian already. Plum Creek and Chatfield,
One time cost.
This project ask is for a small amount of DOCO funding for a big return of useful information.
Small one time ask only 3% of total project cost asked of Doug Co. Plan will help prioritize ongoing expenditure and restoration efforts.
Low cost and one-time ask.
Ongoing irrigations costs?
One time cost for study. Cost of recommendations implementation would be separate. Guidance from NRM Plan will be critical on future tree planting and watering strategy.
- 48
- Huge historic resource.
NRM plan not focused on historic or cultural issues.
Yes-agricultural heritage will be factored in management plan.
- 48 The HighLine Canal IS a historic TREASURE.

- One time ask for the plan does not.
Define needed maintenance and support establishment of funding partnerships.
The study will account for management and maintenance costs.
Parks currently maintains trail segment in DC.
- 48 With so many agencies (14) have centralized organization for maintenance.
Connects to Chatfield state park, Waterton canyon.
71 mile recreational trail and Inearpark. Supports habitat conservancy. No change with this project.
The management plan will consider trail connections and wildlife usage.
Plum creek trail will connect as well as Centennial trail.
Tied into multiple trails all over Denver area and Doug Co. 18 of 71 miles are in
- 32 Douglas County.
- It is a wildlife corridor throughout the 71 miles.
Supports critical wildlife habitat. Improves native vegetation and habitat.
Plan will take this into account.
Improve native vegetation and habitat. 190+ bird species, 25 mammals, 15+ reptiles. Concern over health of cotton woods without comprehensive
- 32 management plan.
- Numerous opportunities along the 71 mile trail.
Canal crosses 15 roadways in the county enticing users with tree-lined canopy.
Scenery and trail visible from whys all over Metro Denver. Highline crosses 15
- 32 roads in Douglas County.
Citizen research is ongoing, along with staff.
The study will be useful information includes a study on the trees along the canal in DOCO.
Plan will recommend citizen scientist initiatives that can support natural resource restoration and interpretive opportunities.
Plan will recommend educational opportunities.
- 32 Plan will recommend citizen science initiatives.

Other Comments not under Criteria

The management plan is forward looking and anticipates what flora and fauna will survive with less water. For that reason, the project would provide valuable information for the continued use of the Highline Canal. Recommend funding requested amount from OS capital fund.
A resource management plan is needed, and the conservancy has done a great job communication that need.

Missing scorecard from:

Tom Rundell

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
HRMD Historical Park Funding (7 scorecards submitted)	\$250,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	36
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	29
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	28
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	33
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	16
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	25

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 11

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 13

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 7

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 8

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and a
vegetation features) 13

HR

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

80 Already conserved.
1.5 Public Process.
195 acres, \$1.5MIL to plan to save project/like now this is North Douglas County. Historic versus Open Space. Overall
ranking correctly is not possible due to a lack of information.
Aim to support natural habitat, historic elements, preserving history and culture.

80 0/0 Open Space.
2026 Shea donates land. Mansion for events. Possibly
partner with Parks and Historic preservation to share in this contribution.
Historic Preservation and Parks should participate in the funding request. Not
sure if it comes out of capital or acquisitions. Acquisitions S/B for acquisitions.
How does Open Space fund this versus Parks & Rec? Like the project, but not
with COSAC. Is there a way to split with other stakeholders?
Project managed by HRMD who seems to have many partners.

80 Fire Station #20. Search & Rescue Education @ center. Public
safety unknown. Not
addressed.

80 Added trails, looking for more safe.
Pertains to District II.
Open space access in Northern tier. Central to H.R. Seems
very accessible and already running programs for kids.

48 External resources? Conservation trust fund/lottery.
Minimal if Parks & Historic Stephanie Stanley estimates \$1.5MIL for
site analysis & master planning the development of this resource. Asking \$250k.
On the one hand, there is a great value in developing this Shea property. On the
other hand, funding a Metro District's project might cause pause, as it might
create precedence. Parts feel like an Open Space project. Can we fund
only the Open Space portions of the project? Funding ask not listed here.
Verbally stated as \$250k of \$1.5MIL for public process and master plan. Totally
unclear how much related to Open Space.

48 Historical Mansion/Various Barns.

48 100 Max Wants per/year. Asked for CO grants \$ - \$900k to stabilize buildings.
Not addressed.

Added trails, looing to add more trails. Connects
to Wildcat Regional Park and back country. Connections
into neighborhoods, but no connections to Regional trails or H.R. backcountry
trails mentioned.
32 In the future, possible connections to existing trail network in open space.

Wildlife Corridor.
Unknown Not
32 addressed.

32 Not addressed.

4H & Rodeo Arena? (2007). Historic, park & rec/education component.
Potential grant education opportunities. Not
32 addressed.

Other Comments not under Criteria

COSAC needs more information. I am looking for possible contribution for passive open space planning on this property. For example, trail planning. I would not support open space funding for planning of an historic park, which primarily include restoration of historic buildings. In the future, if trails are proposed for passive recreational purposes, funding could be considered.

Missing scorecard from:

Jim Guerra

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Macanta Regional Park (7 scorecards submitted)	\$3,800,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	40
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	34
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	55
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	59
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	8
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	22

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 37

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 24

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 21

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 23

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 12

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

80 A park will be developed on a present day undeveloped tract, with partial
cons/duration to wildlife. 463
Acres, 232 future open space. Expected to be as
busy/critical co the Bluffs. Passive recreation with hiking, biking, equestrian use.
Property is already conserved.

80 We are being asked to fund the whole buildout. Developer.
Looks like an Open Space project. \$5.5
MIL value donated by developer. \$450K donated by developer.
\$450K otherwise, county only.
Would like to see this project funded in partnership with Parks. Great project!
Funded by Parks. The
developer is proposes to contribute \$450K.

80 8ft trash w/handicap accessibility. Adds
more area to monitor & maintain. ADA
accessibility. Probably
far more than a "10". Presumably
80 public safety was considered in the design of the trails and other amenities.
Handicapped accessible. Passive
Recreation, hikes, bike, equestrian, 12 miles of path.
ADA = parking & trails under 8%. Trails
80 would be used by residents in nearby population centers. There is access off
Crowfoot Valley road , though accel/decel lanes may be required.

48 Should be a Parks project. No other partners identified. Regional Parks are under the
aspics of the Parks & Trails dept, has been budgeted into the Parks 2023 budget.
Fund only Open Space portions. Substantial
ask for COSAC. 40% apx ask versus value donated. May need extra \$. Substantial ask
for COSAC. Will developed project that works with other funding sources. Big ask in
general. Donation of land by developer. But we can't ask
GOCO because Parks already budgeted. \$3.8 million. Acel/decel
80 possible additional. Maintenance costs would be ongoing.

48 Survey S/B done by historic preservation. Avoiding
bothering these, but how?

- Castle Rock & Cherry Creek Trail Connections. Open
 Space should have no long term maintenance. \$55k in
 labor costs/year. Parks can
 easily afford the estimated \$55K annual costs. Fully maintained
 and supported by D.C. Parks, Trails and Building Grounds.
 48 Ongoing maintenance costs (possible by parks).
- No guarantee that the low density housing will not be replaced by high density
 housing. Will
 connect Castle Rock and Cherry Creek. Dovetails
 with Cobblestone & Hidden Mesa. Great
 connectivity to adjacent open spaces. Planned
 connections through Cobblestone and down to Cherry Creek Regional Trail.
- 32 Possible to connect to Cherry Creek trail and nearby neighborhoods.
 Last chance for the Reuter Hess E/H & pronghorns. Bluffs 4
 miles. 2 wildlife
 corridors. Trails designed to
 avoid wildlife corridors. Creates a greater migration
 corridor. Design considerate of wildlife. Buffer for wildlife moving from
 Reuter Hess to Hidden Mesa and Gateway diverse wildlife there. Considered wildlife
 32 corridors in trail placement. Numerous opportunities to observe
 Beautiful land. So
 beautiful! Macanta is one of the prime jewels in the Douglas County natural
 resources crown. I have long waited for the realization of this goal. This project is
 going to be amazing! Trails could be
- 32 seen from Crowfoot Valley roads.
 None identified. Interpretive
 signage. Potential for
 educational signage. May add interpretive
 32 signage.

Other Comments not under Criteria

Macanta Regional park is envisioned as a passive park (much like Bluffs Regional Park). It is located in a beautiful natural setting of rolling hills and gamble oak. It will be a draw for Castle Rock, Parker, and area residents, as well as residents from throughout Douglas county and the region. I recommend the use of the capital funds that were acquired through the 1994 resolution for open space and that have since been reallocated to Parks for the construction of trails on this property.

Comment Summary

Macanta Regional Park has a feel of an open space property similar to The Bluffs Regional Trail. It will be a local and regional draw for the natural beauty and trails. Trails will connect to Hidden Mesa Open Space, Cobblestone Open Space and the Cherry Creek Regional. Impact to wildlife should be minimized. This project has been approved in the Parks Dept budget and operated by Parks. It is possible Open Space funds may be used to accelerate construction. If open space funds are used then consider adjusting the 1994 resolution allocation dollars from the Parks Department to the Open Space Dept.

Missing scorecard from:

Jim Guerra

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Lone Tree High Note Park Phase I (7 scorecards turned in)	\$2,500,000 out of \$8,000,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	21
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	51
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	44
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	64
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	23
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	12

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 31

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 13

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 6

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 15

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 8

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

Protects the Happy Canyon Riparian area.
Request is for the mile in-park loop trail. This does not appear to meet criteria for open space trail project funding in the resolutions trails and open space account. Though park itself preserves open space, this seems to be parks project. Regional trail connections funded through creek stabilization project. PCR the request to fund the implementation of a trail through the park. The only conservation attribute is recreation.
37 of 80 acres will be conserved as passive open space. Unclear about wildlife corridor benefits due to small passive open space area.

80

One-half of the proposed segment of the trail located in open space is already funded.
In process.
Douglas County would be 25% of Phase I funding. Broad community support. Great opportunity to seek additional funding partners.
Multiple partnerships. South Suburban, Lone Tree, Doug County, Rampart Range, Metro District, Mile High Flood District. Doug Co maybe 25% of cost.

80

Passive use? Yes.
Ease of access for public off light rail, I-25. Managed by SSPRD.
At grade crossing on High Note avenue in 2 locations ADA accessible.
Unclear about public safety impacts or benefits.
This project has the attributes of an active recreational project. Placing a "passive use trail" next to a active recreational project isn't the intent of the resolution. Can Lone Tree offer a better open space project in Highnote, on next to Highnote, the DOCO could consider as a junior funding partner?
In fast urbanizing area near I25 and Ridgeway pkwy. One of few green spaces
One time ask.
City of Lone Tree & South Suburban contributing majority of funds. Doug Co 25% of Phase I.
One time cost.

80

48

Connects to Schweiger Ranch-historic. While
Schweiger Ranch is nearby and some historic resources (projectible points) found on-site, particular project isn't addressing those. Future
interpretive signage identifying cultural resources. Not part of this funding request. Arrowheads
have been found on property. Schweiger Ranch is next door. It's a park with ballfields and Amphitheater. Little history or cultural benefits.

48

- None.
Will be managed and maintained by SSPRD.
- 48 Maintenance by South Suburban.
- Connection to Schweiger Ranch, East-West Regional Trail.
Proposed in-park trail is not a regional trail, does not connect open spaces.
Active users near trail will discourage wildlife actively. Funding request is for a trail loop that most likely will connect to additional trails.
Happy Canyon Trail tied into East/West and other (e.g. Bluffs). Minimal wildlife corridor-narrow with a lot of human presence.
- 32
- Connect to Schweiger & the underpass to Bluffs Regional Park.
In-park trail is for humans.
Funding request for this trail includes no wildlife enhancement components.
Adding a large human presence to what is today and undeveloped and natural area has a negative impact on wildlife in the area.
- 32
- Great view from I25, Ridgeway Ave
Visible from I 25
- 32 Is visible from I25 at Ridgeway.
None mentioned
Potential for educational signage along trail. Not funding by this request.
Tree canopy in Phase 2 would offer unique educational opportunities for children.
- 32

Other Comments not under Criteria

One half of the proposed one-mile trail that is along the Happy Canyon Regional Trail is already funded. The remaining proposed trail segment is not located in open space and connects ball fields and other active recreation amenities and is more of a park funded opportunity. The canopy tree walk, proposed for a future phase, is in the Happy Canyon Creek corridor, and might be a future opportunity for open space funding. For the reason described above, my ranking score for all categories is NA.

High Note Regional Park will be an AMAZING amenity for the people of Douglas County. I'll bet it quickly surpasses bluffs as the most visited. The ranking parameters don't measure the true value of this project. I think \$8MIL is a very reasonable cost given it's central location and broad appeal.

Missing scorecard from:

Tom Rundell

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
High Line Canal Conservancy Origins Story Trailhead Improvement (ER) (7 scorecards turned in)	\$450,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic features, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	40
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	51
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	47
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	49
		Cost of Funding (Consider if it is a one-time cost or ongoing)	26

Historic and Cultural
Resources (Consider
structures and other significant
cultural attributes of the
property) 36

Management and
Maintenance Costs
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 20

Network of Preserved
Open Spaces (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 16

Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 14

Scenic Views from the
Roadway (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 9

Educational Research
(Consider property data,
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 24

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- Property is controlled by Denver Water Easement.
Expected to encourage passive use for multiple user groups. Not significant changes.
Only enhances recreation.
- 80 Encourage passive use for multiple user groups. More use than today.
- Very reliant on the county for the majority of the prospect.
HLC conservancy offers significant cost-share collaboration with Denver Water.
Greater partnerships if looking at the trail as a whole; they propose to 1/4 of the total costs of this project.
Highline match + Denver Water partnership.
DC - \$450K some from Parks, some from Historic, some from open space. DC to fund 2/3 of cost. Can we get funds from GOCO? Denver Water to provide history for interpretive signs.
- 80
- Not a concern.
No significant impact. Safer/better access with improved grade.
Improved accessibility. No plans to expand parking area currently.
- 80 Improved accessibility and amenities at trailhead will increase public safety.
Will provide handicap usability.
On 10/15/2024 Columbus/indigenous people's day only 4 cars in lot while Waterton Canyon was at 90% full with maybe 100 cars. Presenter didn't have figures on use. Consider cost vs. usage. Water usage stats? Would connection to Waterton Canyon trailhead be better use of funds to get more users to HLC trailhead?
Improve accessibility for users.
Current informal trail is very under used. Improved amenities at this trailhead should draw more users. Bigger change will come with future improvements where trail crosses South Platte.
- 80
- 2/3s - 1/3 split. One time ask. I would like to understand why this project has priority over closing the Plum Creek Gap which is a major regional trail project. This project is best suited as a historic preservation project. I would like to hear more about the project before suggesting open space funding. Not parsing between parks and open space. Unclear ask without this distinctly. Cost share with Highline Conservancy. Capital costs one-time with cost share.
One time investment. Cost is pretty firm. Design is 60% + complete. Cost is leveraged by HL Conservancy from private donations.
- 48

Tremendous.
Plan for HLC identified this as regional destination to interpret canal's history for all of Doug Co.
Great plan to highlight historic and cultural attributes.
Has all 3 trails for parks, historical and cultural and interpretive signs and exhibits.
48 One time.
Maintenance will be partnership with HLC for signage and benches. For trailhead, erosion control may reduce maintenance costs. Doug Co parks does current maintenance.
Parks would maintain improvements.
DC parks and Red dept will do maintenance. Parks have been involved with discussions.
48 Runs along Chatfield State Park, connects with Waterton Canyon.
The Plum Creek gap around miles 9-11 seems like a major problem to accessing most of the regional trail. Santa Fe underpass expected to open spring 2025.
This support 9 miles of access.
Trailhead may also service Waterton Canyon.
Will increase use of under-utilized section of Highline Canal in
32 Roxborough/Waterton areas of Douglas County.

Already present.
Project isn't expected to change current wildlife values/habitat.
Other than interpretation opportunity there is no positive impact to wildlife.
Interpretive signs and displays will educate visitors about Canals history and ecosystem.
32

Several along Waterton road, Titan Road, Rampart Range Road.
No scenic value from Waterton Road. Proposed accessibility and visibility may entice new users.
Visible from Waterton Road.
32 This is alone Waterton road near the Platte Canyon Reservoir-visible from road.

Great potential for school groups, citizen group.
Telling story of canal, water, and local history a priority. Site highlights existing historical and cultural resourced land adds significant interpretation.
32 Outdoor classroom with all the exhibits and signs.

Other Comments not under Criteria

This project is shovel ready, though that is not a criteria perse. This project scores high on COSAC's criteria but they would take less \$ if necessary and phase improvements over time or look for other funders. There is opportunity for joint funding on County parks & Historic Preservation.

The Highline Canal Origins Trailhead is one of my favorite places in Douglas County. And so, it is very exciting to see the conservancy work so thoughtfully and carefully with public input to design this amazing new trailhead.

Missing scorecard from:

Tom Rundell

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Camping Passive Program (7 scorecards submitted)	\$400,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic feature, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	18
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	34
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	33
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	15
		Cost of Construction (Consider benefit to the OSNR program)	10
		Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	8

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 8

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 6

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 4

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 12

**Educational Research and
Contribution** (Consider
property data, geological,
topographic and a vegetation
features) 10

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- Camping that allows people to be on the land 24 hours a day could create a negative impact to natural resource protection.
Will be a challenge.
Land Trust must review if compatible with conservation easement. Concern about possible fire risk, even with fires planned to be banned.
Camping will impact conserved properties. Steps can be taken to minimize that.
Overnight human presence on open space, even at campsites, would have negative impact on conservation.
- 80 Does this provide the greatest good for the greatest amount of people?
Definitely a great idea from accessing the forested areas of the Sandstone.
The public is curious about the feasibility of camping on Douglas County lands.
We should, yes, research the feasibility of camping. Love remote back-county camping!
- 80 3-5 campgrounds in pilot. Costs seem to far outweigh revenue. Not greatest.
Safety issues may change in a negative manner creating more staffing needs.
Requires more staffing/supervision.
Requires additional staffing, even consider 24/7 ranger on-site.
Will be considered in planning process.
- 80 Damage to area due to overnight presence would hurt. Not all campers are benign. Ranger presence?
CPW & Forest Service would need to provide input on impact.
Besides connectivity, partnership with USFS/CPW is limited.
Connect to Forest Service.
USFS, CPW. More information on these proposed partnerships is requested.
- 80 Partnerships with other land managers?
Very costly to create, manage and maintain.
\$400K for 3 to 5 campsites is not the greatest good for the greatest amount of people.
Backcountry composting toilet is \$15k. For very few people also requires new trails to be built first?
- 48 Pilot program at Sandstone. Will be expensive.
- None at the Campsites.
Studies required to move forward.
- 48 Resources will be considered in the planning process.

\$300K year one, \$100K year ongoing.

Positive: Great opportunity for residents. Concern: This will take a lot of money & staffing to make work. Is it a good investment for a limited amount of campsites. Need 24/7 coverage. Need new reservation system by County. Requires additional staff, consider 24/7 ranger on-site.

Will require ongoing maintenance costs, estimated at \$100k annually.

48 Staff requirements.

May have a negative impact on wildlife migration corridors.

Connects to the Pike proposed.

Opportunities for connections in the Pike National Forest is not recommended by the Pike National Forest staff at this time.

32 Needs trails for access.

A biological baseline review may be necessary to determine impact to wildlife resources.

Site so location will be paramount. Human disturbance will be negative on wildlife.

Camping and increased usage will impact wildlife.

32 Having humans present overnight with most animals being nocturnal would have negative impact on wildlife.

If camp sites are visible from roadways this may create a negative impact to scenic view scopes.

Will not be able to see the road or from the road.

32 Camping areas proposed to be located outside highway view shed.

None proposed.

32 This pilot program at Sandstone Ranch will add to current knowledge of the property.

Other Comments not under Criteria

A pilot program that adds opportunities for camping on Douglas County open lands will expand public usage of this remarkable property. Though it will affect wildlife habitat and movement corridors, impacts can be minimized through careful planning and oversight. It must be understood that increased and on going annual costs, estimated at \$100k annually, will cut into that program fund. The county will learn much from a pilot program at Sandstone Ranch, and whether such should continue there or be considered in other county open space lands in the future.

Missing scorecard from:

Tom Rundell

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Prairie Canyon Ranch (6 scorecards submitted)	\$5,000,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic feature, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	52
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	33
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	36
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	30
		Cost of Construction (Consider benefit to the OSNR program)	9

Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property)	36
Management and Maintenance Costs (Consider ongoing maintenance cost, staff, vendor costs, and equipment costs)	34
Network of Preserved Open Spaces (Consider trail connections, and wildlife corridors)	22
Wildlife Values and Critical Habitat (Consider the comprehensive plan section 9 wildlife resources, connection to other properties and important habitat)	21
Scenic Views from the Roadway (Consider geological, topographic and vegetation features)	18
Educational Research and Contribution (Consider property data, geological, topographic and a vegetation features)	27

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

	Recreation is not currently a conservation value. May need amendment to CE and do a biological baseline review.	
	Public Access will be detrimental to cultural resources, historic resources. A trial loop would put the conservation values in jeopardy. Trials should be located to the East.	
	Recreation is NOT a conservation easement's value because not original goal as a closed property.	Will
	increase recreation and education but decrease other conservation values and attributes.	Higher
80	score for more limited public access options. Public access is not a conservation value.	
	Sandstone.	
	Maybe consider more guided access on the weekends in order to allow more people to attend.	
80	I like the project for public access. Is an access option from Castlewood canyon an option? Can the Commissioners use their influence with state parks for	
	Very dangerous due to speed limit and no turn lane.	
	Consider staffing needed if open 24/7: could weekend opening with staffing help?	
80	Accl/decel will improve public safety.	
	Main concern here is turning onto and off of Hwy 83.	
	CDOT currently does not have any funding as do other partners.	
	Can we partner with CDOT on the highway construction?	None
	identified.	No
80	partnerships at this time.	
	Very expensive to create turn lane off of Hwy 83. I like the concept if this can be accomplished in a cost effective manner and the cultural resources on the land can continue to be protected.	Par for
	the course.	Very high
	due to needed why improvement.	Cost
	are very high, but will provide increased benefit to the community. 3.5 mil anticipated for accl/decel lane.	
48	High cost, primarily due to turn lanes on Hwy 83.	

48 May create a negative impact to cultural resources without guided access only. There are thousands of artifacts on the property that could be looted. Very high # of cultural resources with high potential for destruction if opened up, especially with meadows trail consider guided hikes instead. Will impact resources but also will provide greater access for the public to appreciate the properties historic resources. Concerns over vandalism and other damage to historic building and cultural artifacts. Need a cultural resource survey.

48 Will require more staffing. Will add new ongoing staff costs to have open and managed. High ongoing costs. Security cameras and or staff to reduce damage to historical and cultural treasures?

32 Will stay away from the ecologically significant wetlands. Potential to connect to Castlewood Canyon in future but would need to be discussed with State Park manager.

32 Trail options, including possible linkage with Castlewood Canyon. The original intended use for this property was to protect the historic agricultural heritage.

32 Already there. May impact wildlife habitat and movement corridors depending on trail alignments and public access. Land already preserved. Providing public access would impact wildlife! Less impact with option A. Option C not recommended.

32 Views are already there. Can they be a Native American cultural center? A great resource for educational opportunities. High potential for educational contribution with both home site and possible on native cultural resources. Can increase opportunities. Improved public access to a local historic and cultural treasure!

Other Comments not under Criteria

Recommend opening PCR on a regular, limited basis, e.g., Fri-Sun, Memorial Day - Labor Day, with possible special days like Halloween. Recommend option B for trail access to start, with scheduled guided hikes on other parts of the property on the weekends. The ongoing maintenance costs are estimated to be \$120k - \$300k. The county will need to consider this in their annual open space capital and maintenance budget, which is scheduled to sunset in 13 years.

Missing scorecard from:

Tom Rundell

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Cherokee Ranch Foundation (8 scorecards submitted)	\$75,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic feature, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	33

Public Accessibility and
Population Use
(Consider driving distance from
population centers and if there is
proper public access) 35

Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence) 30

Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups) 9

Cost of Construction (Consider benefit to the OSNR program) 10

Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property) 19

**Management and
Maintenance Costs**
(Consider ongoing maintenance
cost, staff, vendor costs, and
equipment costs) 9

**Network of Preserved
Open Spaces** (Consider
trail connections, and wildlife
corridors) 13

**Wildlife Values and Critical
Habitat** (Consider
the comprehensive plan section
9 wildlife resources, connection
to other properties and
important habitat) 13

**Scenic Views from the
Roadway** (Consider
geological, topographic and
vegetation features) 13

**Educational Research and
Contribution** (Consider
property data, geological,
topographic and a vegetation
features) 15

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

Already preserved by Douglas County.
Provides unique opportunities for residence & outside implications to protect wildlife & botany. Noted importance by BoCC.
Continue and enhance guided opportunities that do not have a negative effect on other conservation values. Need to amend and restate conservation easement prior to any funding approval to include roads and building envelopes, which currently area not subject to the conservation easement per paragraph 11. OFCE
What are the conservation values in the conservation easement?
Preserve natural environment, heritage, and history. 3400 acres. 12 acres around castle to balance conservation values, historic building Covenant sets vision. Buildings not protected under conservation easement. Was request limited to use of land? Building issues may need to be funded under historic preservation or C.E. may need to be amended to include the buildings. Could sell building + no control.
This project is for an update of project plans and costs, some of which are anticipated to be open space related.
Property already under a conservation easement. Access already limited to guided tours only.

80

Best to carefully control access to prevent destruction. A
private foundation currently not accountable. Making
sure that expanded public access does not negatively impact other conservation values.
Need more information on increased public access on lands and how this will impact the animals.
Limited to public by appointments and private events. Need to extend public availability *40 weddings a year/\$18k pay per year.
Need to increase public availability (to a point).
Limited public access but tries to encourage wildlife protection and minimize impact on land. Plan to increase public access by improving trail system.
The survey will likely consider public access improvements.
Location is near population centers in North part of county. Public access is limited to guided tours only consistent with the conservation easement.

80

Unaddressed. Fire mitigation can be addressed by CPW or the US Forest Service.

Potential need for fire mitigation.

Keep limited access with guided hikes only.

The survey will likely consider public safety.

80 Public visitation limited to guided tours. History of wildfires in the area.

Impressive list of partners, i.e. archeology, water, etc.

\$50K Challenge grant is no guarantee. Organization such as the Douglas Conservation District can play a part.

This makes for fair partnership. How much should COSAC/Douglas County fund a private jurisdiction? Wildlife rehab.

Public-private partnership. Student archeology groups, heritage committee.

No partnerships for funding are proposed.

80 Property already managed by trust.

Majority of costs is for building preservation, not open space.

Douglas County has already funded the conservation easement, \$30 million in today's dollars. Partial funding requests beyond the \$75K ask in \$7MIL in conservation value in today's dollars. The Highlands ranch mansion is self sufficient in their funding, with 100 events per year. We own the CRCF? This funding precedent will encourage the HRMD to ask for funding as well. Update of historic surveys S/B under the umbrella of Historic Resources.

Need to review conservation easement prior to providing funding. May want to consider an MOU or agreement with CRCF outlining how funds may be spent.

Require annual report from CRCF re: fund expenditures. Should

fund only open space projects. Should have specific request for open space funding requests. If one

time ask 2nd ask of \$500k is a bit much. A bit high of one ask for a private program that needs to become more mindful of expenses. Very worth helping, but an annual as us 1 time ask? Challenge grant/raise against to match. Small ask in consideration of county funds, but substantial of COSAC.

The survey will update construction costs, however, the factors of the update is historic resource costs.

48 Ongoing costs are relatively high. This is a one-time cost and ongoing costs.

Would score this higher!

8+++ Unending.

Provides important building in Douglas County.

Petrified wood of 55 million years. Concerts, guided hikes. Buildings are not part of conservation easement. Perhaps look at protections for building.

48 Clearly a historic and cultural treasure. The Castle is a local attraction. There are lots of artifacts and other evidence from Native Americans.

Worth every penny.
 Seems to be unsustainable.
 If funded-would like to see annual report on how funds have been spent.
 TBD, as this is a perpetual ask? Acknowledge expanding scope of BOG.
 Challenge grant for 3 year capital comp.
 The survey will likely include these factors.

48 High ongoing maintenance costs and includes \$ for additional staffing.

CRCF + Daniel's Park + Backcountry
 ? Into the backcountry Great
 connectivity to other conserved properties. While
 property is not accessible to public it preserves open space. Adjacent to
 Daniels Park and Highlands Ranch Backcountry for wildlife, not people.
 This is a key part of preserved open space, along with Daniels Park and HRCA's
 32 backcountry.
 Amazing variety of wildlife.
 Rather critical to wildlife sanctuary.
 Property is important to county, open space does have an active interest.
 Wildlife rehab. Important to wildlife.
 Protection of wildlife inventory regularly. Wildlife rehabilitation. 260 bluebird
 nesting boxes.
 Though not a ? of the survey, it will likely consider wildlife.
 Cherokee Ranch, along with Daniels Park and HRCA's backcountry is a large
 32 conserved wildlife area.
 4++++ Beyond description.
 Amazing views of protected lands from castle. Not really visible from Santa
 Fe/Hwy 85.
 May be considered in the survey.

32 Visible from Santa Fe Drive (US85) and Daniels Park Rd.

I've attended several events there and each is extremely well done. The "ask"
 is \$75,000 for planning Tweet's "world class education center." The cattle is 100
 years old. The 3395 acres offer extra ordinary historic, cultural & natural
 resources. \$75k is a very small "ask" for such an extraordinary property. I
 strongly urge the BOCC to assist the Cherokee Ranch & Cattle Foundation. Even
 \$500k is a great investment for Douglas County. Ongoing.
 I have participated in many events. Can
 prove value to public with increased tours of property.
 Educates public. Scenic infrastructure indigenous artifact documentation and
 potential for more. Livestock education grant from 4H. Engaging students.
 Survey will add to property data.
 Large amounts of petrified wood in the area. Plenty of evidence of indigenous
 32 people's presence in area.

Other Comments not under Criteria

Requested is funding to update project plans and cost estimates for projects envisioned at the ranch. There should be a more detailed listing of these projects before any funding is awarded. Perhaps this survey could be funded through a partnership of OSNR, Historic Preservation and Parks. OSNR could possibly contribute funding where trails, wildlife, and other natural resources are evaluated. Historic Preservation could contribute to the evaluation of historic structures, and possibly parks for any active recreational study components. Other partnerships, including from the CRCF, should be explored.

If this is to provide funding for foundation repairs for the Cherokee Castle, then the open space component is small compared with Historical Preservation.

Missing scorecard from:

2025 Scorecard Results

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>REQUESTED AMOUNT</u>	<u>CREDENTIAL</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Lincoln Mtn Trail & Pavilion (8 scorecards submitted)	\$500,000	Property Conservation (Consider geographic feature, water & mineral rights, recreation features, native vegetation, and environmental constraints)	68
		Public Accessibility and Population Use (Consider driving distance from population centers and if there is proper public access)	62
		Public Safety (Consider National resources, public visitation, fire mitigation, trails, trailhead amenities, Ranger presence)	64
		Partnerships (Consider funding partnerships, supporters, and interest groups)	17
		Cost of Construction (Consider benefit to the OSNR program)	25

Historic and Cultural Resources (Consider structures and other significant cultural attributes of the property) 12

Management and Maintenance Costs (Consider ongoing maintenance cost, staff, vendor costs, and equipment costs) 31

Network of Preserved Open Spaces (Consider trail connections, and wildlife corridors) 6

Wildlife Values and Critical Habitat (Consider the comprehensive plan section 9 wildlife resources, connection to other properties and important habitat) 22

Scenic Views from the Roadway (Consider geological, topographic and vegetation features) 18

Educational Research and Contribution (Consider property data, geological, topographic and a vegetation features) 16

Potential

Max Score COMMENTS

- .25 cement trail, picnic pavilion will increase accessibility *
Minor impact to conservation values.
Added use alters land.
The Cherry Creek view of the water is a great attribute to access. Will affect wildlife & potential degrade to water shed.
Expanding recreations opportunities.
This property is well suited for the construction of an accessible trail and pavilion.
- 80
- Fantastic opportunity. This is a fantastic project! Minimal impact, minimal cost, maximum ROI for increased accessibility. ADA extending access to Evans Homestead is fantastic.
Increased public access opportunities. Great public benefit addition which encourages expanded public access.
Purpose to add ADA SE Douglas County, but not too far from Castle Rock. Handicap, family accessibility.
Increasing accessibility for people with disabilities.
The project would provide access to nature for a wheel share bound population that has few options in Douglas County. This property is far removed from population centers.
- 80
- Provides some access to public with ADA limitations.
Cement trail & picnic pavilion offer safe open space opportunity to handicap citizens.
Safer ADA access to open space.
Great for families, handicap, elderly.
No expected impact
This project would be designed and constructed to provide safe access and enjoyment.
- 80
- Potential for partnership funding.
None positively identified.
No current partnerships. Potential for some. No
partnerships are proposed. This project could possibly benefit from grant funding through GOCO.
\$500k to offer increased accessibility is great ROI.
Pavilion cost seems high.
We can do it cheaper.
Cost consideration. ADA somewhere else to save cost like Hidden Mesa on Cherry Creek?
- 80
- This is a costly project. Relatively high
cost vs alternatives especially for pavilion.
- 48

- Extension to Evans Homestead.
None identified.
Does the trail extension give access to the homestead?
This project would not access historic or cultural resources.
Concern over vandalism at Evans homestead. Use of monitored security cameras there would help.
- 48
- Snow & ice removal
Adds to our staffing needs, which is overstretched presently.
Consider ongoing costs with snow removal of paved path.
- 48
- Relatively low costs.
- Opens up a trail for those previously unable to use.
Not attached to any additional open space. Not
networked.
- 32
- Minimal negative impact.
Human interaction always affects wildlife.
Minimal impact expected impact on wildlife.
- 32
- The project would have minimal impact on wildlife.
No impact to scenic views.
Existing trees minimize viewshed impacts from major roadways.
Would not interfere with natural beauty. Could highlight attraction.
Not visible from roadway.
Not expected to be visible from Hwy 83. Scenic view to be provided to users.
- 32
- Pavilion may be seen from SH83 corridor.
Additional facility! Pond & creek access!
Potentially, not anything identified.
No proposed impact.
Provides opportunities to hold educational lectures in the pavilion.
Access to Evans homestead with interpretive signs would help educate public on life in frontier days.
- 32

Other Comments not under Criteria

Though this is a good project for accessibility purposes, it would be costly to construct. An alternative to this project is to possibly construct a pavilion near the end of the already constructed accessible trail at Hidden Mesa. It might also get more use as it is closer to population centers. The Lincoln Mtn trail and pavilion might be better constructed in future years.

Missing scorecard from: