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BACKGROUND
In 2015, the Community Development Department successfully obtained a Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) planning grant for $45,000 to complete a parks master plan. The Town sent out an RFP, and interviewed prospective firms, and awarded the contract to GreenPlay in late 2015. The Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails (PORT) Master Plan is considered a critical final piece for the Town due to recent growth, and the fact it is the last major planning study the Town needs to adopt. As some Trustees are likely aware, the Town has a long history with PORT plan studies over the years that were adopted by various committees (Planning Commission, a now defunct Parks Committee, the Tree Board) but never formally adopted by the Town Board. In addition, under the current Town Administrator, the Town has acquired 422 acres of undeveloped parkland/open space, as well as conservation and open space easements on an additional 875 acres, and needs a master plan on how to develop these properties.

FINAL PORT PLAN
The Final Port Plan included in this packet is to provide the Town with the data and information to plan for its future Parks, Open Space, Recreation and Trails amenities. The material within, includes an extensive information gathering and public engagement process, which included a statistically valid survey that utilized both traditional and cutting edge social media methods, focus groups, meetings with Staff, public meetings, and similar national data. The purpose of this plan and planning process, is to provide the Town Board and Staff with the necessary data and community findings to create a vision for future Town Parks and Recreation, as well as to implement changes to
the Development Code regarding park dedication and open space, recreation programming, impact fees, and the future park services to be provided. For example, the park and trail requirements and amenities in new developments will be reviewed using this new PORT plan, and the Town can also utilize the plan in applying for Parks and Trails grants.

Public Outreach

Extensive public outreach was required as part of the GOCO Planning Grant. This Plan is the result of a multi-faceted approach, which included everything from traditional surveys to online comments. The first public outreach was conducted with nineteen (19) participants in two Focus Groups on January 28, 2016. These focus groups included parents of children in Berthoud Recreation programs, Coaches of Teams in the Rec. Programs, Kids within the Rec. Programs, local business owners, as well as the Principal of Ivy Stockwell. A kick-off Public meeting was also advertised and held on February 11, 2016, and had seventeen (17) participants. During these initial meetings, the project team distributed a questionnaire as a mechanism to collect data beyond the verbal discussion at each session. Questions were developed by GreenPlay with assistance from Town Staff. The Consultant also conducted interviews Key stakeholders within the community – these stakeholders included representatives from Town staff, the Chamber of Commerce, Thompson Valley School District, and local business owners. The Consultants also utilized mySidewalk to obtain comments online from anyone access to a computer. This was an online, community engagement tool where participants answered questions specific to the Master Plan Process. This new online tool resulted in almost two hundred responses, as well as interactive engagement in forum-like live posts, with Town Staff and the Consultant.

An extensive data collection, mapping, and public engagement process was conducted as part of this PORT Plan, with a list provided below:

PORT Timeline

- Strategic kick off with Staff and consultant: December 2015
- Demographics/Trends data gathering and report: January 2016
- Review of related planning efforts with Staff and consultant: January 2016
- Focus groups (two separate) January 2016
- mySidewalk/ Online engagement: January – March 2016
- Inventory/ Level of service analysis January – March 2016
• First Community wide meeting: February 2016
• Stakeholder interviews: February 2016
• Survey distribution February – March 2016
• Findings presentation with Staff: April 2016
• Second Community wide meeting regarding Findings/Visioning: May 2016
• Draft PORT Plan/ Presentation to Town Board: June 2016
• Creation of Subcommittees June 2016
• Revisions of PORT plan draft: August-September 2016
• Subcommittee meetings and work July-November 2016

Survey
An extensive survey was developed by the Consultant with Staff. The survey process involved three methods: 1) a mail-back survey, 2) an online, invitation-only web survey to further encourage response from those residents already within the defined invitation sample, and 3) an open-link online survey for members of the public who were not part of the invitation sample. The Draft Plan focuses on responses from the statistically-valid invitation sample. The list source used for the mailing was a third party list purchased from Melissa Data Corporation, which provided 1,957 addresses. After accounting for undeliverable addresses (13 total), 1,944 survey mailings were delivered. A total of 519 responses were returned, resulting in a response rate of 26.7 percent, resulting in a margin of error of approximately +/- 4.3 percentage points. The open link survey received an additional 198 responses. According to the Industry Average, a 10% response rate is considered good; a 27% response rate on almost 2,000 surveys show significant interest and engagement with the public.

PORT COMMITTEE BACKGROUND
At the 5-24-16, and the 6-7-16 Town Board meetings, an advisory Board was created first to explore a capital improvement plan for a new recreation district. After the Recreation District was found not to be possible for this year’s election, the Committee was then tasked at the 6-28-16 meeting with breaking into sub-committees to create a future vision utilizing the findings of the PORT Plan, and bring their recommendations back before the Town Board later this year. The Committee met on July 13 and a general overview of the draft plan findings was presented by the
consultant, and each committee member received the Draft Port Plan. At the July 13 meeting, the Committee split into three sub-committees of Buildings, Active Recreation, and Passive Recreation/Trails/Open Space with a Staff and Trustee liaison assigned to each committee. The goal of each sub-committee was to rank and plan a feasible capital improvement program for their specific topic areas, and then come together and make final recommendations to the Town Board for a possible Parks Capital Improvement Vision. After months of meetings utilizing the PORT plan, Staff resources, as well as tours of facilities and numerous presentations, the subcommittees have finalized their recommendations.

PORT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The final PORT committee meeting was held on November 7th, and each subcommittee presented their findings to the entire PORT committee. During this process, some subcommittees met a number of times, and shared drafts with each other. In the case of the Trails committee, a basic map was also created. Each committee came up with a set of values and goals, and prioritized their recommendations. All but one subcommittee member attended the November 7th meeting. In the interests of space and due to breadth of the recommendations, a condensed form of their priorities and recommendations are as follows below (please see the full recommendations attached):

Active Recreation Subcommittee Recommendations:

Short Term Priorities:
- Walking Trails with Landscaping Trees
- Playgrounds and Playground improvements in Waggener Farm Park and Town Park
- Spray Pad or Disc Golf in Waggener Farm Park
- Bmx or bike pump track
- Ball fields in Waggener Farm Park (and conversion of existing ball fields in Town Park)
- Open Green Space
- A Field House (not a rec center) to accommodate adult and youth indoor recreational activities
- A Pavilion or Shelter at Waggener Farm Park
- Renovation of Town Park
- A New Outdoor Pool, With a Water Park/Splash Pad
✓ A Fenced Dog Park in Town Park

**Long Term Priorities:**

✓ Full connectivity of bike/trails throughout Berthoud.
✓ Recreational Activities in Berthoud Reservoir
✓ Richardson Property as the location of a new Rec Center with camping, ball fields, trails, etc.

**Building Committee Recommendations/Priorities:**

✓ Recommend that the $500,000 Jones fund timeline not drive the decision on a future rec center
✓ A recreation center with a pool (not a fieldhouse) should be pursued by the Town.
✓ The recreation Center should be built at Waggener Farm Park which respects the AG heritage
✓ The Town should not enter into any partnerships to build the rec center (Boys and Girls Club, etc.), due to scheduling conflicts

**Trails, Open Space and Passive Recreation Recommendations/Priorities**

✓ Waggener Farm Park should the hub or keystone of the trails system.
✓ Trail to Heron Lakes and its linkages to Loveland is of vital importance, and safe crossings to access this trail from LCR 17, 10E and HWY287 are also of critical importance.
✓ Trail around Berthoud Reservoir, allows additional recreational opportunities and would be heavily utilized by citizens.
✓ The Southern Berthoud Loop Trail, connecting the Nielsen Greenway with Hillsdale, Heritage Ridge, Rose Farm, and down to the Little Thompson River should be connected, and safety concerns around 1st Street and the roundabout should also be addressed.
✓ A vision for a Little Thompson River Trail to I-25 with an eventual connection to Johnstown and Weld County trails

**PORT COMMITTEE-IN-THE-WHOLE RECOMMENDATIONS AND PRIORITIES**

After the recommendations were made by each subcommittee at the November 7th Port Committee in the Whole meeting, the entire committee came together and agreed on five overall priorities. There were a few items that could not be agreed, such as the recreation center, and its location. In this case, the committee in the whole agreed on a general long term view that a recreation center
with a pool should be built in the future, but should not be rushed, and the Town should explore ways to make this happen. No general consensus on how to bring the rec. center to fruition was found, other than a full study of all the Town's options should be begun as soon as possible. The five priorities agreed on by the committee in the whole, and the two long term priorities, are as follows:

**Five Consensus Priorities of the Committee as a Whole:**

1. **Completing Trails that connect Parks and Neighborhoods was the #1 priority**
2. **Low hanging fruit/affordable recreation options was the #2 priority.**
   a. Trails
   b. Pump Track
   c. Disc Golf
   d. Pavilion at Waggener Farm Park
   e. Large Grass Field
   f. Trees
   g. Little League Fields
3. **Master Plan for Waggener Farm Park was the #3 priority**
   a. Perimeter/Recreational Trail
   b. Include Recreational activities/facilities included in #2 priority
   c. Pavilion/Shelter
   d. Playground
   e. Spray Park/Splash Pad
   f. Community Garden
4. **Renovate Town Park was the #4 priority**
   a. Renovate and replace pool/potential multi-use water park/pool/splash area
   b. Replace ball fields
   c. Improve/replace playground
   d. Build a dog park
5. **Plan for Berthoud Reservoir was the #5 priority**
   a) Build trail around Berthoud Reservoir
   b) Plan for and build water activities (fishing, boating, beach) around Berthoud Reservoir as soon as possible.
Long Term Priorities/Discussion

- **Plan for Richardson**
  a) Plan for ballfields at Richardson
  b) Some desire or plan for potential rec center at Richardson or consider for such center.

- **Plan for Recreation Center**
  a) Should contain pool, gymnasium and activity space
  b) Plan must be started soon, or nothing will happen
  c) Should not be bound by $500,000 estate deadline, can take time
  d) Consider way to fund, and plan.
  e) Consider location but no consensus (some want Waggener, some Richardson).
  f) Do not partner with outside agencies due to scheduling conflicts.

**SUGGESTED MOTION**

Review the PORT Master Plan, and hear and review the recommendations and prioritized capital improvements plan from the Committee in the whole, and from each of the three subcommittees. Staff recommends approval of adoption of the PORT Master plan, and direction from the Board on future PORT priorities based on the Port Committee recommendations and priorities.

Administrator review _______ Date ____________
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I. Introduction and Background

A. Purpose of this Plan

The 2016 Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails (PORT) Master Plan is a visionary plan for Berthoud, one to be used as a tool for marketing and economic development while preserving the small, hometown feel. It provides a long-range vision intended to capture the interest of the community, developers, and potential funders and foster an atmosphere of collaborative planning with regional neighbors. It provides guidance for the responsibility of taking care of current assets; the excitement of adding new elements; the community building aspect of connectivity among Town parks, recreation, open spaces and other public spaces, internally, and to neighboring trail systems; and the reality of implementation timing and costs, while allowing the Town to take advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, including partnerships and joint efforts.

Furthermore, this Plan design:

- Updates relevant facts, figures, maps, and data of the 2006 Proposed PORT Plan.
- Gauges the Town’s needs and desires for parks and open space through community engagement, including a citizen survey.
- Creates an implementation strategy to fulfill plan goals addressing:
  - An overall concept for the Town’s future recreational facilities and amenities and how they can most effectively be phased.
  - Current park dedication and open space requirements in the Berthoud Development Code and recommended changes to both based on the proposed plan.
  - A unified trails plan with a goal of regional and local trail connectivity.
  - A feasible long-term operations and management strategy for recreation areas to develop an understanding of ongoing costs to provide park and recreation services.
  - A recreational programming plan and identification of potential community and regional partnerships, as well as possible coordination with new metro districts to determine if regional parks or smaller pocket parks are the best strategy.
  - Stewardship programs for management of conservation lands.

B. History of the Parks and Recreation Department

Berthoud is a progressive community providing a balance between small town living and access to a range of larger city amenities a few miles away. With a population of 5,400 residents within its city limits and 17,000 including the growth management area, Berthoud has its roots in a still-vibrant farming and small business culture. As Colorado continues to experience population growth, Berthoud has been planning for its own strategic growth through the 2014 Comprehensive Plan, incorporating a new economic development program, and updating the development code. A final step is to update the Town’s plan for existing and future parks and recreational spaces, open spaces, and trails, through this planning effort.
Historically, residents of the Town of Berthoud have been quite fortunate to access open lands and recreational opportunities with little effort. The Town occupies a favored location, one that combines some of northern Colorado’s finest agricultural land with unobstructed views of Long’s Peak and the dramatic rise of the Front Range. Within this scenery, a small town has prospered with tree lined streets, interconnected neighborhoods, local parks, historic homes, and an appealing downtown. Berthoud’s first park was built by the Colorado & Southern Railway Company in 1908 along the railroad and was called Depot Park; today, the park is commonly known as Railroad Park. The agrarian setting from which the Town emerged left little want or need for a structured parks, open lands, recreation, and trails system.

While these past qualities remain today, the Town is entering a time of change like many Front Range communities. The northern Colorado region is witnessing numerous planned developments, a prospering business environment, and a population increase, all of which will challenge the Town in maintaining its quality of life.

C. Parks and Recreation Department Overview

The Parks and Recreation Department is responsible for the recreation programs, facilities, parks, and an outdoor pool that are important factors for the quality of life in the community.

The Department provides a variety of programs including youth and adult sports, aquatics, and park rentals. The Department is also responsible for maintaining the area’s parks, including Pioneer Park, Fickel Park, Roberts Lake Park, and Hillsdale Park, with many of the outdoor programs held at the outdoor pool and ballfields at Bein Park and Town Park/ballfields. Without dedicated indoor space, the Department relies on a partnership with the School District to provide access to court space.

In addition to the Director, there are two full-time recreation employees, one clerical support employee and three full-time employees dedicated to parks, forestry, and maintenance. The Department also employs seasonally for positions such as umpires/referees, lifeguards, and park maintenance.

D. Strategic Framework

The Town of Berthoud has operated under a 2006 Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails (PORT) Master Plan even though it was not formally adopted. Since 2006, the Town has acquired 422 acres of undeveloped parkland/open space, along with conservation/open space easements on 875 acres. The PORT Plan did not accommodate these acquisitions; therefore, the Town does not have a plan for the future development of the parkland nor plans for stewardship or management of the conservation/open space easements.

Population growth in Colorado has brought heightened development interest in Berthoud; this new growth is creating an increase in demand for parks and recreational facilities. The Town’s current policies and requirements do not provide adequate guidance to developers as new communities are planned.
In 2014, the Town completed an update to the Comprehensive Plan, which strongly supports planning, funding, and development of parks, open spaces, recreation, and trails, mentioning such actions in over 20 different vision statements, policies, and goals. The Comprehensive Plan refers to the PORT Plan as a guiding policy document in implementing these park, open space, recreation, and trails goals. Therefore, a current and updated PORT Plan is vital in ensuring that the community vision is achieved.

On July 14, 2015, the Town Board directed staff to start the design of a small community center utilizing an endowment fund for its construction, and to research the possibility of creating a recreation district to fund future improvements.

**E. Related Planning Efforts and Integration**

**2006 Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails (PORT) Master Plan**

Though the 2006 PORT Plan was not formally adopted, the Department used it as a guiding document. Many elements of the 2006 Plan are still relevant today, but need to be evolved to address current issues facing the Town. Specific areas include:

- Maintaining and enhancing the level of service.
- Determining walkable access and trail connectivity of parklands.
- Determining appropriate development policies.
- Determining the recreational needs of the community.
- Establishing recommendations that are actionable and achievable.

**2014 Town Comprehensive Plan Update**

The 2014 Town Comprehensive Plan Update is a, “long-range plan intended to provide a vision for growth and development in the Berthoud community. The Plan covers a broad geographic area and establishes goals and policies in nine subject areas.”¹ *Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails* is a key subject area of the plan. The following is a list of the goals and policies identified within the Comprehensive Plan:

**Park, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails Goals**²

1. Provide a wide range of recreational and leisure time opportunities for all citizens and visitors in Berthoud.
2. Ensure that parks, recreational facilities, and trails are strategically located to serve the entire community.
3. Focus efforts on the provision and maintenance of developed parklands, trails, recreational facilities, and open lands of community-wide significance.
4. Protect open lands that preserve unique or sensitive environmental resources, buffers between Berthoud and adjacent communities, prime agricultural lands, and key view corridors that contribute to the Town’s rural identity.

---

Park, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails Policies³

1. Design parks for both active and passive use and promote a balance between different sized parks, special facilities, and recreation programming.
2. Locate parks conveniently to neighborhoods and in areas with excellent pedestrian or trail access with emphasis given to strategic partnerships with the school district, Larimer County, and the State of Colorado where applicable.
3. Provide both hard and soft surface trails to accommodate a variety of users.
4. Provide facilities and activities for all ages – children, teens, adults, and seniors.
5. Pocket parks should be provided and maintained by Homeowner Associations, Metropolitan Districts, or others to complement, but not replace, larger neighborhood parks.
6. Locate community parks within two to three miles of the residential areas they are intended to serve.
7. Connect community parks to a primary off-street trail system and connect neighborhood parks to the primary trail with secondary off-street trails/sidewalks or on-street bike lanes as feasible.
8. Incorporate art into park designs to celebrate the unique aspects of Berthoud and provide distinctiveness between parks.
9. Preserve views to agricultural lands, natural areas, and the mountains along major roadway corridors.
10. Protect and enhance the Little Thompson River corridor, Dry Creek corridor and other major drainages in and around the community.

³ Ibid.
The Comprehensive Plan also details a Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails Map containing suggestions for land use and trails. The map, shown in Figure 1, was used as a resource during the information gathering process for the 2016 PORT Plan.

Figure 1: 2014 Town of Berthoud Comprehensive Plan Parks, Open Space, and Trails Plan
F. Methodology of this Planning Process

The project team, including Town and Department staff, guided this project throughout the planning process. This collaborative effort creates a plan that fully utilizes the consultants’ expertise and incorporates the local knowledge and institutional history that only community members can provide. The following tasks were completed during the master planning process:

Demographic Profile and Trends
- Consideration of the profile of the community and demographics, including population growth.
- Research of trends related to Berthoud, Colorado, and American lifestyles to help guide the efforts of the Department over the next several years.

Community Engagement
- Review of previous planning efforts and the area’s historical information.
- Extensive community involvement effort including focus groups, meetings with key stakeholders, and community-wide public meetings.
- Distribution and analysis of statistically-valid survey of area residents.

Facility Inventory
- Inventory of parks and facilities using existing mapping, staff interviews, and on-site visits to verify and assess the condition of amenities and surrounding areas.

Level of Service Analysis
- Interviews with staff to provide information about parks and recreation facilities and services, along with insight regarding the current practices and experiences of the Department in serving residents and visitors.
- Identification of alternative providers of recreation services to provide insight regarding the market opportunities in the area for potential new facilities and services.
- Analysis addressing recreation, parks, cultural affairs, and related services.

Assessment and Analysis
- Review and assessment of relevant plans.
- Measurement of the current delivery of service for park and recreation facilities using the level of service analysis and allowing for a target level of service to be determined that is both feasible and aligned with the desires of citizens as expressed through public input and available or projected resources.
- Exploration of finance and funding mechanisms to support development and sustainability within the system.

Financial, Operational, and Marketing Analysis
- Identification of probable operating, maintenance and capital costs, and potential funding sources.
- Analysis of departmental programming and service delivery.
- Development of a broad assessment of the overall parks and recreation operations, including cost recovery and resource allocation.
- Analysis of development fees, including regional benchmarking.
- Consideration of funding for further parks and recreation amenities.
Recommendations: Goals, Objectives, and Action Plan

- Identification and categorization of recommendations into themes with goals and objectives.
- Development of an action plan.
- Identification of potential funding sources.

Master Plan Timeline

- Strategic Kick Off: December 2015
- Demographics/Trends report: January 2016
- Review of related planning efforts: January 2016
- Focus groups: January 2016
- mySidewalk/Online engagement: January – March 2016
- Inventory/Level of service analysis: January – March 2016
- Community-wide meeting #1: February 2016
- Stakeholder interviews: February 2016
- Survey distribution: February – March 2016
- Findings presentation with Staff: April 2016
- Findings/Visioning with Town Board/Community-wide meeting #2: May 2016
- Financial, operational, and marketing analysis: June 2016
- Recommendations and action plans
- Draft PORT Plan/Presentation to Town Board: July 2016
- Final PORT Plan and deliverables: August 2016
Figure 2 is a graphic depiction of this Plan’s process.

Figure 2: PORT Plan Engagement Process

Key Elements of a Community Parks and Recreation Strategic/Master Plan

4 Stages of Public Engagement

1. Information Gathering
   - Needs Assessment
   - Staff
   - Stakeholders
   - Public Meetings
   - Focus groups
   - Interviews
   - Surveys
   - Online engagement

2. Findings & Visioning
   - Presentation/Feedback Sessions
   - Staff
   - Stakeholders
   - Decision Makers
   - What We Have Discovered
   - Key Issues Matrix
   - Key Ideas and Themes for Improvement
   - Analysis
   - Programming
   - Operations
   - Maintenance
   - Marketing Communications
   - Financial Resources

3. Draft Recommendations
   - Summary Findings
   - Strategies
   - Long-Term Vision
   - Short-Term Action
   - Implications
   - Financial
   - Operational
   - Maintenance
   - Recommendations
   - Action Plan
   - Tasks
   - Timing
   - Costs
   - Review & Revisions

4. Final Plan
   - Review
   - Staff
   - Public
   - Decision Maker
   - Distribute/Post

Implementation

Typically our Strategic/Master Plans include a 5-year focus on operations, 10-year focus on capital, and 20-year strategic vision. Other elements and tools are added as needed for a community-specific plan.
II. Community Needs Identification and Analysis

A. Berthoud Demographic Profile

The population data, estimates, and projections used in this demographic profile come from Esri Business Information Solutions, based on 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census data. The data includes demographic information for the Town of Berthoud (Berthoud) alone, and for the Greater Berthoud Growth Management Area, (GMA). A summary of demographic highlights is followed by more detailed demographic analysis.

Figure 3: Town of Berthoud and its Growth Management Area (GMA)

Source: Esri Business Information Solutions based on 2010 U.S. Census

The Town of Berthoud is represented in grey in Figure 3. The green shaded area represents the town’s Growth Management Area (GMA). Both the grey area and the green shown on Figure 3 are included in the Greater Berthoud GMA demographics referenced in this demographic analysis.
Demographic Analysis

Table 1: Town of Berthoud and Growth Management Area Summary Demographics – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Demographics</th>
<th>Berthoud</th>
<th>Greater GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>8,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>3,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Size</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$76,031</td>
<td>$78,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key demographic trends to reference for future park and recreation planning efforts are compared in Table 2 and summarized below.

- According to Esri, estimated median household income for Berthoud residents in 2015 is $76,031, and it is $78,729 for the GMA.
- The median age for Berthoud in 2015 is 43.2, higher than the median age (37.9) for the United States.
- Gender distribution for Berthoud is 49.1 percent male and 50.9 percent female.
- The annual growth rate for Berthoud between 2015 and 2020 is projected at 1.65 percent. For the Greater Berthoud GMA, the annual growth rate between 2015 and 2020 is projected at 1.51 percent.

Population Projections

Although the future of population growth cannot be predicted with certainty, it is helpful to make assumptions for planning purposes. Table 2 contains population estimates and projections for Berthoud and the Greater Berthoud GMA area in the years 2000, 2010, 2015, and 2020, based on the 2010 U.S. Census. The annual growth rate for Berthoud between 2000 and 2010 was .2 percent, while the GMA experienced a growth rate of .65 percent during the same period. Esri projects the annual growth rate for Berthoud and the GMA between 2015 and 2020 to be 1.69 percent. Comparatively, the State of Colorado’s projected annual growth rate in the same time period is 1.29 percent. The population growth trend for the area is graphically represented in Figure 4 on the following page.

Table 2: Berthoud Area Population Trends, 2000-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual, Estimated, and Projected Population</th>
<th>Berthoud</th>
<th>Greater GMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>7,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Population</td>
<td>5,271</td>
<td>7,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Estimated</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>8,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Projected</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>9,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Berthoud Area Population Growth Trend


Gender and Age Distribution

Gender distribution in Berthoud was 49.1 percent male to 50.9 percent female in 2015. In the GMA, the gender distribution was 49.4 percent male to 50.6 percent female. A comparison of the estimated population breakdown by age for Berthoud and the Greater Berthoud GMA is shown in Figure 5. The median age in 2015 for Berthoud was 43.4, and was somewhat higher for the Greater GMA, at 44.

Figure 5: Berthoud Area Population Age Distribution, 2015

Source: 2010 U.S. Census; 2015 estimates provided by Esri Business Information Solutions.
The age demographics for Berthoud and the GMA in 2015 are similar with a slightly larger percentage of the 45 – 74 age demographic residing outside of the Berthoud town limits. Both demographic areas reflect a noticeable downward trend in the 45 – 54 age demographic from 2010 to 2020 and a noticeable upward trend in the 55 – 74 age demographic (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Berthoud Area Population Age Distribution 2020

Source: 2010 U.S. Census; 2015 estimates provided by Esri Business Information Solutions.

In Berthoud, the 45 – 54 age demographic is projected to decrease from 19.2 percent of the population in 2010 to 12.9 percent of the population in 2020. Similarly, in the GMA, this demographic is projected to decrease from 19.6 percent of the population to 14 percent in this timeframe. The 65 – 74 age demographic in Berthoud is projected to grow from 7.2 percent of the population in 2010 to 11.2 percent of the population in 2020. In the GMA, this population is expected to grow from 7.3 percent to 11.3 percent in the 2010 – 2020 timeframe. Further, it is anticipated that the 25 – 34 age demographic will represent 13.7 percent of the Berthoud population in 2020 but it is expected to represent 11.7 percent of the GMA population in 2020.
Race/Ethnicity

*Figure 7* reflects the racial population distribution for the GMA area in 2015 (the racial distribution for Berthoud in 2015 is almost identical to that for the GMA). In 2015, 92.6 percent of the GMA population was Caucasian with Asian, Native American, African American, and Pacific Islander populations representing the largest populations of other races. Additionally, the GMA’s population of Hispanic origin (a separate self-identifying look at the population, irrespective of race) was about nine percent.

*Figure 7: Greater Berthoud GMA Area Population Racial Distribution, 2015*

![Racial Distribution Chart](chart.png)

Source: 2010 U.S. Census; 2015 estimates provided by Esri Business Information Solutions.

Hispanic origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before arriving in the United States. In the U.S. Census, people who identify as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be any race and are included in all of the race categories.

2015 to 2020 growth patterns:

- Little change in racial demographics is projected in the GMA from 2010 to 2020. The GMA’s Caucasian population is trending slightly downward from 93.1 percent in 2010 to a predicted 91.9 percent in 2019.
- Berthoud’s population of Hispanic origin (irrespective of race), at about nine percent in 2015, is expected to grow to 10 percent by 2020. Across the United States, this group has accounted for more than half of all the population growth. Trends research indicates that Hispanics tend to use recreational amenities in unique ways, as family and individual recreation patterns and preferences are strongly shaped by cultural influences. More information can be found in the Trends sections of this document.
Household Information

In 2015, the GMA had 3,420 housing units with a 71.7 percent owner-occupied housing rate, compared to a 24.1 percent renter-occupied rate. As reflected in Table 3, the owner-occupied and renter occupied housing rates have changed pretty significantly over the years, with an owner-occupied occupancy rate of about 78 percent in 2000 compared to a predicted owner-occupied occupancy rate closer to 71 percent in 2020. The average household size in 2015 was 2.49 for Berthoud and 2.53 for the Greater Berthoud GMA.

Table 3: Berthoud Area Housing Statistics, 2000, 2010, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>3,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent owner occupied</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent renter occupied</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent vacant</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 U.S. Census; 2015 estimates and 2020 forecasts provided by Esri Business Information Solutions.
Household Income
The estimated 2015 median household income for residents of Berthoud was $76,031 and, for the GMA, $78,729. Berthoud’s median income is expected to grow to $82,828 by 2020, and the expectation for the GMA is $87,454. Figure 8 illustrates the full income distribution estimated for Berthoud and for the Greater Berthoud GMA in 2015.

- In 2015, the highest percentage of residents in the Berthoud area had an income in the $100,000–$149,000 income range (around 21 percent – 23 percent) followed by the $75,000–$99,999 income range (18 percent – 20 percent).
- The percentage of residents with income in the $75,000 – $200,000+ range for both Berthoud and the GMA is expected to rise by 7.6 percent and 7.9 percent, respectively, from 2014 to 2020 to represent 58.8 percent and 61.61 percent of the household income distribution in the two demographic areas (with the GMA being inclusive of the Town of Berthoud).

Figure 8: Berthoud Area Income by Household Distribution Comparison, 2015

Recreation Expenditures
As of 2015, in the Town of Berthoud, the average amount spent per person on recreational expenditures is $1,577.80. This amount is broken down into six categories: Entertainment/Recreation/Civic Clubs, Toys and Games, Recreation Vehicles and Fees, Sports/Recreation/Exercise Equipment, Photographic Equipment/Supplies, and Reading. As seen in Figure 9, 48 percent of those expenditures are spent on Entertainment/Recreation/Civic Club Fees and Admissions. This category includes membership fees for social and recreation clubs, recreation lessons, fees for participant sports, admission to sporting events, and admission to movies, theater, ballet, and opera shows. Of the remaining average yearly per person expenditures, 15 percent are spent on recreational vehicles and fees, and 13 percent are spent on sports, recreation, and exercise equipment.

Figure 9: Average Amount Spent on Recreation Expenditures in the Town of Berthoud (2015)


Key Demographics Summary
The Town of Berthoud is expected to grow at a faster rate than the state of Colorado, whose current growth rate is fourth among all states. With the total population expected to grow so quickly, the Department should also be aware of key demographic areas projected to shift. These shifts will influence how the Berthoud’s recreational needs evolve over time. Being aware of these areas allows the Department to proactively plan for new programs and amenities within their system. These areas include:

- Baby Boomers – With the aging of Baby Boomers, the average age is shifting upward, and household size is moving downward, signaling the need to provide a new focus on the needs of the older generations.
- Owner-occupied Housing – A downward shift in owner-occupied housing is expected, likely representing a need to plan for a more transient population in the area.
- Income Levels – Incomes tend to be rising, as are housing prices and general inflation; on average in the Town of Berthoud, residents are spending $1,578 annually on recreation.
- Growth in the Hispanic Population – The overall racial make-up of the community is projected to stay close to the same, with the exception of a slight growth in the Hispanic population.
Further information on these demographics and how they impact parks and recreation is detailed in the next section.

B. Park and Recreation Influencing Trends

The following information highlights relevant regional and national outdoor recreation trends from various sources that may influence the Town of Berthoud’s recreation planning for the next several years. A full Trends report can be found in Appendix A.

Demographic Trends in Recreation

Adult – The Millennial Generation
In a 2011 study of the Millennial Generation, Bartley Advertising Agency made the following observations:
- Sixty percent (60%) of Millennials say they try to work out on a regular basis. Seventy-three percent (73%) exercise to enhance their physical appearance.
- Fifty-four percent (54%) regularly treat themselves to spa services.
- Despite their commitment to health, Millennials stray from their healthy diets on weekends.

Adults – Baby Boomers
As Baby Boomers enter retirement, they will be looking for opportunities in fitness, sports, outdoors, arts and cultural events, and other activities that suit their lifestyles. With their varied life experiences, values, and expectations, Baby Boomers are predicted to redefine the meaning of recreation and leisure programming for mature adults.

Things to consider when planning for the demographic shift:
- Boomer characteristics
- What drives Boomers?
- Marketing to Boomers
- Arts and entertainment
- Passive and active fitness trends
- Outdoor recreation/adventure programs
- Travel programs

---

Youth – Generation Z
With regard to physical activity, a 2013 article published by academics at Georgia Southern University\(^5\) notes that the prevalence of obesity in Generation Z (which they describe as individuals born since the year 2000) is triple that of Generation Xers (born between 1965 and 1981). It suggests that due to increased use of technology, Generation Z spends more time indoors, is less physically active, and more obese compared to previous generations. While the most competent generation from a technological standpoint, Generation Zers tend to struggle in and fear some basic activities such as physical activity and sports.

Multiculturalism
As the recreation field continues to function within a more diverse society, race and ethnicity will become increasingly important in every aspect of the profession. More than ever, recreation professionals will be expected to work with, and have significant knowledge and understanding of, individuals from many cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

- **Outdoor participation varies by ethnicity**: Participation in outdoor activities is higher among Caucasians than any other ethnicity and lowest among African Americans in nearly all age groups.
- **Lack of interest reason for not participating**: When asked why they did not participate in outdoor activities more often, the number one reason given by people of all ethnicities and races was because they were not interested.
- **Most popular outdoor activities**: Biking, running, fishing, and camping were the most popular outdoor activities for all Americans, with each ethnic/racial group participating in each in varying degrees.

Recreational Preferences among Ethnic/Racial Groups (Self-Identifying):
According to the 2014 “Outdoor Recreation Participation Report,” the most popular outdoor activities among the Caucasian population are running and jogging (19%); fishing (freshwater, saltwater, and fly) (18%); road, mountain, and BMX biking (17%); camping (car, backyard, and RV) (16%); and hiking (14%).

In the United States, the Hispanic population increased by 43 percent over the last decade, compared to 5 percent for the non-Hispanic population, and accounted for more than half of all the population growth. At Berthoud’s current rate, the percentage of the population that identifies as of Hispanic origin will be 10 percent. According to Emilyn Sheffield, the growing racial and ethnic diversity is particularly important to recreation and leisure service providers, as family and individual recreation patterns and preferences are strongly shaped by cultural influences.\(^6\)

---


Participation in outdoor sports among those who identify as Hispanic is at eight percent nationwide according to the 2014 “Outdoor Recreation Participation Report.” Those who do get outdoors, however, participate more frequently than other outdoor participants, with an average of 47 outings per year. Hispanic youth (ages 13-17) are the most likely age group to participate in outdoor recreation in the Hispanic demographic (56%), followed closely by those in the 6-12 and 25-44 age ranges (54% each). The most popular outdoor activities among the Hispanic population are running and jogging (24%); road, mountain, and BMX biking (15%); fishing (freshwater, saltwater, and fly) (14%); camping (car, backyard, and RV) (13%); and hiking (9%).

Facilities
Much like Berthoud residents expressed through the survey, national trends show an increased user-base of recreation facilities (private and public). According to *Recreation Management* magazine’s 2015 “State of the Industry Report,” the top 10 planned features to be constructed for all facility types are:
1. Splash play areas (23%)
2. Playgrounds (22%)
3. Dog parks (22%)
4. Fitness trails and outdoor fitness equipment (22%)
5. Hiking and walking trails (20%)
6. Bike trails (20%)
7. Park restroom structures (20%)
8. Park structures such as shelters and gazebos (18%)
9. Synthetic turf sports fields (16%)
10. Wi-Fi services (14%)

The current national trend is toward “one-stop” indoor recreation facilities to serve all ages. Large, multipurpose regional centers help increase cost recovery, promote retention, and encourage cross-use. “One-stop” facilities attract young families, teens, and adults of all ages.

Aquatics/Water Recreation Trends
The National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) ranks swimming as the third most popular sport nationwide in terms of participation in 2014. Nationally, there is an increasing trend toward indoor leisure and therapeutic pools.

Additional indoor and outdoor amenities like “spray pads” are becoming increasingly popular as well. In some cities and counties, splash pads are popular in the summer and are converted into ice rinks in the winter. Communities are also concerned about water quality as well as conservation. Interactive fountains are a popular alternative, ADA-compliant, and low maintenance.

---

The Outdoor Foundation’s 2015 “Outdoor Recreation Participation Topline Report” provided nationwide trends for various outdoor activities (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>3 Year Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardsailing/windsurfing</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>10,553</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>10,044</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (fly)</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>5,683</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>5,842</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (freshwater/other)</td>
<td>38,860</td>
<td>38,863</td>
<td>39,135</td>
<td>37,796</td>
<td>37,821</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayak fishing</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (recreational)</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>8,144</td>
<td>8,716</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up paddle boarding</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeboarding</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Outdoor Foundation 2015 (numbers in thousands).

Dog Parks
Dog parks continue to see high popularity and have remained among the top planned addition to parks and recreational facilities over the past three years, reaching as high as #3 on Recreation Management magazine’s “State of the Industry Report” (2015) behind only playgrounds and splash play areas. In 2014, a new association was created dedicated to providing informational resources for starting and maintaining dog parks, the National Dog Park Association.

The best dog parks cater to people with design features for their comfort and pleasure, but also with creative programming.10 Amenities in an ideal dog park might include the following:

- Benches, shade, and water – for dogs and people
- At least one acre of space with adequate drainage
- Double gated entry
- Ample waste stations well-stocked with bags
- Sandy beaches/sand bunker digging areas
- Custom designed splashpads for large and small dogs
- People-pleasing amenities such as walking trails, water fountains, restroom facilities, picnic tables, and dog wash stations.

---

Programming

Fitness Programming

Initial survey results identified fitness opportunities as a desired program within the Town. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) Health and Fitness Journal\(^\text{11}\) conducts a survey annually to determine trends that would help create a standard for health and fitness programming. Table 5 shows survey results from 2007 (the first year of the survey) and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children and obesity</td>
<td>1. Body weight training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special fitness programs for older adults</td>
<td>2. High-intensity interval training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
<td>3. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Functional fitness</td>
<td>4. Strength training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core training</td>
<td>5. Personal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal training</td>
<td>7. Yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mind/body exercise</td>
<td>8. Fitness programs for older adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Outcome measurements</td>
<td>10. Group personal training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American College of Sports Medicine

General Programming

According to Recreation Management magazine’s 2015 “State of the Industry Report,”\(^\text{12}\) the most common programs offered by parks and recreation survey respondents include:

- Holiday events and other special events (80%)
- Youth sports teams (69%)
- Day camps and summer camps (64%)
- Educational programs (64%)
- Adult sports teams (63%)
- Arts and crafts (62%)
- Programs for active older adults (56%)
- Fitness programs (55%)
- Sports tournaments and races (55%)
- Sport training such as golf or tennis instruction (54%)


The 10 most common types of additional programming planned for 2015 include:

1. Environmental education programs
2. Mind-body/balance programs such as yoga and tai chi
3. Fitness programs
4. Educational programs
5. Programs for active older adults
6. Teen programming
7. Holidays and special events
8. Day camps and summer camps
9. Adult sports teams
10. Water sports such as canoeing and kayaking

**Older Adults and Senior Programming**

The American Academy of Sports Medicine issues a yearly survey of the top 20 fitness trends. It ranks senior fitness programs eighth among most popular fitness trends for 2015. Programs like SilverSneakers, low-impact cardio classes, water aerobics, hiking, birding, pickleball, and swimming are all popular in this age group.

**Festivals and Events**

Community events were also identified through the survey as an important program provided within the Town. As these events continue to grow, it is important to continuously evaluate their success. The success rate for festivals should not be evaluated simplistically solely on the basis of profit (sales), prestige (media profile), and/or size (numbers of events). There is evidence of local and city government supporting, and even instigating and managing particular festivals themselves, to achieve local or regional economic objectives, often defined very narrowly (sales, jobs, tourists, etc.). There are also a growing number of smaller, more local, community-based festivals and events in communities, most often supported by local councils that have been spawned partly as a reaction to larger festivals that have become prime economic-drivers.

In 2014, festivals grew in popularity as economic drivers and urban brand builders. Chad Kaydo describes the phenomenon in the January 2014 issue of Governing magazine:

“Municipal officials and entrepreneurs see the power of cultural festivals, innovation-focused business conferences and the like as a way to spur short-term tourism while shaping an image of the host city as a cool, dynamic location where companies and citizens in modern, creative industries can thrive.”

**Healthy Lifestyle Trends and Active Living**

**Active Transportation – Bicycling and Walking**

Throughout the public input and on the survey, residents identified trail connectivity on a local and regional level as a high priority. Bicycle-friendly cities have been emerging over the last 10 years. Cycling has become a popular mode of transportation as people consider the rising cost of fuel, desire for better health, and concern for the environment.

---


The Alliance for Biking and Walking’s “Bicycling and Walking in the United States: 2014 Benchmarking Report”\(^\text{15}\) shows that increasing bicycling and walking are goals that are clearly in the public interest. Where bicycling and walking levels are higher, obesity, high blood pressure, and diabetes levels are lower.

In November 2013, the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy published a Standard for Transportation Oriented Design, with accessible performance objectives and metrics, to help municipalities, developers and local residents design land use and built environment “to support, facilitate, and prioritize not only the use of public transport, but the most basic modes of transport, walking and cycling.”

**Trails and Health**

A connected system of trails increases the level of physical activity in a community has been scientifically demonstrated through the Trails for Health initiative of the (CDC).\(^\text{16}\) Trails can provide a wide variety of opportunities for being physically active, such as walking/running/hiking, rollerblading, wheelchair recreation, bicycling, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing, fishing, hunting, and horseback riding.

The health benefits for trails in urban neighborhoods are as high as for those in state or national parks. A trail in the neighborhood, creating a “linear park,” makes it easier for people to incorporate exercise into their daily routines, whether for recreation or non-motorized transportation. Urban trails need to connect people to places they want to go, such as schools, transit centers, businesses, and neighborhoods.\(^\text{17}\)

**Health Ranking**

The United Health Foundation ranked Colorado 8\(^\text{th}\) in its *State Health Rankings* in 2015 unchanged from its 2014 ranking. In the 2015 *Colorado County Health Rankings* (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, countyhealthrankings.org), Larimer County ranked 15\(^\text{th}\) out of the 60 ranked counties for health outcomes and 10\(^\text{th}\) for health factors. Weld County ranked 23\(^\text{rd}\) for health outcomes and 35\(^\text{th}\) for health factors.

---


\(^\text{16}\) “Guide to Community Preventive Services” Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), http://www.thecommunityguide.org/index.html

Natural Environments and Open Space

Conservation

As Berthoud develops its natural areas, many factors will play a role in successful conservation and preservation programs. The top ten recommendations of the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) Conservation Task Force are:

1. Take a leadership role in the community to promote conservation.
2. Lead by example in employing best management conservation practices in parks.
3. Engage volunteers in conservation and stewardship.
4. Establish a strategic land acquisition strategy based on knowledge and awareness of significant natural and cultural resources (watershed protection, unique ecological characteristics, and sensitive natural areas deserving protection).
5. Engage youth in conservation.
6. Conserve energy in all ways.
7. Protect natural resources in parks and in the community.
8. Create sustainable landscapes that demonstrate principles of conservation.
9. Forge partnerships that foster the mission of conservation.
10. Utilize technology to promote conservation.

Natural Areas Programs

“Our Lands – Our Future” is a plan for Larimer County developed as a tool for communities to use to help promote both conservation and recreational opportunities for the growing area. “Our Lands – Our Future” provided an inventory of the current County system, a vision and values for the plan, an analysis of economic benefit/mapping models/need assessment, and tools that include funding sources, stewardship models, and a website. The plan left the responsibility of development and implementation of its vision to the communities involved in the planning efforts. In order for communities to realize this vision special attention should paid to the following areas:18

- Land conservation
- Stewardship
- Passive Recreation
- Education
- Level of Service
- Definitions and Standards

---

18 Our Lands – Our Future. – Chapter 6 – Creating Our Vision. Pg. 6.15
From a programming standpoint, “Our Lands – Our Future” provided a list of recreational programs and opportunities, along with economic impact projections, for communities to consider while developing their natural programs. The programs are¹⁹:

- Biking (on paved trails, roads, and unpaved trails)
- Boating (motorized and non-motorized)
- Camping (including backpacking or backcountry)
- Education Programming
- Fishing
- Horseback Riding
- Rock Climbing/Bouldering
- Shooting/Achery
- Walking/Running/Hiking (on natural surfaces: roads or trails, and pavement: roads or trails)
- Watching Wildlife/Birding
- Winter Activities (as permitted by snow/ice levels)
- Picnicking
- Photography/Drawing/Painting
- Recreating with Dogs

While the responsibility of realizing the vision of “Our Lands – Our Future” does not fall solely on the Town of Berthoud, it is the responsibility of the Town to evaluate the feasibility of providing these programs within its community.

Economic and Health Benefits of Parks

“The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More City Parks and Open Space,” a report from the Trust for Public Land, makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental, and social benefits of parks and open space²⁰:

- Physical activity makes people healthier.
- Physical activity increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Residential and commercial property values increase.
- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and act as natural air conditioners.
- Trees assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency are reduced.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created.

¹⁹ Our Lands – Our Future. – Chapter 4 – Our Economic Benefit. Pg. 4.11
Riparian and Watershed Best Practices

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) suggests the following steps to building an effective watershed management plan.\(^{21}\)

- Build partnerships
- Characterize the watershed
- Set goals and identify solutions
- Design and implementation program
- Implement the watershed plan
- Measure progress and make adjustments

Sports and Recreation Trends

General Sports and Recreation Trends

*Table 6* outlines the top 20 sports ranked by total participation, according to a National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) survey on sports participation\(^{22}\) in 2014.

**Table 6: Top 20 Sports Ranked by Total Participation (in millions) in 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exercise walking</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exercising with equipment</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Swimming</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aerobic exercising</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Running/jogging</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hiking</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Camping (vacation/overnight)</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workout at club/gym/fitness studio</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bicycle riding</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bowling</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Weightlifting</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fishing (freshwater)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Yoga</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Basketball</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Billiards/pool</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Target shooting (live ammunition)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Golf</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hunting with firearms</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Soccer</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NSGA 2015*


Sports and Leisure in the Town of Berthoud
Residents of the Town of Berthoud participate in a wide variety of outdoor recreation and sports, as seen in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Sports and Leisure Market Behavior in Past 12 months in Town of Berthoud (2015)

Source: GfK MRI, 2015 Forecast by ESRI Business Information Solutions.
Outdoor Recreation
The Outdoor Foundation releases a “Participation in Outdoor Recreation Report” annually. According to the “2015 Topline Report,” both the total number of outdoor outings and number of participants dropped in 2014, with extreme weather and an unusually cold winter likely contributing to the decline. Bright spots in outdoor participation include paddle sports, with stand up paddling remaining the top outdoor activity for growth, with participation growing by 38 percent from 2013 to 2014. Participation in snow sports, including telemarking, snowshoeing, freestyle skiing, and cross-country skiing, grew significantly as well.

The Foundation reports that the top outdoor activities for adults in 2014 were running, fishing, bicycling, hiking, and camping. Birdwatching and wildlife viewing are also among the favorite adult outdoor activities by frequency of participation.

The Outdoor Foundation’s 2015 “Topline Outdoor Recreation Participation Report” lists the most popular (by participation rate) and favorite (by frequency of participation) outdoor activities for youth ages 6-17.

Most Popular Outdoor Activities (ages 6-17)
1. Road, mountain, and BMX biking (27% of youth participating)
2. Running, jogging, and trail running (24%)
3. Freshwater, saltwater, and fly fishing (21%)
4. Car, backyard, backpacking, and RV camping (20%)
5. Hiking (12%)

Favorite Outdoor Activities (ages 6-17)
1. Running, jogging, and trail running
2. Road, mountain, and BMX biking
3. Skateboarding
4. Freshwater, saltwater, and fly fishing
5. Car, backyard, backpacking, and RV camping

Trail Recreation and Cycling Trends
For trail-related recreation activities such as hiking, bicycling, and running, the 2015 “Outdoor Recreation Topline Report” indicates a positive three-year trend for trail running, running/jogging, hiking, mountain biking, and BMX biking.

Other Cycling Trends
• Bicycle touring is becoming a fast-growing trend around the world, including the United States and Canada. “Travelers are seeking out bike tours to stay active, minimize environmental impact, and experience diverse landscapes and cityscapes at a closer level.”
• Urban bike tours are taking hold in the United States.
• One of the newest trends in adventure cycling is “fat bike.”

Role and Response of Local Government
Administration Trends for Recreation and Parks
Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed, and more alternative methods of delivering services are emerging. Certain services are being contracted out, and cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions are being developed. Newer partners include the health system, social services, justice system, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies.

The traditional relationship with education and the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs.

Additional administrative national trends:
- Level of subsidy for programs is lessening and more “enterprise” activities are being developed, thereby allowing subsidy to be used where deemed appropriate.
- Information technology allows for better tracking and reporting.
- Pricing is often determined by peak, off-peak, and off-season rates.
- More agencies are partnering with private, public, and non-profit groups.

Trends in Marketing by Parks and Recreation Providers
Municipalities can use marketing to increase awareness of an issue, promote an upcoming program, encourage community participation, or to gain advocacy for a public service. Active Network offers expertise in activity and participation management. Their mission is to make the world a more active place. In their blog, they offered the following marketing mix ideas:
- Updated booths and community event presence.
- Facebook redirect apps.
- Instagram challenges.
- Social media coupons.

C. Community and Stakeholder Input
Public outreach for this master plan process was conducted with nineteen (19) participants in two Focus Groups on January 28, 2016 and seventeen (17) participants at a Public Meeting on February 11, 2016.

During these initial meetings, the project team distributed a questionnaire as a mechanism to collect data beyond the verbal discussion at each session. Questions were developed by GreenPlay with assistance from the Department staff and project team. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Further input was received from other sources:
- Key stakeholders within the community – These stakeholders included representatives from Town staff, the Chamber of Commerce, Thompson Valley School District, and local business owners.
- mySidewalk – An online, community engagement tool where participants could answer questions specific to the Master Plan Process. A full list of responses from the site can be found in Appendix C.
The input listed below is a summary of major themes of perceptions identified. The lists represent the responses from the participants and are not in order of importance. Participants in the focus groups, stakeholder meetings, and public forum expressed general agreement with this input.

Strengths:
- Variety of opportunities
- Work well with other organizations in town
- Low costs to participate
- Receptive to feedback
- Staff is easily accessible and helpful
- Sponsorships and partnerships prevalent
- Parks well maintained
- Brochure and flyers are great marketing tools, good communication
- Parks & Recreation is strong department

Areas for Improvement
- Outdated facilities, need more fields and gyms
- Nothing for teens/toddlers to do
- Not enough gym space
- No indoor pool
- Expand program offerings for all age groups
- Tennis courts need updating
- Website not always current
- Trails don’t connect
- School district facilities not available for recreation
- Dog parks are needed

Additional programs or activities needed:
- Teen/Tween programs
- Teen Night Out
- Dance/Music/Art programs
- Day camps
- Educational/Life skills classes, including outdoor opportunities on trail/natural areas
- Open-water opportunities, including swimming and fishing
- Preschool programs
- Adult leagues
- Movie nights
- Concerts
- Public art
- Youth camps
- Volunteer programs
- Special events staff
Improvements are needed at existing facilities:

- Lights on athletic fields
- Restrooms in parks, along trails and outdoor pool
- Playgrounds/spraygrounds
- Trail connections, including bike lanes and interpretive signage
- Natural surface trails in parks and open space
- Sidewalks
- Dog stations (bags to clean up after pets)
- Basic amenities for special events, including shelters, picnic areas, water stations

Additional facilities:

- Recreation Center with
  - Indoor aquatics (leisure pool)
  - Gymnasium
  - Track
  - Climbing wall
  - Fitness/wellness/weights
- Special events space
- Performing arts space/bandshell
- Access to water areas, including open-water and spraygrounds
- Athletic fields, including ball diamonds and soccer/football fields

Community Values:

- Small town feel
- Safety
- Good schools
- Family oriented
- Conveniently located to other front range communities
- Trees
- Open spaces

Financial support:

- Consideration of forming a recreation district
- Capital should be supported with taxes
- Operational should be supported with fees

Top priorities in next 5-10 years:

- Trails/connections
- Recreation Center with aquatics, gym, fitness/wellness, and program space preferred at Waggener Park location
- Athletic fields
- More space for special events

The project team used this information to develop a survey, which is summarized in the next section.
D. Community Survey Summary

The survey process involved three methods: 1) a mail-back survey, 2) an online, invitation-only web survey to further encourage response from those residents already within the defined invitation sample, and 3) an open-link online survey for members of the public who were not part of the invitation sample. The following analysis focuses on responses from the statistically-valid invitation sample.

The list source used for the mailing was a third party list purchased from Melissa Data Corporation, which provided 1,957 addresses. After accounting for undeliverable addresses (13 total), 1,944 survey mailings were delivered. A total of 519 responses were returned, resulting in a response rate of 26.7 percent, resulting in a margin of error of approximately +/- 4.3 percentage points. The open link survey received an additional 198 responses.

The underlying results are weighted by age and ethnicity to ensure appropriate representation of Berthoud area residents across different demographic cohorts in the sample. Using the Esri Demographic and Income Profile, the age distribution and ethnicity distribution within the invitation sample were matched to the 2015 demographic profile of the Town of Berthoud and the Greater Berthoud GMA.

Due to variable response rates by some segments of the population, the underlying results, while weighted to best match the overall demographics of residents, may not be completely representative of some sub-groups of the population.

A full survey report, including open-ended comments, has been provided separately.
Key Survey Findings

**Familiarity with and Usage of Current Facilities is Moderate.** Invitation sample respondents indicated some familiarity with current Berthoud parks and recreation offerings, with 45 percent reporting that they are familiar. Pocket parks are the most frequently used facility, with three-quarters (76%) of respondents indicating that they use pocket parks with some frequency. The Town Park & Swimming Pool, trails, Pioneer Park, and Bein Park & Baseball Complex are also used by a majority of respondents, reflective of their awareness and usage of Berthoud facilities. *Figure 11* and *Figure 12* depict these results.

*Figure 11: Respondent Familiarity*

*Figure 12: Current Usage of Facilities*
Pathways/Trails are Highly Important, Need Improvement. Eighty-two percent (82%) of invitation respondents identified pathways and trails as important (Figure 13), and appeared consistently throughout the survey as an area that should be focused on to better meet the needs of respondents. Only 31 percent of respondents indicated that pathways and trails are currently meeting their needs, and roughly two-thirds (65%) said pathway/trail connectivity is their top area of focus in regards to parks, trails, and facilities.

Figure 13: Importance of Facilities – Invitation Sample

A needs-met vs. importance matrix (Figure 14) compares the relative importance and degree to which needs are met for each amenity. Scores from invitation respondents are again displayed in the matrix using the mid-points for both questions to divide into four quadrants.

The upper right quadrant includes programs that are highly important to community households and are meeting their needs well. Enhancements to these amenities are generally not needed now; however, preserving the amenities in this quadrant should be a top priority as they are important to many resident households.

Amenities found in the upper left quadrant were given high importance ratings on average, though they are not faring well in terms of meeting community needs. These amenities should be considered for potential improvements, which could increase the degree to which residents feel their needs are being met overall.

The lower right quadrant shows amenities with relatively low importance ratings but high needs-met ratings – these amenities should be reviewed to understand whether the resources allocated justify the benefits received from them.
Finally, amenities in the lower left quadrant are neither important nor are adequately meeting the needs of the community. These programs typically appeal to only a small group of community members, so participation should be considered in future discussions.

Figure 14: Need vs. Importance Matrix
Fitness and Wellness Programs and Community Events Top List of Program Needs. A question about top areas for focus in terms of programs (Figure 15) revealed that invitation respondents were most likely to identify fitness and wellness programs (45%) and community events (40%) as areas of need for their households. Figure 16 shows programming needs when children are present in the home.

Figure 15: Programming Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Areas of Focus: Programs</th>
<th>Invitation Sample</th>
<th>Open Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult programs (non-sports)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic classes/programming</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family programs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs (non-sports)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/dance/music programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programs for individuals with disabilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Programming Focus Areas when Children are Present in the Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Areas of Focus: Programs - by Presence of Children in Household (Invitation Sample Only)</th>
<th>Children Present</th>
<th>No Children Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult programs (non-sports)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic classes/programming</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family programs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs (non-sports)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/dance/music programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programs for individuals with disabilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pathway/Trail Connectivity Tops List of Parks, Trails, and Facility Needs. The top area of focus for parks, trails, and facilities among invitation respondents was by far pathway/trail connectivity (65%). Open link respondents also selected this as their top priority. Other frequently chosen areas include aquatic features (35%) and condition/maintenance of parks/facilities (32%). Full responses are represented in Figure 17. Figure 18 shows parks, trail, and facility needs when children are present in the home.

**Figure 17: Parks, Trails, and Facilities Focus Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Areas of Focus: Parks, Trails, and Facilities</th>
<th>Invitation Sample</th>
<th>Open Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway/trail connectivity</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic features</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition/maintenance of parks/facilities</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved park amenities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land preservation/acquisition</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new parks/facilities in under-served areas</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional athletic facilities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog stations</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional restrooms</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade structures</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights for outdoor athletic facilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18: Parks, Trails, and Facilities Focus Areas when Children are Present in the Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Areas of Focus: Parks, Trails, and Facilities - by Presence of Children in Household (Invitation Sample Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway/trail connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition/maintenance of parks/facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved park amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land preservation/acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new parks/facilities in under-served areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional athletic facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights for outdoor athletic facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural Areas Used on Average More Than Once per Month; Lack of Awareness is Top Reason for Not Using. Invitation respondents reported that they have used natural areas or nature-based facilities in Larimer County but outside of Berthoud an average of 16.7 times per year (Figure 19). Those who do not use natural areas were asked a follow-up question to identify the reasons they are not using these areas. Lack of awareness of natural areas/facilities was identified as the top reason (39%), followed by a preference for other locations (27%), a lack of time (25%), and the distance from the respondent’s home (21%).

Figure 19: Usage of Natural Areas
Support for Unifying Recreation District/Community Center Strong. When asked whether or not they would support the creation of a Berthoud Recreation District, invitation sample respondents were highly positive, with three in four indicating that they would likely support the creation of a recreation district. Only 11 percent said they would likely not be supportive (Figure 20). In addition, when asked to allocate $100 toward a variety of potential parks and recreation offering, respondents allocated the most on average toward a new community/recreation center ($22) (Figure 21). When asked for open-ended feedback, many respondents also took the opportunity to voice their support for some sort of unifying district or facility.

Figure 20: Support of Creating a Recreation District

![Support of Creating a Recreation District](image)

Figure 21: Allocation of Funding

![Allocation of Funding](image)
**Newsletter Best Communication Method.** Approximately two-thirds (65%) of respondents said that the Town’s newsletter is the best way to reach them with parks and recreation information, followed by the quarterly recreation brochure (57%) and a variety of other communication methods (*Figure 22*).

*Figure 22: Best Communication Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Method</th>
<th>Invitation Sample</th>
<th>Open Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Berthoud newsletter</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly recreation brochure</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail from the Town</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/town website</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School flyers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the recreation facilities/program location</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priorities Vary Considerably by Location of Residence.** Opinions and priorities among invitation respondents who live within Berthoud limits (74%) are quite different than those of respondents who live outside of Berthoud limits (26%). Those who live outside Berthoud reported less usage of all facilities, less familiarity with current offerings, less support for a recreation district, and focused on different priorities that need attention or improvement.

**Open Link Sample Respondents Are Typically More Invested in Parks and Recreation, Have Different Interests Based on Demographics.** Throughout the results, open link respondents show greater involvement and investment in Berthoud parks and recreation. They were more likely to be familiar with the Town’s current offerings (58% vs. 45% of the invitation sample), and more frequently indicated support for the creation of a recreation district (87% vs. 75%). In addition, open link respondents showed particular interest in youth, providing higher importance ratings for aquatic facilities, playgrounds, programs, athletic fields, and ball fields. The emergence of this special youth interest is likely due to the dominant presence of family households (81%) in the open link sample.
III. What We Have Now – Inventory and Level of Service Analysis

A. Parks and Facilities Inventory

Inventory Methods and Process
In planning for the delivery of parks and recreation services, it is useful to think of parks, trails, indoor facilities, and other public spaces as parts of an infrastructure. This infrastructure allows people to exercise, socialize, and maintain a healthy physical, mental, and social wellbeing. It is made up of components that support this goal. A component is a feature that people go to a park or facility to use, such as a tennis court to play a game of tennis, and serve as an intended destination. Components include assets such as playgrounds, picnic shelters, courts, fields and other elements that allow the system to meet its intended purpose.

Developed by GreenPlay, LLC, and Design Concepts CLA, GRASP® (Geo-referenced Amenities Standards Process) is a proprietary, component based metric to evaluate access to recreation. The GRASP® Methodology has been utilized in hundreds of communities nationwide and was used to inventory and analyze the Town of Berthoud recreation system.

A detailed GIS (Geographic Information System) inventory of parks and recreation facilities was assembled by the GRASP® team and approved by the Town of Berthoud in March 2016. The inventory was completed in a series of steps. The planning team first prepared a preliminary inventory, which was reviewed by Town staff for accuracy and completeness.

Field visits were conducted by the consulting team to confirm or revise preliminary component data, add new data, make notes with regard to sites or assets, and develop an understanding of the system. Information collected during the site visits was compiled in the dataset, which was then formatted for review by Berthoud staff.

The inventory for this study focused on park sites and schools available for public use by the Berthoud community, and included sites owned or managed by the Town of Berthoud as well as select alternative provider facilities. Each component was evaluated to ensure it was serving its intended function within the system. Any components in need of refurbishment, replacement, or removal were noted. Site comfort and convenience amenities, called modifiers were also recorded.

A standardized list of components was used to classify each asset in the system, and a range of information was collected:

- Component type and location
- Component functionality
- Site modifiers
- Site design and ambience
- General comments
- Site photos
The GIS asset inventory may serve the Town of Berthoud in a number of ways. It can be used for planning and operations tasks such as asset management as well as future strategic and master plans. For the purposes of this study, however, it is used to measure access to recreation in the community. The current Berthoud Town limits were used as the study area.

Berthoud parks and facilities are mostly located in the central core of Berthoud, near the majority of the Berthoud’s residents. The eastern most part of Town currently has no facilities and is excluded from all analysis maps.
It should be noted that as all parks and facilities and most Berthoud residents are located in the central core, all maps focus on this historic area and the immediate vicinity, and exclude the yet undeveloped eastern most part of Town.

**Figure 25: Berthoud System Map**

This map shows all Berthoud inventory included in GRASP® analysis.

**Summary of Inventory Locations**

The Town of Berthoud has a number of recreation locations that serve the community at large in a variety of ways.
Outdoor Locations
The following Outdoor Locations were included in the GRASP® Inventory and Analysis:
- 1st Street Utility Site
- 2nd Street Detention
- Bein Park
- Berthoud Cemetery
- Berthoud Community Library
- Berthoud Elementary
- Berthoud Reservoir
- Cedar Drive Parkway
- Collins Park
- Fickel Park
- Heron Lakes
- Hillsdale Nature and Open Space Park
- Ivy Stockwell Elementary
- Jaskowski Open Space
- Knievel Property East
- Knievel Property West
- Lewis Farm Open Space
- Matthew Farms Property
- Nielsen Greenway
- Pioneer Community Park
- Pioneer Museum
- Railroad Park
- Richardson Property
- Roberts Park
- Skate Park
- Town Park
- Turner Middle School
- Waggener Farm Park

Parks
Park size in Berthoud ranges from pocket parks less than an acre in size to neighborhood parks of up to 10 acres. Parks offer a variety of recreation opportunities from neighborhood playgrounds to ballfield and athletic fields. Small parks may have only one or two amenities while larger parks offer many various components.

Schools
School grounds provide recreational opportunities in Berthoud, but as access is limited to non-school hours, school components were included in the analysis at a 50 percent discount. This discount also accounts for the fact that the quality of equipment and standards of maintenance may not always be consistent with Town standards.

Open Space Areas
Several open space and natural areas are publically accessible in the Town of Berthoud. Only those owned or maintained by the Town were included in the inventory.

Trails
 Trails data included all existing multi-use trails, or paths, in Town. These were scored as both passive active system components and for their value as open public space. Typical street sidewalks were excluded.
Indoor Facilities
The following Indoor Locations were included in the GRASP® Inventory and Analysis:
- Berthoud Community Center
- Berthoud Community Library
- Berthoud Elementary (25%)
- Ivy Stockwell Elementary (25%)
- Turner Middle School (50%)

Schools gymnasiums in town that are programmed for Town use were included as part of the indoor analysis for the entire recreation system. Indoor school facilities were discounted to 50 percent or 25 percent accordingly, based on the extent of Town programmed public access. Additionally, publicly accessible, non-fee based indoor facilities were also included. No additional analysis was conducted specific to indoor recreation.

B. Assessment and Analysis

Level of Service Analysis
GRASP® Level of Service Analysis evaluates how parks, schools, and facilities in the Town of Berthoud serve the community. It may be used as a tool to benchmark current access to recreation and serve future planning efforts.

Why GRASP® Level of Service?
GRASP® Level of Service may be defined as the extent to which a recreation system provides residents of a community access to recreational assets and amenities. It is indicative of the ability of people to pursue active lifestyles and can have implications for health and wellness, the local economy, and quality of life. Further, GRASP® Level of Service for a recreation system tends to reflect community values. It is often emblematic of the manner and extent to which people are connected to their communities, especially true in Colorado where residents lead active lifestyles focused on outdoor recreation and healthy living.

Scoring
The GRASP® process is a component-based system. A component is a feature that people go to a park or facility to use. All components were scored based on condition, size, site capacity, and overall quality as they reflect the expected quality of recreational features in the Town of Berthoud. A three tier rating system was used to evaluate these:
1 = Below Expectations
2 = Meets Expectations
3 = Exceeds Expectations

In addition to scoring components, each park site or indoor facility was given its own set of scores to account for its comfort, convenience, and ambient qualities, called modifiers. This includes traits such as the availability of restrooms, drinking water, shade, scenery, etc. These modifier values then serve to enhance or amplify component scores at any given location.
Beyond quality and functionality of components, however, GRASP® Level of Service analysis also takes into account these important aspects a park or recreation site that are easily overlooked. Not all parks are created equal and the quality of a user’s experience may be determined by their surroundings. For example, the GRASP® system acknowledges the different contexts of these identical playground structures:
Perspectives
Perspective maps and charts were produced by applying the GRASP® process to the Town of Berthoud inventory and assessment. Maps and data quantifications produced using the GRASP® methodology are known as perspectives. Each perspective is a model of how service is being provided across the study area. The model can be further analyzed to derive statistical information about service in a variety of ways. Maps are utilized along with tables and charts to provide benchmarks or insights Town staff may use to determine success in providing services.

Catchment areas, also called buffers, are used to calculate total GRASP® Level of Service scores. An outline is drawn on a map around each component and location at a specific distance. The GRASP® value for a component or location is then applied to that buffer to reflect that value. This scored buffer is called a service area.

When service areas for multiple components and locations are overlapped on a map, a picture emerges that represents the cumulative GRASP® Level of Service provided by those various locations. This process yields the data used to create GRASP® perspective maps and charts. For any place in a study area there is a total GRASP® value that reflects cumulative scoring for nearby assets.

Figure 26: GRASP® Illustration

This simplified example graphic illustrates the GRASP® process assuming the three components at City Park, and the park boundary itself, are scored a “2.” The overlap of their service areas yields higher or lower overall values for different parts of a study area.
A basic algorithm is used to calculate scoring totals, accounting for both component and modifier scores for every park and facility in the inventory. The resulting scores reflect the overall value of a site.

Figure 27: GRASP® score calculation.

Types of Perspectives
People arrive at a recreation destination by a variety of transit modes, on foot, on a bike, in a car, via public transportation, or utilizing any combination of these or other alternatives. The travel mode is often determined, at least in part, by the distance or duration of travel to the destination. This variability may be accounted for by applying more than one catchment area distance to determine GRASP® Level of Service. The GRASP® methodology typically applies two different catchment area distances to calculate scoring totals, yielding two distinct types of perspectives used to examine a recreation system:
1. Neighborhood Access to Recreation
2. Walkable Access to Recreation

A Neighborhood Access perspective applies a catchment distance of one mile to the inventory. A one-mile catchment is intended to capture recreational users travelling from home or elsewhere to a park or facility by way of bike, bus, or automobile. One mile is also considered a suitable distance for a longer walk. However, the ability to walk to a recreation opportunity is addressed specifically in the Walkable Access perspective.

A Walkable Access, or “walkability,” perspective utilizes a shorter catchment distance intended to capture users within a ten to fifteen-minute walk travelling at a leisurely pace. This distance can range from as short as 1/4 mile to as far as 1/2 mile, depending on the study area. For the Town of Berthoud, a 1/3 mile walkability catchment area was used. A 1/3 mile catchment accounts for longer actual walking distances as a result of indirect routes and serves to ensure a travel time of 10 minutes or less for most pedestrians.
GRASP® Walkable Access does not necessarily indicate that a safe or desirable route exists between two places. Walking routes between locations have not been specifically evaluated, and this type of network analysis is well beyond the scope of a typical GRASP® Perspective. A distance of 1/3 mile “as the crow flies” is used to determine the parts of Town with walkable access to recreation. In many built environments, the street layout or development pattern does not allow for a direct route between two points. An indirect route is more likely in most towns or cities by way of gridded street sidewalks, or around private property. A 1/3 mile radius is used for this reason to account for the fact that users may actually walk a distance closer to 1/2 mile due such indirect walking routes. An actual walking distance of 1/2 mile is commonly accepted in the industry as “walkable,” and most people can walk a 1/2 mile in 10 minutes or less at a typical rate of three miles per hour.

Figure 28: GRASP® Perspectives

GRASP® Level of Service perspectives overlap service areas to yield a picture of total service for any place within a study area. Yellow dots indicate components. Modifiers at each park or recreation site influence overall scoring. Orange shades display cumulative scoring for a given area.
Assumptions

1. Proximity equates to access. The presence of a recreational facility within a specified distance indicates that a site is “accessible.” “Access” in this analysis does not refer to access as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
2. Neighborhood Access equates to proximity of 1 mile, a reasonable distance for a drive in a car or by bicycle.
3. Neighborhood Access also accounts for a premium value for walkability, essentially doubling the score in areas with both 1 mile and unobstructed 1/3 mile access.
4. Walkable Access equates to proximity of 1/3 mile, a reasonable distance attainable in 10 minutes walking at a leisurely pace.
5. Walkability access to recreation is affected by barriers, obstacles to free and easy travel on foot.
6. Barriers within the Berthoud study area identified as restrictive to non-motorized travel include:
   - Mountain Ave (“Main St”)
   - Highway 287
   - Burlington Northern Railroad
   - 1st Street
   - Bunyan Ave
   - County Rd 10E
   - U.S. Interstate 25
   - 42nd St
7. A minimum standard for service, also called a threshold, equates to that provided by a “typical” neighborhood park. A GRASP® score of 67.2 was used to as this threshold value. This equates access to a park with four components and an off-street trail. Common neighborhood park components might include a playground, shelter, open turf area, and a loop walk. Access to a variety of other component types is likely to contribute to GRASP® Value.

Barriers

Walkability can often be limited by environmental barriers. Several such disruptions to walkable access are created by highways, major roads, and rail corridors within the Town of Berthoud. To account for this, walkability service areas in the GRASP® Level of Service analysis have been “cut-off” by identified barriers where applicable. Barriers define zones that serve as discrete areas of Berthoud within which any facilities are accessible without crossing a major barrier.

To account for greater walkability along Mountain Ave (“Main Street”) and across the railroad in downtown, these barriers were made porous in those locations.
Figure 29: Walkability Barriers

Walkability barriers were used to “cut-off” service areas where applicable.
Neighborhood Access to Recreation

This perspective is intended to capture access to recreation for users travelling from home or elsewhere to a park or school facility by way of automobile or bicycle, and shows where in town more or better recreation assets are available within a one mile service area. The “heat map” created to examine Neighborhood Access to Recreation indicates that the central core of Berthoud, including the historic downtown, has the greatest service concentration. In general, Berthoud has good distribution of parks and outdoor facilities in developed parts of town. Access to recreation is more limited at the periphery of town limits and in future growth areas.

This perspective indicates that 58 percent of the Berthoud town limits is within one mile of a recreation opportunity. This reflects the many undeveloped acres in town, including those along the I-25 corridor, which have no parks or facilities and therefore no service.

A variation on the heat map is the “threshold map” which displays the same data based on a minimum standard. This perspective is intended to identify gap areas, parts of town with opportunities for improvement as compared to other areas of Berthoud that already meet the target standard. For this reason, any service areas outside of town limits are removed from the data to examine town acreage and population exclusively.
For the Town of Berthoud GRASP® analysis, the minimum standard threshold is based on a neighborhood park with four components (such as a shelter, open turf, a loop walk, and playground for example) and access to an off-street trail. This is the typical standard used in GRASP® analysis. An equivalent GRASP® Value of 67.2 is used as this cut-off point above which the standard is met, below which it is not. Note: A GRASP® Value is different than a GRASP® Score, hence the score for existing Town parks as shown in the Inventory Atlas may be substantially different than the GRASP® threshold value.

The threshold perspective for Neighborhood Access to Recreation in Berthoud again indicates that most developed areas of town have access to recreation opportunities that meets or exceeds the threshold value. Only one significantly developed area at the edge of Town, west of U.S. 287 and north of Mountain Ave., falls below the minimum standard threshold.

The threshold analysis may be further developed. Beyond simply examining GRASP® Level of Service based on Town acreage, assessments based on population distribution can be most informative. One such perspective compares where people actually live within the Town of Berthoud to GRASP® values.
For Neighborhood Access to Recreation this shows that service is in fact far better than the acreage perspective indicates, with 99 percent of Berthoud residents living within one mile of recreation. More significantly, recreation opportunities for 95 percent of residents meet or exceed the minimum standard threshold. This means that nearly all Berthoud Town residents live within a mile of a typical park, or within a mile of several recreation opportunities that add up to the GRASP® equivalent. Only one percent of Berthoud residents have no Town recreation service within one mile.

Figure 32: Neighborhood Access to Recreation based on population.

Another important demographic indicator, median household income, was also examined as it compared to the Neighborhood Access to Recreation GRASP® threshold data.
Areas with the lowest median household income in Berthoud tend to have the highest Neighborhood GRASP® Level of Service. In a consideration of social equity, this is a positive finding, as it reflects greater access to recreation opportunities in those parts of town where residents have lesser financial resources. Parks and recreation are especially important for lower income demographics that often have more limited mobility and less time and money to invest in exercise and wellness related activities.

### Walkable Access To Recreation
This perspective models access to recreation components by walking or other active transportation. One-third mile service areas have been applied to each component and location and represent a distance from which access to these recreation opportunities can be achieved by an average person within a ten minute walk. This walkability analysis also accounts for barriers to non-motorized travel, thus service areas are truncated by these obstacles.

Walkability is a measure of how user-friendly an area is to people travelling on foot. A walkable environment benefits a community in many ways related to public health, social equity, and the local economy. Many factors influence walkability and include the presence or absence and quality of footpaths, sidewalks or other pedestrian rights-of-way, traffic and road conditions, land use patterns, and public safety. Walkability is an important factor in provision of recreation as one of three Americans is unable to drive a vehicle due to youth, advanced age, or disability.
This perspective indicates that 33 percent of Berthoud town limits is within a ten-minute walk of a recreation opportunity, while just nine percent of town limits meets the minimum standard threshold for access to walkable recreation. Walkable Access to Recreation is concentrated mostly in the core of Berthoud, primarily in the vicinity of Town Park, Fickel Park, and to a lesser extent Pioneer Park. Other developed areas of Town have some recreational GRASP® Level of Service but are more limited in the quantity and/or variety of recreation opportunities.
The threshold walkability map highlights these service “pockets” in downtown and around Pioneer Park, as these same areas meet or exceed the minimum standard threshold. Though a relatively small part of town this above threshold concentration in Berthoud’s core is significant. While only one third of town limits (33%) is walkable to a recreation opportunity, the majority of inventory sites are located in well-established areas of Berthoud and are connected by walkable travel routes.

For this reason, an examination of the threshold data based on population indicates that the vast majority of residents, 93 percent total, have walkable access to some sort of recreation. Beyond that, 61 percent of the Berthoud population has service that meets threshold within walking distance of home, even accounting for major barriers.

Barriers do serve to limit walkable access to recreation in Berthoud. This is most notable in the Parkview Meadows subdivision, northeast of the roundabout at Mountain Ave and 1St St. Due to the impact of these barriers this neighborhood has no GRASP® Level of Service despite close proximity to many parks or outdoor facilities.
Most other developed parts of Berthoud have some GRASP® Level of Service, though insufficient to meet the threshold value. These include neighborhoods around Collins Park, Hillsdale Nature and Open Space Park, and Cedar Drive Parkway, which typically have walkable access to only a single outdoor recreation location with limited offerings. Residents of these neighborhoods make up the majority of the 32 percent of town population with below threshold access to recreation.

The Walkable Access to Recreation threshold map also illustrates the impact and potential of undeveloped lands in Berthoud such as Knievel, Matthews Farm, Richardson, and Heron Lakes properties. The inclusion of undeveloped lands in the GRASP® inventory and analysis is intended to capture their value to the community as “green on the map,” banked park or open space land safe from other types of development. The threshold map shows that the parts of town surrounding these lands, many acres of which are slated for planned residential development, will be well served by these properties as walkable park land or open space assets in the future.

A consideration of median household income shows that areas with better walkable access to recreation tend to have lower incomes. This finding indicates that, regarding social equity, the Town of Berthoud does a good job providing walkable parks and recreation facilities to those residents with the most limited financial resources.
Greater Growth Management Area: Outside Berthoud Town Limits

The Town of Berthoud Growth Management Area (GMA) includes many acres of land surrounding Berthoud. It also includes several enclaves that fall within the Town boundary that have not been annexed, mostly private farms or minimally developed private properties. These hinterlands and enclaves are home to residents who identify as locals of Berthoud, despite that they live outside of Town. This Greater Growth Management Area, excluding Berthoud town limits, was analyzed to determine to what extent it is served by the Berthoud recreation system.
Figure 39: Walkable Access to Recreation Based on the GMA Outside of Town Limits

Access to recreation based on population for the GMA.

Access to Recreation for the Greater GMA is notably limited. As with the GRASP® analyses for the Town boundary, an examination of service based on population indicates better access to recreation than the acreage breakdown shows. Both indicate service levels for the Greater GMA are quite low.

Neighborhood Access to Recreation examined by either acreage or population indicates less than 10 percent of the Greater GMA meets the minimum standard threshold. For Walkable Access to Recreation this metric falls below one percent. Most service indicated within the Greater GMA is in fact provided by undeveloped lands with no current amenities, such as the Lewis Farm property and other Town-owned land surrounding Berthoud Reservoir and Loveland Reservoir. Berthoud Cemetery also impacted the Greater GMA in the analyses despite only providing limited recreational value.
Those areas of the Greater GMA with above threshold service are typically private enclaves within town limits or low density residential areas in the immediate vicinity of Town limits.

**Utilizing GRASP® Perspectives**

GRASP® perspectives are used to evaluate GRASP® Level of Service throughout a community from various points of view. Their purpose is to reveal gaps in access to recreation and provide a metric to use in understanding a recreation system.

However, it is not necessarily beneficial for all parts of a community to value equally in the analyses. Recreation access for a particular location should depend on the type of service being analyzed, land use, and other factors such as community need, population growth forecasts, and planned future development.

Commercial, institutional, and industrial areas might reasonably be expected to have lower GRASP® Level of Service than residential areas. Access to recreation in high density or low density areas may also vary appropriately. Undeveloped parts of a study area may be prioritized as future opportunities arise.

GRASP® perspectives are intended to focus attention on gap areas for further scrutiny but must be considered with such factors in mind. Maps, charts, and other GRASP® deliverables provided should be employed as additional tools to assist staff in future planning efforts.

**C. Beyond GRASP®: A Vision of Berthoud**

While GRASP® inventory and level of services perspectives focus on the current system, the information can be used as a tool to inform many different and future scenarios. Knowing that Berthoud is in a period of growth, it is important for the Department to plan development with this in mind. At the time of this report, there are six residential sites, comprised of approximately 4,000 rooftops that are in different stages of development. These properties are:

- Heron Lakes
- Bader
- Prairie Star
- Heron Point
- Vantage (Westhaven and Easthaven)
- Hammond

*(A full list and map of planned sites can be found in Appendix C.)*
According to the GRASP® perspectives and access analysis, these residential developments have lower levels of service than the current neighborhoods within Berthoud. This highlights the need for the Department to prioritize park site development by criteria such as:

- Number of households or people served
- Distribution of park sites
- Number and quality of amenities in the park site
- Trail connections/access opportunity

Figure 41 provides a visioning perspective of Berthoud, which extends neighborhood and walkable access to the new residential developments, by assuming further development of Waggener Farm Park, the Richardson Property, the Knievel Property, and Berthoud Reservoir. A threshold analysis was not completed for this scenario, because it is assumed that new park development will exceed the minimum threshold levels detailed previously.

This perspective also incorporates:

- The proposed/future trails plan from the Town of Berthoud Comprehensive Plan
- Walkability barriers
- Key connections/crossings
- Other gap areas
IV. Identification of Key Issues

The project team used public input from focus groups, public meetings and the statistically-valid citizen survey, staff experience, consultant team expertise, and the level of service analysis to identify and prioritize the key issues pertaining to this Master Plan. Table 7 is a matrix that:

- Identifies and categorizes the key issues.
- Identifies the source of input where the issues arose.
- Identifies a priority rating by source for each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue - Rating Scale</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meetings/Focus Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistically Valid Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Service Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Outdoor facilities or amenities to add, expand or improve**
  - Limited active amenities in parks
  - Current park amenities need updating
  - Limited aquatic opportunities
  - No plan to develop 400+ newly acquired acres
  - Smaller parks affords limited event space
  - Additional athletic fields
  - Trail connectivity - Regional trails are not prioritized
  - Trail connectivity - Local trails are not prioritized
  - Support services along trails

- **Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve**
  - People are traveling to neighboring communities for desired amenities (Chilson)
  - Year round aquatic space
  - Gymnasium
  - Additional multi-use space
  - Performing events space

- **Operations**
  - Current staff size limits programming/maintenance levels
  - Partnership with School District limits space
  - Development policies may not support needed system upgrades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Consultant Team</th>
<th>Staff Input</th>
<th>Public Meetings/Focus Groups</th>
<th>Statistically Valid Survey</th>
<th>Level of Service Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor facilities or amenities to add, expand or improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited active amenities in parks</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current park amenities need updating</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited aquatic opportunities</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plan to develop 400+ newly acquired acres</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller parks affords limited event space</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional athletic fields</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail connectivity - Regional trails are not prioritized</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail connectivity - Local trails are not prioritized</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services along trails</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are traveling to neighboring communities for desired amenities (Chilson)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year round aquatic space</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional multi-use space</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing events space</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff size limits programming/maintenance levels</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with School District limits space</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development policies may not support needed system upgrades</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since many of these issues are not mutually exclusive, the project team categorized them into five key areas. This allows the team to tell a more complete story of issues within the plan. These categories, along with a brief summary of issues, are:

- **Outdoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve**
  - The community is happy with the park system, but expressed interest in active amenities, like interactive art, splash pads, or climbing structures.
  - Upgrades to current features are needed within the system.
  - The community is looking for access to open water.
  - Special community events, like Berthoud Days, are manageable in size, but come with their share of logistics issues.
  - Additional fields within Berthoud would allow the Department to offer more diverse opportunities for participants, while also planning for opportunities to draw regional tournaments into town.
  - Though there is no plan for the newly acquired land, the Town of Berthoud participated in Larimer County’s “Our Lands – Our Future” Planning effort, a plan for Larimer County which was developed as a tool for communities to use to help promote both conservation and recreational opportunities for the growing area. To provide more active amenities within the town, a concept plan for Waggener Farm Park, the Knievel Property, the Richardson Property, and Berthoud Reservoir were developed.

- **Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand or Improve**
  - Residents are traveling to other recreation centers to gain access to a wider range of programs and services.
• Operations
  ▪ The staff of the Department is small, but was recognized by the community for what they accomplish. To alleviate issues, the Department could look at the following opportunities:
    ✷ Contracting maintenance
    ✷ Partnering with alternative providers
    ✷ Evaluating current partnerships
  ▪ With new staff coming on board, job descriptions could evolve with new responsibilities.
  ▪ The general fund does not provide enough revenue to cover the development of all Town services. To proactively plan for the projected growth, the Department should explore additional funding strategies to generate dedicated sources of revenue.

• Programs to Add, Expand or Improve
  ▪ The community is looking for more programming opportunities in the following areas:
    ✷ Youth and teens
    ✷ Dance/music/art
    ✷ Educational
    ✷ Water based recreation
    ✷ Fitness and wellness
    ✷ Community events
    ✷ Volunteer opportunities

• Marketing and Awareness
  ▪ Even with a small service profile, the community is looking for consistent channels of communication. Developing these channels now will allow the brand and the community perception of the Department to grow with the community.

Categorizing each issue and ranking them according to feedback, analysis, and professional experience, allows the project team to tell a more complete story of opportunities within the Department. Further it allows the team to develop recommendations based on the feasibility of the Department’s ability to capitalize on the opportunity. The next sections further detail these issues, and provide recommended goals and action steps.
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V. A Vision for Berthoud through the Exploration of Key Issues

A Vision for Berthoud
This Master Plan is a visionary plan for Berthoud – one that provides guidance for the City’s short and long-term park and recreation opportunities. This plan can be used to provide residents with the recreational opportunities that they are looking for, and as a tool for marketing and economic development.

Understanding the importance of preserving the small, home-town feel of Berthoud, the Plan provides a path to stewardship and conservation of undeveloped acres by:

- Incorporating Larimer County’s “Our Lands – Our Future” plan, and championing the preservation of Berthoud’s assets.
- Identifying local trails connecting the community to parks, recreation, and commercial opportunities.
- Identifying opportunities that allow users to access desired programs and amenities within their community.

Its long-range vision captures the interest of the community, developers, potential funders, and regional neighbors by providing a path toward a system complete with:

- Regional trails connecting the Front Range.
- Regional recreational opportunities that attract area residents and alternate providers.

The following sections recognize and discuss key issues, identified throughout the process, that are critical to the success of a growing Berthoud. These issues should be seen as opportunities to capitalize on the vision provided within this plan.

A. Outdoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand, or Improve

Active Amenities in Parks are Limited
Many participants in the public process, especially those families with children, identified the need for active amenities in parks. While the community is happy with the park system, active amenities, like interactive art, splash pads, or climbing structures, are missing. This causes residents to travel to neighboring communities (Loveland, Longmont, etc.) to access these services. The Department should look at adding active amenities to centrally-located parks with appropriate space to better service its residents.

Current Park Amenities Need Updating
Though Berthoud scored well on the Level of Service (LOS) Analysis, upgrades are needed throughout the system. Areas for upgrade include:

- Park benches
- Playgrounds
- Outdoor pool
- Sensory trails
Many of these amenities are addressed in the Department’s replacement plan, but some, specifically the outdoor pool, will require a bigger investment to update. Currently, the pool needs significant upgrades. The Department will need to decide what an appropriate upgrade would consist of, considering the demand for the amenity and the evolution of trends in parks and recreation.

**Aquatic Opportunities are Limited**
Participants in the process identified open water activities like canoeing and kayaking as desired opportunities within the Town. Current access for open water within the GMA are Loveland Reservoir and Berthoud Reservoir.

Loveland Reservoir is not owned by the Town. In order to gain appropriate access, the Town would either have to purchase the Reservoir, or enter into an agreement with the current owner. Berthoud Reservoir presents a more feasible opportunity to provide these opportunities. However, it is not currently filled, and it serves as a source of drinking water to the town. Appropriate planning and development at this site will be key in making it a feasible water destination within town.

**Smaller Parks Afford Limited Event Space**
Special community events, like Berthoud Days, were identified as an area of focus throughout the input process. As they currently exist, these events are manageable in size, but come with their share of logistics issues, such as:
- Parking
- Restrooms
- Electrical supply
- Areas for children/families
- Drinking water/water fountains

As the community grows, it can be expected that these events will grow out of their current sites. The Department should plan to develop new park areas with special event areas in mind.

**Number of Athletics Fields is Limited**
Currently, the Department has a shortage of athletics fields, specifically open fields that can be used for sports such as football, soccer, or lacrosse and baseball/softball. An increased number of fields would allow the Department to offer more diverse opportunities for participants, while also planning for opportunities to draw regional tournaments into town.
Development Opportunities with Connectivity in Mind
Throughout the public process, trails/pathways and connectivity were key areas of focus. Citizens expressed interest in a trails system that connected them locally and regionally. The 2015 Comprehensive Plan identifies a proposed trail system (Figure 42) that would connect Berthoud’s community members to local amenities like parks, recreational amenities, and the Town center; and regionally to opportunities along the Front Range and I-25.

Figure 42: Town Comprehensive Plan Proposed Trails Map

While the entire proposed system may not be feasible in the short-term, the Department should identify key focus areas of development:
- Walkability barriers identified in Section III of this Plan: What We Have Now – Inventory and Level of Service Analysis
- Key spines trails which connect residents to recreational opportunities
- Ability to partner with HOAs or regional providers
- Prioritization of connection points – recreational (including open space)/retail/commuter
- Funding as available

Support Services for Trails
Support services for trails was also identified as a need for the community, but it is recommended that without a developed trail system in place, the Department should focus on enhancing trail access points as staging areas and for wayside amenities. If support services are determined to be a priority in the existing system, the Department should look at partnering with local groups to develop:
- Dog stations
- Mile markers
- Interactive/interpretive signage
Potential partners include:
- Local volunteers
- Local non-profits
- Service Organizations
- School Clubs
- Boy/Girl Scouts
- Churches

**Plan to Develop Newly Acquired Acres Does Not Exist**
The Town acquired 422 acres of undeveloped parkland/open space, along with conservation/open space easements on 875 acres. While there is no current development plan within the Department, the Town of Berthoud participated in Larimer County’s “Our Lands – Our Future” Planning effort, a plan for Larimer County which was developed as a tool for communities to use to help promote both conservation and recreational opportunities for the growing area. “Our Lands – Our Future” provided an inventory of the current County system, a vision and values for the plan, an analysis of economic benefit/mapping models/need assessment, and tools that include funding sources, stewardship models, and a website. The plan left the responsibility of development and implementation of its vision to the communities involved in the planning efforts. In order for communities to realize this vision, special attention should paid to the following areas:25
- Land conservation
- Stewardship
- Passive Recreation
- Education
- Level of Service
- Definitions and Standards

From a programming standpoint, “Our Lands – Our Future” provided a list of recreational programs and opportunities, along with economic impact projections, for communities to consider while developing their natural programs. The programs are26:
- Biking (on paved trails, roads, and unpaved trails)
- Boating (motorized and non-motorized)
- Camping (including backpacking or backcountry)
- Education Programming
- Fishing
- Horseback Riding
- Picnicking
- Photography/Drawing/Painting
- Recreating with Dogs
- Rock Climbing/Bouldering
- Shooting/Archery
- Walking/Running/Hiking (on natural surfaces: roads or trails, and pavement: roads or trails)
- Watching Wildlife/Birding
- Winter Activities (as permitted by snow/ice levels)

While the responsibility of realizing the vision of “Our Lands – Our Future” does not fall solely on the Town of Berthoud, it is the responsibility of Department to evaluate the feasibility of providing these programs within the community.

---

25 *Our Lands – Our Future. – Chapter 6 – Creating Our Vision.* Pg. 6.15
26 *Our Lands – Our Future. – Chapter 4 – Our Economic Benefit.* Pg. 4.11
Concept Plans at Waggener Farm, Knievel, Richardson, and Berthoud Reservoir

Assessing the needs of the Department, and comparing them with national trends, the project team identified opportunities for the Town. These include:

- Athletics fields
- Destination playgrounds
- Splash pads
- Indoor recreation facilities
- Community gardens
- Community events space
- Open water recreation opportunities

Understanding how the Town is projected to develop, the vision focuses on four properties (Figure 43):

- Knievel Property
- Richardson Property
- Waggener Farm Park
- Berthoud Reservoir

Figure 43: Four Properties Identified for Park Development
These concept plans are intended to show an amenities mix at each site, and how the Town could provide services in the future. They should not be considered final plans, as there are many factors that could play a role in the future of each site including funding, deed restrictions, site topography/development needs, etc.

It is recognized that the Town owns more undeveloped park acreage than these properties. Properties not identified in this vision, or ones that the Town may acquire in the future, should be considered for open space/passive development and trail connectivity in line with previous efforts, such as Larimer County’s “Our Lands – Our Future.” Conversations about private development in some areas of Town were also taking place at the time of this report (e.g. development of the intersection at I-25 and Highway 56).

**Knievel Property**
The Knievel Property is on the west side of Town. It is south of Handy Reservoir and west of Highway 287.

Amenities proposed for this location include:
- Soccer fields
- Multi-purpose fields
- Outdoor basketball courts
- Large playground
- Loop trails
- Trail connections

Initial cost estimates at this site, with the proposed amenities in the conceptual plan, are $25,610,398. A detailed facility program (by line item) can be found in *Appendix D*. These costs do not include utilities and substantial grading, earthwork, or drainage. Costs not included will be detailed and estimated by a feasibility study or site plan.

**Figure 44: Proposed Knievel Property Development**
Richardson Property
The Richardson Property is east of the Knievel Property and north of Loveland Reservoir. Amenities proposed for this location (Figure 45) include:
- Ball fields
- Fieldhouse
- Recreation center
- Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts
- Destination playground
- Amphitheater
- Multi-purpose fields
- Trail connections

Initial cost estimates at this site, with the proposed amenities in the conceptual plan, are $3,846,617. A detailed facility program (by line item) can be found in Appendix E. These costs do not include utilities, substantial grading/earthwork/drainage, recreation center or fieldhouse. Costs not included will be detailed and estimated by a feasibility study or site plan.

Figure 45: Proposed Richardson Property Development
Waggener Farm Park
Waggener Farm Park is just west of downtown Berthoud. Considering that the other locations have more active amenities with a regional feel, Waggener Farm Park was designed with a more local feel in mind. Amenities proposed for this location (Figure 46) include:

- Community center
- Community gardens
- Little league ball fields
- Community bike/skate park
- Outdoor basketball/volleyball/tennis.pickleball courts
- Community playground
- Special events space
- Dog park
- Loop trails
- Trail connections

Figure 46: Proposed Waggener Farm Park Development

Initial cost estimates at this site, with the proposed amenities in the conceptual plan, are $33,449,664. A detailed facility program (by line item) can be found in Appendix F. These costs do not include utilities, substantial grading/earthwork/drainage, or a community center. Costs not included will be detailed and estimated by a feasibility study or site plan.
At the time of this planning effort, the Department was exploring indoor opportunities at Waggener Farm Park. One such facility is anticipated to be operated by a partnership between organizations to provide additional services to the community, and envisions a small gymnasium and multi-purpose space. Understanding the community’s desire for indoor space and the current opportunity, the project team added a small indoor space to represent this facility.

Even though this is a small facility, it could be designed with a phased approach allowing it to grow with the needs of community in the future. While this is one approach, the project team is concerned that space and deed restrictions will limit the future size of the facility and the flexibility and amenity mix/potential within Waggener Farm Park. Due to these concerns, it was determined that a larger center would be more appropriate at a different location (See Figure 45: Proposed Richardson Property Development).

**Berthoud Reservoir Property**
The Berthoud Reservoir is north of Town. Amenities proposed for this location (Figure 47) include:
- Loop trail
- Trail connections
- Picnic shelters
- Water access points

Figure 47: Proposed Berthoud Reservoir Development

To develop this property, the Town will need to further investigate opportunities for use on the Reservoir, because it serves as a part of the water supply for the town.
Initial cost estimates at this site, with the proposed amenities in the conceptual plan, are $3,637,751. A detailed facility program (by line item) can be found in Appendix G. These costs do not include utilities or substantial grading/earthwork/drainage. Costs not included will be detailed and estimated by a feasibility study or site plan.

Development Opportunities as a Whole
Looking at these four properties together (Figure 48), it is easy to see how undeveloped acreage could be maximized to provide opportunities for town residents in a larger system, and increase connectivity to the Town’s current system and proposed developments.

Figure 48: A Vision for Berthoud
Operations and Maintenance of the System
While rough estimates for the capital cost for each new site have been provided within this Plan, it is imperative for the Department to define the cost of operating its system as it plans to add new sites over time. Utilizing the 2015 National Recreation and Parks Association PRORAGIS Field Report, a compilation report of statistics gathered from parks and recreation agencies nation-wide, general park maintenance costs can be estimated between $10,000 and $15,000/acre per year, with agencies in the lower quartile reporting costs of approximately $6,054/acre and agencies in the upper quartile reporting costs of approximately $27,242/acre. Additionally, revenues cannot be projected without deeper understanding of how parks and sites within the system will be utilized. As of the writing of this plan, there are too many variables outstanding to provide accurate cost estimates for the proposed system. These include:

- Site design/development
- Maintenance standards/operational policies
- Staffing
- Employee wages
- Site programming
- Estimated usage rates/capacity
- Pricing strategies/fees
- Parking

Further refinement of the sites plans must be completed before operations and maintenance costs can be determined by the Department.

Outdoor Facilities or Amenities Recommendations
1. Provide a wide range of outdoor recreational and leisure time opportunities for all citizens and visitors in Berthoud.
   a. Identify most appropriate areas for regional and local amenities.
   b. Develop intergovernmental agreements to provide water access to residents during the offseason.
   c. Identify opportunities to upgrade and/or develop community events space.
   d. Develop Capital Improvement Plan and strategy to include:
      i. Local and regional trail connections
      ii. Shade structures
      iii. Support services
   e. Design parks for both active and passive use and promote a balance between different sized parks, special facilities, and recreation programming.
   f. Locate parks conveniently to neighborhoods and in areas with excellent pedestrian or trail access, with emphasis given to strategic partnerships with the school district, Larimer County, and the State of Colorado where applicable.
   g. Incorporate art into park designs to celebrate the unique aspects of Berthoud and provide distinctiveness between parks.
   h. Develop and implement an ADA Transition Plan, and identify issues as they arise to ensure that facilities remain compliant.

2. Ensure that parks, recreational facilities, and trails are strategically located to serve the entire community.
   a. Utilize GRASP® Analysis to identify key areas of development.
3. Focus efforts on the provision and maintenance of developed parklands, trails, recreational facilities, and open lands of community-wide significance.
   a. Develop Capital Improvement Plan and strategy to:
      i. Upgrade current park amenities
      ii. Provide active amenities in parks
      iii. Develop newly acquired park acres
   b. Continue maintenance plan for park facility upgrades.
   c. Provide both hard and soft surface trails to accommodate a variety of users.

4. Protect open lands that preserve unique or sensitive environmental resources, buffers between Berthoud and adjacent communities, prime agricultural lands, and key view corridors that contribute to the town’s rural identity.
   a. Preserve views to agricultural lands, natural areas, and the mountains along major roadway corridors.
   b. Protect and enhance the Little Thompson River corridor, Dry Creek corridor, and other major drainages in and around the community.
   c. Preserve floodplains, wetlands, and natural areas.
   d. Determine appropriate amounts of irrigated turf for current and future parks.
   e. Become a model for the public through educating and advocating for conservation practices in river corridors, bluffs, trails, and working agricultural areas.
   f. Design future assets with conservation in mind.
   g. Evaluate operating efficiencies, and address problem areas, for example determining the efficiency of the watering schedule.
   h. Design with appropriate plant selection for a given site or microclimate.
   i. Limit development in working agricultural assets.

5. Develop a system of prioritized growth and/or funding allocation.
   a. Categorize growth opportunities by:
      i. Safety Issues
      ii. Available funding – is it dedicated and/or recurring?
      iii. Need and/or demand for service
      iv. Ability to generate revenue for the Department
      v. Ability to partner
      vi. Potential impact (cost/benefit) to the Department and to the Town
      vii. Equitable investment across Department

6. Ensure Town development is in line with vision for the Department.
   a. Conduct feasibility studies at Waggener Farm Park, the Knievel Property, the Richardson Property, and Berthoud Reservoir.

B. Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand, or Improve

Indoor Recreation Facilities are Not Available Locally
An indoor recreation center is a top priority for Berthoud. This was a consistent theme throughout the public process, and level of service analysis. Without an indoor facility, residents are traveling to other recreation centers, most often to the Chilson Recreation Center in Loveland, Colorado, to gain access to a wider range of programs and services.
A full recreation center is not a feasible, short-term solution in Berthoud. To provide these services, the Department could look at potential partnerships with surrounding jurisdictions, or with local service providers. Currently, the Town is in discussion with two potential partners, Boys and Girls Club and La Familia, about the development of a community center at Waggener Farm Park. The ideal form of this partnership is being investigated, but this opportunity provides a mid-term solution to providing some indoor program space within the Town of Berthoud.

In the long-term, Berthoud should investigate the feasibility of building a full-service recreation center. This could be a new facility, or, if appropriate, an extension of the proposed facility at Waggener Farm Park. The proper location and design of this facility will need to be determined. The project team developed site considerations for this facility based on town input and growth trends, which can be found in the previous section.

**Indoor Facilities or Amenities Recommendations**

1. Provide a wide range of indoor recreational and leisure time opportunities for all citizens and visitors in Berthoud.
   a. Analyze current intergovernmental and partnership agreements to locate new indoor programming space.
   b. Provide activities for all ages – children, teens, adults, and seniors, such as:
      i. Fitness programs
      ii. Indoor aquatics
      iii. Skill/educational classes
      iv. Art/craft classes
      v. Performing arts space
      vi. Meeting/gathering space
   c. Explore opportunities at Waggener Farm Park to provide short-term strategy and solution to limited indoor space.
   d. Develop a committee of citizens to investigate the development of a special district dedicated to the provision of parks and recreation.
   e. Conduct feasibility studies in conjunction with site plans for indoor spaces including a recreation center and fieldhouse at the Richardson Property, and a community/activity center at Waggener Farm Park.

**C. Operations**

**Current Staffing Levels Limit Programming Development and Maintenance**

Though the staff of the Department is small, the community is highly satisfied with what they accomplish. This is true from high level programs to facility maintenance. However, this does not mean that the day-to-day operation and function of the Department cannot improve. Areas to consider are program development and maintenance.
From a programming and maintenance standpoint, the Department needs additional resources in order to provide the demanded services. Without hiring additional staff to take on some of this operation, the Department should look at the following opportunities to help alleviate current work pressures from staff, and provide a higher level of service to its users:

- Contracting maintenance in appropriate areas (e.g. mowing).
- Partnering with alternative providers to provide classroom space (e.g. fire department, churches).
- Partnering with alternative providers to provide programming support (e.g. local arts provider, contractual instructors).
- Evaluating current partnerships to determine if it is a mutually-beneficial relationship (e.g. school district).

If it is determined that the Town can support additional staff or expand contracting/partnership opportunities, current staff members could focus their efforts toward the development of the Department. For example, the recreation coordinator position could become responsible for new program development, while a local service provider is responsible for youth sports within town.

**Funding Through the General Fund is Limited**
The Town of Berthoud is considerably smaller than surrounding cities, and therefore has a relatively small general fund. While this is can be expected to increase in the coming years, it still may not provide enough generated revenue to cover the development of all Town services. It is appropriate for the Department to determine additional funding strategies to generate dedicated sources of revenue. Potential strategies are discussed further in the “Financial Analysis” section. This is also true for the development policies within Berthoud. While they are appropriate today, they may not be appropriate for the Town in 10 years, or within the market of northern Colorado. Suggestions for improvement are summarized below.

**Operations Recommendations**
1. Ensure proper staffing levels to meet the growing demands of the Parks, Recreation, and Culture Department.
   a. Use internal data and benchmark comparisons to justify additional staff to keep up with growing demand.
   b. Investigate the feasibility of additional contractual services.

2. Ensure diversified funding for the Department.
   a. Identify and develop additional funding mechanisms, including:
      i. General Obligation Bonds
      ii. Local Tax Revenues
      iii. Utility Bill Fee
      iv. Advertisement Sales
      v. Special Improvement Districts
      vi. Concessions and Merchandise Sales
      vii. Partnerships
      viii. Philanthropic
      ix. General Purpose/Operating Support Grants
      x. Program or Project Support Grants
   b. Develop and adopt a cost recovery and subsidy allocation philosophy.
D. Programs to Add, Expand, or Improve

New Programs are Desired
Even without the space and/or staff to provide additional services, the Department should determine the feasibility of providing programs and services identified throughout the public process. Programs that the community wants but the Town does not currently offer are:

- Opportunities for youth and teens
- Dance/music/art programs
- Educational programs
- Water based recreation
- Fitness and wellness programs
- Community event opportunities
- Volunteer opportunities

Similar to the recommendations within the “Operations” section, the Department will need to rely on contracting or partnering to provide the appropriate services.

Programming Recommendations
1. Ensure that programming services are in line with a growing population base and target markets.
   a. Evaluate programs on an annual or biannual cycle for fit within the Department.
   b. Evaluate program fee schedule on a biannual basis.
   c. Explore opportunities for resource/environmental programs.
   d. Develop partnerships with local and regional providers to expand Department services to the community.
2. Ensure that programming meets the goals of “Our Lands – Our Future.”
   a. Develop and prioritize nature based and open programs.
   b. Develop educational programs.
   c. Communicate the value of natural areas and open space to the community.

E. Marketing and Awareness

The Story of the Department Needs to be Told to the Appropriate Audience
Like a systems plan, a marketing plan should not and cannot happen through a patchwork approach. It needs to be developed strategically, and over time. To begin to develop this strategy it is important the following steps occur:

1. Develop a consistent brand for the Department.
   The Department already has a brand, or perception. The Department should define how it wants to be perceived and develop strategies that promotes that perception. Today, marketing has evolved from a product-focused strategy to an idea or story-focused strategy. People are connecting with brands that tell the best story and with which they identify. The Department is in a unique position by being a public agency, and as such, it already authentically represents its market.
2. **Develop goals for the marketing effort as a whole.**
   These goals should be unique to the Department. One of the biggest mistakes made in marketing is not defining goals that promote the brand, story, and authenticity of an agency. Defining goals that are not unique to the Department will make it difficult to communicate its value to town residents and visitors.

3. **Define target markets and segments.**
   Defining the target market for the Department goes deeper than “all of Berthoud.” Underserved portions of the community were identified in previous sections, as well as demographic segments that are expected to grow in the Town. Focusing efforts on market segments streamlines communication, and allows the Department to communicate directly to a select group rather than having its messages muddled when trying to communicate with the town as a whole.

4. **Define the goals for each channel of communication.**
   Due to the nature of the Department’s services, its marketing channels can take on wide-variety of forms, including:
   - Recreational programming
   - Events, festivals, and concerts
   - Museum services
   - Environmental education and conservation
   - Level of service
   - Pricing
   - Social media, including the website
   - Print media
   - Online media/video
   - Mobile applications
   - Online searches
   - Text
   - Email
   - Signage/wayfinding

   Each channel, and subsequent goal, should be developed with specific target markets in mind. For example, Millennial populations should be engaged through fitness opportunities promoted through mobile applications.

5. **Define the content guidelines for each channel.**
   Content guidelines should also be developed, so that messages consistently reinforce the brand, story, and goals of the marketing efforts.

6. **Define evaluation methods for marketing efforts.**
   Lastly, evaluation methods should be based on the brand, segments, goals, and content that is unique to the Department. To establish and reinforce the Department as an authentic brand it needs to focus on evaluating its own efforts. If efforts are evaluated based on other benchmarks, the Department may inaccurately conclude the success or failure of its effort.
Each of the items above can be read as steps of where to start, meaning that if the brand of the Department is not defined, it cannot necessarily evaluate its current efforts. Alternatively, if the Department does not have a target market then it cannot evaluate its channels. Without these steps in place, marketing efforts cannot effectively be developed or evolved.

Marketing and Awareness Recommendations

1. **Continue to promote community awareness.**
   a. Develop a consistent message of what the Department stands for, its services, and its value to the community.
   b. Develop educational programming and communication about the mission, goals, and value of the Department.
   c. Develop operational efficiencies to ensure messages are delivered across each channel.

2. **Develop marketing efforts to reach targeted population segments.**
   a. Define the brand of the Department.
   b. Develop a Marketing Plan.
   c. Define a target market or markets within the greater whole.
   d. Develop channels of communication, including upgrades to the Town website.
   e. Provide connections to technology through services (registration app, recreation program passport, etc.).

F. Financial Analysis

Planning for Parks
Like many agencies, Berthoud requires park land dedication from pending development as well as an impact fee assessed on building permits, in an attempt to ensure that growth pays its own way. **Appendix H** compares Berthoud’s current practice to surrounding communities, including Broomfield, Castle Rock, Lafayette, Windsor, Longmont, Loveland, Erie, and Ft. Collins.

In summary, Berthoud currently provides a significant amount of developed park land per 1,000 residents, at 11.2 acres/1,000 residents, compared to others. The park impact fee assessed on building permits of $2,178 is in the average range compared to these communities. However, a higher impact fee is not assessed for multi-family dwellings, nor is a fee differential present for community parks, which often have different and more costly amenities than neighborhood parks.

While this formula may produce sufficient land, in the long run, it does not produce sufficient funds for development of those lands into the park and recreation amenities the community is seeking.
Land Dedication

A formal definition and range of acreage would be helpful for various park categories, such as:

- **Green Space** – a percent of green/open area *not considered* park land. This might include such areas as planting strips adjacent to sidewalks and roadways, retention or detention, drainages or remnants of land from the subdividing process that perhaps preserve environmental resources. This should be a percent of the overall development; communities are typically in the 10-20 percent range.
- **Pocket Parks** – one to three acres; not owned or maintained by the Town; minimal amenities.
- **Neighborhood Parks** – three to five acres owned and maintained by the Town (or future parks and recreation service provider); provides amenities consistent with local neighborhood use such as shelters, playgrounds, a multipurpose court, open play space, or trail connections.
- **Community Parks** – likely 15 or more acres owned and maintained by the Town (or future parks and recreation service provider); provides amenities consistent with regional interest such as sport fields or courts, unique recreational facilities, restrooms, and regional trail access.

In **Figure 49** below a flow chart indicates the process proposed for park land dedication.

**Figure 49: Proposed Park Land Dedication Process**

- Application for development submitted to the Town of Berthoud.
- Based on number of dwelling units, a calculation is determined for park land dedication requirements. Town staff determines the need and location for park land as development proposal is approved.
- No Town park land is needed at this location due to adjacent amenities within or land small size of dedication requirement. Fees in lieu are calculated and accepted for future land acquisition. Pocket Parks may be encouraged.
- Park land is needed; but required dedication is only 2 acres. Fees in lieu balance may be used to negotiate with and purchase additional park acreage from the developer.
- Park land is needed; required dedication is 4.5 acres. Dedication is accepted.
- As development begins, impact fees are paid on each building permit.
- With no park land for this development, the funds are reserved in a park development improvement fund for other future parks.
- A timeline for development of the park is estimated, depending on funds availability and build out of the project.
Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks, while open to the general public, are designed to serve the immediate neighborhood. These parks thus have limited services but typically include such things as shelter, playgrounds, picnic tables, benches and perhaps multipurpose courts or a field. Berthoud’s current provision of 64.66 developed park acres results in an average of .0112 acres per person. In an effort to maintain the same ratio as new development occurs, land dedication should occur proportionate to the number of dwelling units and average household size (2.49 people) as follows:

\[ \text{# Dwelling Units} \times \text{Average Household Size} \times \text{Acres per Person} = \text{Acres of Park Land Dedication Requirement} \]

WHICH TRANSLATES TO:

\[ \text{# Dwelling Units} \times 2.49 \times 0.0112 = \text{Acres of Park Land Dedication Requirement} \]

Example:

Subdivision with 100 new homes is approved.

\[ 100 \times 2.49 \times 0.0112 = 2.788 \text{ Acres of Park Land Dedication Required} \]

This formula allows Berthoud to grow, yet provide a comparable level of service in terms of acres of park land currently provided. In addition, a minimum park size should be established. If a development’s land dedication requirement falls below 3-5 acres, it likely is not feasible to develop a neighborhood park on such a limited site, and fees in lieu should be considered. The Town always maintains the prerogative of accepting park land or requiring a fee-in-lieu. In addition, a pocket park might be encouraged that would not be owned or maintained by the Town. From time to time, it may be determined that park land is not desired in a particular area due to adjacent recreational opportunities. Fees in lieu would also be considered in this case. Lastly, a required dedication may be accepted to be applied toward a Community Park, subject to negotiations with the developer for sufficient acreage or adjacent property.

Acceptable Land Dedication

It is important that land dedicated for development of park land meets certain criteria. Definitions of land that is acceptable should be adopted such that:

- Park land dedication is in addition to required green space.
- Drainages and detention or retention areas are not suitable for park development.
- Disconnected remnants of land created by division of sites into lots or parcels are not generally acceptable.
- Setback is required areas around oil and gas production facilities, and should not be counted.
- Private yards, HOA common areas, remanence of any homes, or tree lawns if present in a subdivision should not be counted.
- Required parking lot landscaping associated with all uses should not be counted.

Fees in Lieu of Land

Currently, the fee in lieu of formula calls for seven percent of the appraised raw land value. A better approach would be to determine the per acre value of “developable land,” land that has been rough graded, with infrastructure installed and utilities stubbed to the site. This likely is equivalent to the local school district fee in lieu value.
Park Impact Fees
Legislatively, impact fees are authorized by C.R.S. 29-20-104.5, allowing municipalities to levy fees on new development relative to the impacts of the development. Impact fees must be:
   1. Legislatively adopted.
   2. Generally applicable to a broad class of property owners.
   3. Intended to defray the projected impacts of capital facilities directly caused by proposed development.  

Neighborhood Parks
Neighborhood parks are intended to be within walking distance of households. Impact fees are sometimes determined to meet the costs of developing neighborhood parks without regard for the development of community parks, leaving no immediate funding source for this need.

Community Parks
Community parks are larger tracts of land offering more regional or destination type amenities. Through a visioning session, Berthoud has identified four key areas for community park development: Berthoud Reservoir, Knievel, Richardson, and Waggener properties. To construct the initial concept plans for these sites is estimated to cost $450,000 per acre, subject to final site plan recommendations. Currently, there is no dedicated funding mechanism to obtain funding for community parks, serve as a grant match, or implement phased development. Impact fees are recommended.

Neighboring communities along the front range have impact fees for neighborhood parks ranging from $1,262 (Ft. Collins) to $5,333 (Longmont) as shown in Appendix H. Many of these communities also differentiate fees for single or multi-family dwelling units. Some also add additional impact fees for trails or facilities, another option to consider, and other impact fees might be considered as well.

Berthoud currently collects impact fees of $2,178 per building permit. This is not differentiated between neighborhood parks or community parks nor between single family or multifamily dwellings. The current fee is recommended as a single family, Neighborhood Park impact fee, with an additional impact fee recommended for Community Parks of $1,200-$1,500 as shown below in Table 8. Multi-family impact fees are also suggested along with a trail impact fee. While not shown, impact fees for Community Parks and/or trails on commercial development could also be considered. Based on anticipated future building permits, this would generate funding toward community parks in the next 5-10 years, and create the opportunity for phasing or grant matches. Impact fees should increase incrementally each year based on the Consumer Price Index, or other appropriate indices.

Table 8: Park Impact Fee Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Fee Type</th>
<th>Colorado Range</th>
<th>Suggested Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park SF</td>
<td>$1,262 - $5,333</td>
<td>$2,178 - $2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park SF</td>
<td>$400 - $1,692</td>
<td>$1,200 - $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park MF</td>
<td>$2,165 - $2,616</td>
<td>$2,200 - $2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park MF</td>
<td>$1,300 - $1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>less common</td>
<td>$300 - $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility</td>
<td>less common</td>
<td>not recommended at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recreation Programs
Revenues and expenditures for the Parks and Recreation Department are included in the General Fund for the Town of Berthoud. A simple chart showing the departmental allocation and impact is below in Table 9.

Table 9: Town of Berthoud 2016 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund (all sources)</td>
<td>$3,679,236</td>
<td>$4,114,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Parks, Pool</td>
<td>$124,652</td>
<td>$769,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of General Fund</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department contributes 3.5 percent of the revenues associated with the General Fund via fees and charges, and expenses amount to 18 percent of the General Fund, primarily associated with staff and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities. Revenues are collected from a diversity of recreational athletics for youth and adults, as well as seasonal pool operations and park reservations. Expenditures exceed revenues in most all categories, and overall, recreation programs are subsidized in excess of $18,000 annually. For example, sample programs estimate the following for 2016:

Flag Football:
- Revenues: $5,100
- Expenses: $13,090

Adult Basketball:
- Revenues: $1,836
- Expenses: $2,960

Youth Baseball/Softball:
- Revenues: $11,220
- Expenses: $18,285

Many programs require partnerships with outside organizations or other agencies in order to create leagues or form teams. Offering these programs in this capacity relieves the need for staff coordination and oversight and is a good use of regional collaboration.

Operating under a cost recovery philosophy and communicating it to elected officials and the public, can go a long way toward directing subsidies to the appropriate areas. The creation of a cost recovery and subsidy allocation philosophy and policy is a key component to maintaining financial control, equitably pricing offerings, and helping to identify core services including programs and facilities. As operational costs continue to increase, revenues must increase at a higher rate in order to maintain current cost recovery, if that is the desire. An established cost recovery policy helps to allocate appropriate resources and charge appropriate fees for services to meet cost recovery targets. A beneficial summary of the pyramid methodology developed by GreenPlay, LLC, is illustrated on the right.
The development of a financial resource allocation philosophy and policy is built upon a very logical foundation, based upon the theory that those who benefit from parks and recreation services ultimately pay for services. The Pyramid Methodology can be presented to staff in a focused workshop upon further request.

**Alternative Funding**
There are many sources of alternative funding for programs and capital needs; some options follow.

**Partnership Opportunities**
Partnerships are joint development funding sources or operational funding sources between two separate agencies, such as two government entities, a non-profit and a government agency, or a private business and a government agency. Two partners jointly develop revenue-producing park and recreation facilities and share risk, operational costs, responsibilities, and asset management based on the strengths and weaknesses of each partner.

Creating synergy based on special events, expanded program offerings and collaborative efforts focused on capital can be beneficial to all providers as interest grows and people gravitate to the type of facility and program that best suits their recreational needs and schedules. Potential strategic partnerships where missions run parallel, and mutually beneficial relationships can be fostered, may include such organizations as:
- LaFamilia
- YMCA
- School districts
- Medical centers or hospitals
- Boys and Girls Club
- Kiwanis, Optimists, VFWs, Elks, Rotary, and other service and civic organizations
- Chamber of Commerce
- Convention and Visitors Bureau
- Homeowner or neighborhood associations
- Youth sports associations
- Neighboring counties/communities
- Private alternative providers
- Churches

**Advertising Sales**
Advertising sales are a limited opportunity for revenue through the sale of advertising on items such as program guides, event flyers, and other visible products or services. This could be a viable strategy for Berthoud publications or events. Current sign codes should be reviewed for conflicts or appropriate revisions.

**Corporate Sponsorships**
An agency can solicit this revenue-funding source itself or work with agencies that pursue and use this type of funding. Sponsorships are often used for programs and events where there are greater opportunities for sponsor recognition (greater value to the sponsor). Opportunities present themselves for sponsoring not only events, but for sponsoring venues such as picnic tables, benches, parks, signs, etc.
Fundraising
Some park and recreation agencies have fundraisers to help cover specific programs and capital projects. This can include selling bricks, benches, pavers, tiles, and commemorative tree plantings, etc. and might be useful for key upgrades in certain park areas, such as a performing arts venue or water features.

Crowdfunding
Crowdfunding is the practice of funding a project or venture by raising many small amounts of money from a large number of people, typically via the internet. Park and recreation agencies are beginning to incorporate crowdfunding efforts alongside traditional fundraising strategies as noted above. NRPA has implemented a Fund Your Park crowdfunding platform. It is free to members, donations are tax deductible, and there is support from NRPA staff.

Source: Kara Kish, MPA, CPRE, CPSI, article in Parks and Recreation Magazine, December 2015. www.NRPA.org

Grants
Grants often supplement or match funds that have already been identified. For example, grants can be used for program purposes, information technology infrastructure, planning, design, seed money, and construction. Due to their infrequent nature, grants are often used to fund a specific venture and should not be viewed as a continuous source of funding. While some types of grants are listed below, “watch lists” also help to keep track of such opportunities and include:

- GrantWatch (www.grantwatch.com)
- Grant Helpers Watch List (www.thegranthelpers.com)

Types of grants available include:
- Facilities and Equipment Grants
- General Purpose or Operating Grants
- Management or Technical Assistance Grants
- Matching Grants
- Planning Grants
- Private Grant and Philanthropic Agencies
- Program or Support Grants
- Seed Money or Start-up Grants
- Great Outdoors Colorado – Great Outdoors Colorado (Lottery funds) provides grants related to parks and recreation projects. This continues to be a viable funding option for projects independently or in cooperation with others.
Financial Recommendations

1. Ensure that Town development policy is in line with vision for the Department.
   a. Adopt a formal requirement and criteria for green space dedication (not to be counted toward park land).
   b. Adopt park definitions by size/amenity type (Pocket, Neighborhood, Community).
   c. Adopt formula for determining park land dedication requirements.
   d. Adopt a fee in lieu of policy that matches other “developable land” costs or full appraised value per acre.
   e. Adopt impact fees reflective of residential single family, multi-family and commercial for neighborhood and community parks, and trails.
VII. Action Plan

The following Action Plan has been developed for the Department through input and analysis of key issues. Many of the 2007 Master Plan Goals are still relevant today, and this action plan represents new issues facing the Department. For the purposes of this action plan four timeframes were used:

- Ongoing – The Department is currently taking action, whether it be in planning or currently implementing.
- Short-Term – The Department should plan to accomplish the action in 1 – 3 years.
- Mid-Term – The Department should plan to accomplish the action in 3 – 5 years.
- Long-Term – The Department should plan to accomplish the action in 5 – 10 years.

Since the priorities of the Department will change and evolve throughout the lifetime of this plan, the following are not ranked in order of importance priority.

A. Outdoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand, or Improve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.1: Provide a wide range of recreational and leisure time opportunities for all citizens and visitors in Berthoud.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.a Identify most appropriate areas for regional and local amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.b Develop intergovernmental agreements to provide water access to residents during the offseason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.c Identify opportunities to upgrade and/or develop community events space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.d Develop Capital Improvement Plan and strategy to develop:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local and regional trail connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shade structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.e Design parks for both active and passive use and promote a balance between different sized parks, special facilities, and recreation programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.f Locate parks conveniently to neighborhoods and in areas with excellent pedestrian or trail access with emphasis given to strategic partnerships with the school district, Larimer County, and the State of Colorado where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.g</th>
<th>Incorporate art into park designs to celebrate the unique aspects of Berthoud and provide distinctiveness between parks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.h</td>
<td>Develop and implement ADA Transition Plan, and identify issues as they arise to ensure that facilities remain compliant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 1.2:
Ensure that parks, recreational facilities, and trails are strategically located to serve the entire community.

#### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.a</td>
<td>Utilize GRASP® Analysis to identify key areas of development.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 1.3:
Focus efforts on the provision and maintenance of developed parklands, trails, recreational facilities and open lands of community-wide significance.

#### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.a</td>
<td>Develop Capital Improvement Plan and strategy to:</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade current park amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide active amenities in parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop newly acquired park acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.b</td>
<td>Continue maintenance plan for park facility upgrades.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.c</td>
<td>Provide both hard and soft surface trails to accommodate a variety of users.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1.4:
Protect open lands that preserve unique or sensitive environmental resources, buffers between Berthoud and adjacent communities, prime agricultural lands and key view corridors that contribute to the town’s rural identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.a</strong> Preserve views to agricultural lands, natural areas, and the mountains along major roadway corridors.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.b</strong> Protect and enhance the Little Thompson River corridor, Dry Creek corridor and other major drainages in and around the community.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.c</strong> Preserve floodplains, wetlands, and natural areas.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.d</strong> Determine appropriate amounts of irrigated turf for current and future parks.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.e</strong> Become a model for the public through educating and advocating for conservation practices in river corridors, bluffs, trails, and working agricultural areas.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.f</strong> Design future assets with conservation in mind.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.g</strong> Evaluate operating efficiencies, and address problem areas, for example determining the efficiency of the watering schedule.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.h</strong> Design with appropriate plant selection for a give site or microclimate.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4.i</strong> Limit development in working agricultural assets.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1.5:
**Develop a system of prioritized growth and/or funding allocation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.a</td>
<td>Categorize growth opportunities by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Available funding – is it dedicated and/or reoccurring?</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need and/or demand of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to generate revenue for the Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential impact (cost/benefit) to the Department and to the Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equitable investment across Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 1.6:
**Ensure Town development policy is in line with vision for the Department.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.a</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility studies for Waggener Farm Park, the Knievel Property, the Richardson Property, and Berthoud Reservoir.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time/Approx. $60,000 per site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Indoor Facilities or Amenities to Add, Expand, or Improve

### Objective 2.1
**Provide a wide range of indoor recreational and leisure time opportunities for all citizens and visitors in Berthoud.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.a</td>
<td>Analyze current intergovernmental and partnership agreements to locate new indoor programming space.</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.b</td>
<td>Provide activities for all ages – children, teens, adults, and seniors, such as:</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fitness programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indoor aquatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skill/educational classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Art/craft classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performing arts space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting/gathering space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.c Explore opportunities at Waggener Farm Park to provide short-term strategy and solution for limited indoor space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPRD/Planning</th>
<th>Staff time</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1.d Develop a committee of citizens to investigate the development of a special district dedicated to the provision of parks and recreation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPRD/Planning</th>
<th>Staff time</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1.e Conduct feasibility studies in conjunction with site plans for indoor spaces including a recreation center and fieldhouse at the Richardson Property, and a community/activity center at Waggener Farm Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPRD/Planning</th>
<th>Staff time/ Approx. $60,000 per site</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. Operations

Objective 3.1: Ensure proper staffing levels to meet the growing demands of the Parks, Recreation, and Culture Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/ Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.a</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use internal data and benchmark comparisons to justify additional staff to keep up with growing demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.1.b   | BPRD/Planning | Staff time | Short-Term |
| Investigate the feasibility of additional contractual services. |

Objective 3.2: Ensure diversified funding for the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/ Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.a</td>
<td>BPRD/Planning</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Identify and develop additional funding mechanisms, including:  
  - General Obligation Bonds  
  - Local Tax Revenues  
  - Utility Bill Fee  
  - Advertisement Sales  
  - Special Improvement Districts  
  - Concessions and Merchandise Sales  
  - Partnerships  
  - Philanthropic  
  - General Purpose/Operating Support Grants  
  - Program or Project Support Grants |
3.2.b
Develop and adopt a cost recovery and subsidy allocation philosophy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Programs to Add, Expand, or Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Objective 4.2** | Ensure that programming meets the goals of “Our Lands – Our Future.” |
| Actions | Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support | Resource Impact/Budget Requirement | Timeframe to Complete |
| 4.2.a | Develop and prioritize nature based and open programs. | BPRD/Planning | Mid-Term |
| 4.2.b | Develop educational programs. | BPRD/Planning | Mid-Term |
| 4.2.c | Communicate the value of natural areas and open space to the community. | BPRD/Planning | Staff time | Mid-Term |
E. Marketing and Awareness

**Objective 5.1:** Continue to promote community awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.a</td>
<td>Develop a consistent message of what the Department stands for, its services, and its value to the community.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.b</td>
<td>Develop educational programming and communication about the mission, goals, and value of the Department.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.c</td>
<td>Develop operational efficiencies to ensure that messages are delivered across each channel.</td>
<td>BPRD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 5.2:** Develop marketing efforts to reach targeted population segments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.a</td>
<td>Define the brand of the Department.</td>
<td>BPRD/Contract marketing service</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.b</td>
<td>Develop a Marketing Plan.</td>
<td>BPRD/Contract marketing service</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.c</td>
<td>Define a target market or markets within the greater whole.</td>
<td>BPRD/Contract marketing service</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.d</td>
<td>Develop channels of communication, including upgrades to the Town website.</td>
<td>BPRD/Contract marketing service</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.e</td>
<td>Provide connections to technology through services (registration app, recreation program passport, etc.).</td>
<td>BPRD/Contract marketing service</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F. Financial

### Objective 6.1:
Ensure that Town development policy is in line with vision for the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Primary Dept. Responsibility/Support</th>
<th>Resource Impact/Budget Requirement</th>
<th>Timeframe to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.1.a**
Adopt a formal requirement and criteria for green space dedication (not to be counted towards park land). | BPRD |  | Short-Term |
| **6.1.b**
Adopt park definitions by size/amenity type (Pocket, Neighborhood, Community). | BPRD |  | Short-Term |
| **6.1.c**
Adopt formula for determining park land dedication requirements. | BPRD |  | Short-Term |
| **6.1.d**
Adopt a fee in lieu of policy that matches other “developable land” costs or full appraised value per acre. | BPRD |  | Short-Term |
| **6.1.e**
Adopt impact fees reflective of residential single family, multi-family and commercial for neighborhood and community parks, and trails. | BPRD |  | Short-Term |
Appendix A – Parks and Recreation Influencing Trends

The following information highlights relevant regional and national outdoor recreation trends from various sources that may influence The Town of Berthoud’s recreation planning for the next several years.

Demographic Trends in Recreation

Adult – The Millennial Generation

The Millennial Generation, generally considered to represent those born between about 1980 and 1999, represent about 24 percent of the Berthoud population in 2015. In their book, Millennials Rising, the Next Great Generation, authors William Strauss and Neil Howe identify seven Millennial characteristics.28 These characteristics were discussed in a 2010 California State Parks article entitled “Here come the ‘Millennials’: What You Need to Know to Connect with this New Generation”:

1. Special: Used to receiving rewards just for participating, Millennials are raised to feel special.
2. Sheltered: Millennials lead structured lives filled with rules and regulations. Less accustomed to unstructured play than previous generations and apprehensive of the outdoors, they spend most of their time indoors, leaving home primarily to socialize with friends and families.
3. Team Oriented: This group has a “powerful instinct for community” and “places a high value on teamwork and belonging.”
4. Technically savvy: Upbeat and with a can-do attitude, this generation is “more optimistic and tech-savvy than its elders.”
5. Pressured: Millennials feel “pressured to achieve and pressured to behave.” They have been “pushed to study hard and avoid personal risk.”
6. Achieving: This generation is expected to do great things, and they may be the next “great” generation.
7. Conventional (and diverse): Millennials are respectful of authority and civic minded. Respectful of cultural differences because they are ethnically diverse, they also value good conduct and tend to have a “standardized appearance.”

The California State Parks article provides a broad range of ideas for engaging Millennials in parks and recreation.29

The highest-ranking age cohorts in the Town of Berthoud in 2015 were 45--55 and 55--64 (at about 17 percent each), followed by the 35--44 cohort at about 11 percent of the population. Close to 25 percent of the population was in the Baby Boomer age range in 2015 (currently age 52–70, a nearly 20 year span). In 2015, an estimated 24 percent of the population is in the Millennial Generation (age 17 – 36, again, a nearly 20 year span).

---

In a 2011 study of the Millennial Generation, Barkley Advertising Agency made the following observations about Millennials and health/fitness:

- Sixty percent (60%) of Millennials say they try to work out on a regular basis. Twenty-six percent (26%) consider themselves health fanatics.
- Much of this focus on health is really due to vanity and/or the desire to impress others – 73 percent exercise to enhance their physical appearance.
- Millennials are also fans of relaxation and rejuvenation, as 54 percent regularly treat themselves to spa services.
- Despite their commitment to health, Millennials stray from their healthy diets on weekends. There is a noticeable difference between their intent to work out regularly and the amount of exercise that they actually accomplish.

Figure 50 illustrates contrasts between Millennials and Non-Millennials regarding a number of health and fitness topics.

Figure 50: Millennials (red) Vs. Non-Millennials (grey) on Health and Fitness

Source: Barkley’s Report on Millennials.

---

31 Barkley report.
Adults – Baby Boomers

Baby boomers are defined as individuals born between 1946 and 1964, as stated in “Leisure Programming for Baby Boomers.” They are a generation that consists of nearly 76 million Americans. In 2011, this influential population began its transition out of the workforce. As Baby Boomers enter retirement, they will be looking for opportunities in fitness, sports, outdoors, arts and cultural events, and other activities that suit their lifestyles. With their varied life experiences, values, and expectations, baby boomers are predicted to redefine the meaning of recreation and leisure programming for mature adults. In the July 2012 issue of *Parks and Recreation* magazine, published by NRPA, Emelyn Sheffield, Professor of Recreation and Parks Management at the California State University, at Chico, authored an article titled “Five Trends Shaping Tomorrow Today.” In it, she indicated that Baby Boomers are driving the aging of America, with boomers and seniors over 65 composing about 39 percent of the nation’s population.33

In the leisure profession, this generation’s devotion to exercise and fitness is an example of its influence on society. When Boomers entered elementary school, President John F. Kennedy initiated the President’s Council on Physical Fitness; physical education and recreation became a key component of public education. As Boomers matured and moved into the workplace, they took their desire for exercise and fitness with them. Now as the oldest Boomers are nearing 65, park and recreation professionals are faced with new approaches to provide both passive and active programming for older adults. Boomers are second only to Gen Y/Millennials (born between 1980 and 1999) in participation in fitness and outdoor sports.34

Jeffrey Ziegler, a past president of the Arizona Parks and Recreation Association identified “Boomer Basics” in his article, “Recreating Retirement: How Will Baby Boomers Reshape Leisure in their 60s?”35 Highlights are summarized below.

**Boomers are known to work hard, play hard, and spend hard.** They have always been fixated with all things youthful. Boomers typically respond that they feel 10 years younger than their chronological age. Their nostalgic mindset keeps Boomers returning to the sights and sounds of their 1960s youth culture. Swimming pools have become less of a social setting and much more of an extension of Boomers’ health and wellness program. Because Boomers in general have a high education level, they will likely continue to pursue education as adults and into retirement.

**Boomers will look to park and recreation professionals to give them opportunities to enjoy many life-long hobbies and sports.** When programming for this age group, a customized experience to cater to the need for self-fulfillment, healthy pleasure, nostalgic youthfulness, and individual escapes will be important. Recreation trends will shift from games and activities that Boomers associate with senior citizens, as Ziegler suggests that activities such as bingo, bridge, and shuffleboard will likely be avoided because Boomers relate these activities to being old.

---

Boomers will reinvent what being a 65-year-old means. Parks and recreation agencies that do not plan for boomers carrying on in retirement with the same hectic pace they have lived during their years in employment will be left behind. Things to consider when planning for the demographic shift:

- Boomer characteristics
- What drives Boomers?
- Marketing to Boomers
- Arts and entertainment
- Passive and active fitness trends
- Outdoor recreation/adventure programs
- Travel programs

Youth – Generation Z

In her article, Sheffield also identified that the proportion of youth is smaller than in the past, but still essential to our future. As of the 2010 Census, the age group under age 18 forms about a quarter of the U.S. population. Nationwide, nearly half of the youth population is ethnically diverse and 25 percent is Hispanic. In Berthoud, about 24 percent of the population is 19 and under.

Characteristics cited for Generation Z, the youth of today,\(^{36}\) include:

- The most obvious characteristic for Generation Z is the pervasive use of technology.\(^{37}\)
- Generation Z members live their lives online and they love sharing both the intimate and mundane details of life.
- They tend to be acutely aware that they live in a pluralistic society and tend to embrace diversity.
- Generation Zers tend to be independent. They do not wait for their parents to teach them things or tell them how to make decisions.\(^{38}\)

With regard to physical activity, a 2013 article published by academics at Georgia Southern University\(^{39}\) notes that the prevalence of obesity in Generation Z (which they describe as individuals born since the year 2000) is triple that of Generation Xers (born between 1965 and 1981). It suggests that due to increased use of technology, Generation Z spends more time indoors, is less physically active, and more obese compared to previous generations. The researchers noted that Generation Z is a generation that seeks social support from peers more so than any previous generation. This is the most competent generation from a technological standpoint but Generation Zers tend to struggle in and fear some basic activities such as physical activity and sport.

\(^{36}\) Note: There does not appear to be a general consensus about the transition from Millennials to Generation Z. The range sited in various articles puts the transition year anywhere from about 1994 to 2000.


Multiculturalism

Our country is becoming increasingly racially and ethnically diverse. In May 2012, the U.S. Census Bureau announced that non-white babies now account for the majority of births in the United States. “This is an important tipping point,” said William H. Frey, the senior demographer at the Brookings Institution, describing the shift as a “transformation from a mostly white Baby Boomer culture to the more globalized multi-ethnic country that we are becoming.” Cultural and ethnic diversity adds a unique flavor to communities expressed through distinct neighborhoods, multicultural learning environments, restaurants, places of worship, museums, and nightlife.

As the recreation field continues to function within a more diverse society, race and ethnicity will become increasingly important in every aspect of the profession. More than ever, recreation professionals will be expected to work with, and have significant knowledge and understanding of, individuals from many cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

The population of Hispanic origin provides a separate look at the population, irrespective of race. Hispanic origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before arriving in the United States. In the U.S. census, people who identify as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be any race and are included in all of the race categories. As recorded in the Esri demographics, an estimated 10 percent of the Berthoud population self-identified as being of Hispanic origin in 2015.

- **Outdoor participation varies by ethnicity:** Participation in outdoor activities is higher among Caucasians than any other ethnicity and lowest among African Americans in nearly all age groups.
- **Lack of interest reason for not participating:** When asked why they did not participate in outdoor activities more often, the number one reason given by people of all ethnicities and races was because they were not interested.
- **Most popular outdoor activities:** Biking, running, fishing, and camping were the most popular outdoor activities for all Americans, with each ethnic/racial group participating in each in varying degrees.

Multiculturalism and Marketing

Today the marketplace for consumers has dramatically evolved in the United States from a largely Anglo demographic, to the reality that the United States has shifted to a large minority consumer base known as “new majority.”

---


The San Jose Group, a consortium of marketing communications companies specializing in reaching Hispanic and non-Hispanic markets of the United States, suggests that today’s multicultural population of the United States, or the “new majority,” is 107.6 million, which translates to about 35.1 percent of the country’s total population. The United States’ multicultural population alone could essentially be the twelfth largest country in the world.42 Parks and recreation trends in marketing leisure services continue to emerge and should be taken into consideration in all planning efforts, as different cultures respond differently to marketing techniques.

Facilities

According to Recreation Management magazine’s 2015 “State of the Industry Report,”43 national trends show an increased user-base of recreation facilities (private and public). Additionally, parks and recreation providers responding to the survey indicated an average age of 26.4 years for their community recreation facilities. To meet that growing need, a majority of the parks and recreation survey respondents (72.6%) reported that they have plans to build new facilities or make additions or renovations to their existing facilities over the next three years. Nearly one-third (32.4%) of parks respondents said they have plans to build new facilities, and 29.9 percent said they plan to add to their existing facilities. More than half (53.1%) are planning renovations to existing facilities.

Also according to the 2015 “State of the Industry Report,” the average amount planned for parks and recreation department construction in the 2015 budgets saw an increase from an average of $3,795,000 in the previous year’s survey to an average of $3,880,000 for 2015. Currently, the most likely features included in park facilities are playgrounds, park shelters, restroom structures, walking and hiking trails, open spaces—gardens and natural areas, bleachers and seating, outdoor sports courts, natural turf sports fields, concession areas, and classrooms/meeting rooms. The top 10 planned features to be constructed for all facility types are:

1. Splash play areas (planned by 23.4 percent of parks respondents who will be adding features)
2. Playgrounds (22.4%)
3. Dog parks (22%)
4. Fitness trails and outdoor fitness equipment (21.5%)
5. Hiking and walking trails (20.3%)
6. Bike trails (20.1%)
7. Park restroom structures (19.5%)
8. Park structures such as shelters and gazebos (17.7%)
9. Synthetic turf sports fields (16.1%)
10. Wi-Fi services (14.4%)

The current national trend is toward “one-stop” indoor recreation facilities to serve all ages. Large, multipurpose regional centers help increase cost recovery, promote retention, and encourage cross-use. Agencies across the United States are increasing revenue production and cost recovery. Providing multiuse and flexibility in facilities versus specialized space is a trend, offering programming opportunities as well as free-play opportunities. “One-stop” facilities attract young families, teens, and adults of all ages.

Aquatics/Water Recreation Trends
According to the National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA), swimming ranked third nationwide in terms of participation in 2014. Outdoor swimming pools are not typically heated and open year round. Swimming for fitness is the top aspirational activity for “inactives” in six of eight age categories in the Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) 2013 Sports, Fitness and Leisure Activities Topline Participation Report, representing a significant opportunity to engage inactive populations. Nationally, there is an increasing trend towards indoor leisure and therapeutic pools.

Additional indoor and outdoor amenities like “spray pads” are becoming increasingly popular as well. In some cities and counties spray pools are popular in the summer months and turn into ice rinks in the winter months. In this maturing market, communities are looking for atmosphere, an extension of surroundings either natural or built. Communities are also concerned about water quality and well as conservation. Interactive fountains are a popular alternative, ADA-compliant and low maintenance. Trends in architectural design for splash parks can be found in Recreation Management magazine articles in 2014 and 2015.

The Outdoor Foundation’s 2015 “Outdoor Recreation Participation Topline Report” provided nationwide trends for various outdoor activities, including the following water recreation activities: board sailing/windsurfing, canoeing, fishing, kayaking, rafting, sailing, stand-up paddling, and wakeboarding (Table 10). Among water recreation activities, stand-up paddle boarding had the largest increase in participation from 2012 to 2014 (30.5% increase) followed by several varieties of the kayaking experience: kayak fishing (20.1% increase) and whitewater kayaking (15.1% increase). Fly fishing participation went up, while other fishing activities went down in the same time period. Sailing participation increased somewhat, while rafting and wakeboarding participation went down.

Table 10: Water Recreation Participation by Activity (in thousands) (6 years of age or older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>3 Year Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardsailing/windsurfing</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>10,553</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>10,044</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (fly)</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>5,683</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>5,842</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (freshwater/ other)</td>
<td>38,860</td>
<td>38,868</td>
<td>39,135</td>
<td>37,796</td>
<td>37,821</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayak fishing</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (recreational)</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>8,144</td>
<td>8,716</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (white water)</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up paddle boarding</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeboarding</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Outdoor Foundation 2015 (numbers in thousands).

Dog Parks

Dog parks continue to see high popularity and have remained among the top planned addition to parks and recreational facilities over the past three years. In 2014, a new association was formed dedicated to providing informational resources for starting and maintaining dog parks, the National Dog Park Association. *Recreation Management* magazine\(^{47}\) suggests that dog parks can represent a relatively low-cost way to provide an oft-visited a popular community amenity. Dog parks can be as simple as a gated area, or more elaborate with “designed-for-dogs” amenities like water fountains, agility equipment, and pet wash stations, to name a few. Even “spraygrounds” are being designed just for dogs. Dog parks are also places for people to meet new friends and enjoy the outdoors.

The best dog parks cater to people with design features for their comfort and pleasure, but also with creative programming.\(^{48}\) Amenities in an ideal dog park might include the following:

- Benches, shade and water – for dogs and people
- At least one acre of space with adequate drainage
- Double gated entry
- Ample waste stations well-stocked with bags
- Sandy beaches/sand bunker digging areas
- Custom designed splashpads for large and small dogs
- People-pleasing amenities such as walking trails, water fountains, restroom facilities, picnic tables, and dog wash stations.

Programming

Fitness Programming

There have been many changes in fitness programs in the last 15 years. What clients wanted in 2000 is not necessarily what they want today. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) *Health and Fitness Journal*\(^{49}\) has conducted a survey annually since 2007 to determine trends that would help create a standard for health and fitness programming. *Table 11* shows survey results that focus on trends in the commercial, corporate, clinical, and community health and fitness industry. Some trends first identified in 2007 have stayed near the top of the list year after year while others came and went in popularity. Zumba made a brief appearance on the top 10 in 2012 but fell off the list of top 20 in 2014. Body weight training appeared as a developing trend in 2014 and is projected to stay strong in 2015 as is high-intensity interval training. Yoga is regaining popularity after falling out of the top 20 in 2009 and staying out of the top 10 until 2014. Fitness programs for older adults will remain strong in 2015.

---


Table 11: Top 10 Worldwide Fitness Trends for 2007 and Predicted Trends for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Trends for 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children and obesity</td>
<td>1. Body weight training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special fitness programs for older adults</td>
<td>2. High-intensity interval training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
<td>3. Educated and experienced fitness professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Functional fitness</td>
<td>4. Strength training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core training</td>
<td>5. Personal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal training</td>
<td>7. Yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mind/body exercise</td>
<td>8. Fitness programs for older adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Outcome measurements</td>
<td>10. Group personal training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American College of Sports Medicine

According to the 2015 Participation Report by the Physical Activity Council,50 over half of each generation participates in fitness sports and that team sports are more of a Generation Z activity while water and racquet sports are dominated by Millennials. Outdoor and individual sports tend to have younger participants with participation decreasing with age. Figure 51 illustrates participation rates by generation.

Figure 51: A Breakdown of Fitness Sports Participation Rates by Generation


General Programming

One of the most common concerns in the recreation industry is creating innovative programming to draw participants into facilities and services. Once in, participants recognize that the benefits are endless. According to Recreation Management magazine’s 2015 “State of the Industry Report,” the most common programs offered by parks and recreation survey respondents include: holiday events and other special events (79.6%); youth sports teams (68.9%); day camps and summer camps (64.2%); educational programs (63.8%); adult sports teams (63.4%); arts and crafts (61.6%); programs for active older adults (56.2%); fitness programs (55%); sports tournaments and races (55%); and sports training such as golf or tennis instruction (53.8%).

About one-third (35.7%) of parks and recreation respondents indicated that they are planning to add programs at their facilities over the next three years. The 10 most common types of additional programming planned for 2015 include:

1. Environmental education programs (up from No. 7)
2. Mind-body/balance programs such as yoga and tai chi (up from No. 6)
3. Fitness programs (down from No. 2)
4. Educational programs (up from No. 8)
5. Programs for active older adults (down from No. 1)
6. Teen programming (down from No. 3)
7. Holidays and special events (down from No. 5)
8. Day camps and summer camps (did not appear in 2014)
9. Adult sports teams (down from No. 4)
10. Water sports such as canoeing and kayaking (did not appear in 2014)

Older Adults and Senior Programming

The American Academy of Sports Medicine issues a yearly survey of the top 20 fitness trends. It ranks senior fitness programs eighth among most popular fitness trends for 2015. Whether it is SilverSneakers, a freestyle low-impact cardio class, or water aerobics, more and more people are realizing the many benefits of staying active throughout life. According to the National Sporting Goods Association, popular senior programming trends include hiking, birding, and swimming.

Festivals and Events

In the context of urban development, from the early 1980s, there has been a process that can be characterized as “festivalization,” which has been linked to the economic restructuring of towns and cities, and the drive to develop communities as large-scale platforms for the creation and consumption of “cultural experience.”

---

The success rate for festivals should not be evaluated simplistically solely based on profit (sales), prestige (media profile), and/or size (numbers of events). Research by the European Festival Research Project (EFRP) indicates that there is evidence of local and city government supporting and even instigating and managing particular festivals themselves to achieve local or regional economic objectives, often defined very narrowly (sales, jobs, and tourists). There are also a growing number of smaller, more local, community-based festivals and events in communities, most often supported by local councils that have been spawned partly as a reaction to larger festivals that have become prime economic-drivers. These community-based festivals often will re-claim cultural ground based on their social, educational, and participative value. For more information on the values of festivals and events, see the CRC Sustainable Tourism research guide on this topic.

In 2014, festivals grew in popularity as economic drivers and urban brand builders. Chad Kaydo describes the phenomenon in the January 2014 issue of Governing magazine: “Municipal officials and entrepreneurs see the power of cultural festivals, innovation-focused business conferences and the like as a way to spur short-term tourism while shaping an image of the host city as a cool, dynamic location where companies and citizens in modern, creative industries can thrive.” Examples of successful festivals include:

- South by Southwest (SXSW) – This annual music, film, and digital conference and festival in Austin, Texas, is a leading example. Launched in 1987, the festival’s economic impact has grown steadily over recent years. In 2007, it netted $95 million for Austin’s economy. In 2013, the event topped $218 million.
- Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival in California – This two-week cultural event draws big-name bands, music fans, and marketers, attracting 80,000 people per day.
- First City Festival in Monterey, California – Private producer, Goldenvoice, launched this smaller music event in August 2013 with marketing support from the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau, drawing on the city’s history as host of the Monterey Jazz Festival. Adding carnival rides and local art, furniture and clothing vendors to the live music performances, the event drew 11,000 attendees each of its two days.

Healthy Lifestyle Trends and Active Living

Active Transportation – Bicycling and Walking

Bicycle-friendly cities have been emerging over the last 10 years. Cycling has become a popular mode of transportation as people consider the rising cost of fuel, desire for better health, and concern for the environment. Some people also use cycling as a mode of transportation just for the fun of it.

---

The Alliance for Biking and Walking published its “Bicycling and Walking in the United States: 2014 Benchmarking Report,” updating its 2012 Benchmarking Report. The report shows that increasing bicycling and walking are goals that are clearly in the public interest. Where bicycling and walking levels are higher, obesity, high blood pressure, and diabetes levels are lower.

Design of a community’s infrastructure is directly linked to physical activity – where environments are built with bicyclists and pedestrians in mind, more people bike and walk. Higher levels of bicycling and walking also coincide with increased bicycle and pedestrian safety and higher levels of physical activity. Increasing bicycling and walking make a big impact on improving public health and life expectancy. The following trends as well as health and economic indicators are pulled from the 2012 and 2014 Benchmarking Reports:

**Public health trends related to bicycling and walking include:**
- Quantified health benefits of active transportation can outweigh any risks associated with the activities by as much as 77 to 1, and add more years to our lives than are lost from inhaled air pollution and traffic injuries.
- Between 1966 and 2009, the number of children who bicycled or walked to school fell 75 percent, while the percentage of obese children rose 276 percent.
- Bicycling to work significantly reduces absenteeism due to illness. Regular bicyclists took 7.4 sick days per year, while non-bicyclists took 8.7 sick days per year.

**The economic benefits of bicycling and walking include:**
- Bicycling and walking projects create 8–2 jobs per $1 million spent, compared to just seven jobs created per $1 million spent on highway projects.
- Cost benefit analyses show that up to $11.80 in benefits can be gained for every $1 invested in bicycling and walking.

**National bicycling trends:**
- There has been a gradual trend of increasing bicycling and walking to work since 2005.
- Infrastructure to support biking communities is becoming more commonly funded in communities.
- Bike share systems, making bicycles available to the public for low-cost, short-term use, have been sweeping the nation since 2010. Twenty of the most populous U.S. cities have a functional bike share system.

In November 2013, the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy published a Standard for Transportation Oriented Design, with accessible performance objectives and metrics, to help municipalities, developers and local residents design land use and built environment “to support, facilitate and prioritize not only the use of public transport, but the most basic modes of transport, walking and cycling.” The TOD Standard, along with its performance objectives and scoring metrics, can be found at [www.itdp.org/documents/TOD_v2_FINAL.pdf](http://www.itdp.org/documents/TOD_v2_FINAL.pdf).

---
Trails and Health
That a connected system of trails increases the level of physical activity in a community has been scientifically demonstrated through the Trails for Health initiative of the (CDC).

Trails can provide a wide variety of opportunities for being physically active, such as walking/running/hiking, rollerblading, wheelchair recreation, bicycling, cross-country skiing and snowshoeing, fishing, hunting, and horseback riding. Recognizing that active use of trails for positive health outcomes is an excellent way to encourage people to adopt healthy lifestyle changes, American Trails has launched a “Health and Trails” resource section in its website: www.americantrails.org/resources/benefits/.

The health benefits are equally as high for trails in urban neighborhoods as for those in state or national parks. A trail in the neighborhood, creating a “linear park,” makes it easier for people to incorporate exercise into their daily routines, whether for recreation or non-motorized transportation. Urban trails need to connect people to places they want to go, such as schools, transit centers, businesses, and neighborhoods.

Health Ranking
The United Health Foundation has ranked Colorado 8th in its State Health Rankings in 2015 unchanged from its 2014 ranking. The State’s biggest strengths include:

- Low prevalence of obesity
- Low prevalence of physical inactivity
- Low prevalence of diabetes

Some of the challenges the State faces include:

- High incidence of pertussis
- High prevalence of low birthweight
- Large disparity in health status by educational level

The Town of Berthoud is split between Larimer and Weld Counties in Colorado. In the 2015 Colorado County Health Rankings (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, countyhealthrankings.org), out of the 60 ranked counties, Larimer County ranked 15th for health outcomes and 10th for health factors. Weld County ranked 23rd for health outcomes and 35th for health factors. As explained in the health ranking report, “Health outcomes represent how healthy a county is while health factors represent what influences the health of the county.”

---

Natural Environments and Open Space

Conservation

The top ten recommendations of the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) Conservation Task Force were published in the November 2011 issue of *Parks and Recreation* magazine.61 These recommendations are a compilation of best practices used by trendsetting agencies.

1. Take a leadership role in the community to promote conservation. Park and recreation agencies have a unique opportunity to bring governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, community leaders, and the public together for the cause of working together on community wide conservation objectives – clean water, wildlife habitat preservation, reducing energy use and improving environmental quality. Park and recreation agencies must lead the way in promoting conservation to diverse and underserved audiences.

2. Lead by example in employing best management conservation practices in parks. Park and recreation agencies should become the catalyst in the community for conservation by showing how best practices can be adopted – not mowing what you do not need to mow, stopping wasteful energy consumption, and reducing pesticide use for example. Show the public how conservation practices can benefit everyone.

3. Engage volunteers in conservation and stewardship. Create a sense of belonging and stewardship for parks by creating a personal sense of ownership and value. Enable people to identify with their parks and natural resources, and to care about their future. Sustain stewardship by creating meaningful public participation in implementation of conservation principles and practices.

4. Establish a strategic land acquisition strategy based on knowledge and awareness of significant natural and cultural resources (watershed protection, unique ecological characteristics, and sensitive natural areas deserving protection). As the largest owners of public land within most communities, park and recreation agencies should lead the way in developing a strategic vision for preserving open space and conserving important landscapes and natural features.

5. Engage youth in conservation. Get kids and teens outdoors and enjoying their parks. The experience of nature is inherently rewarding for youth. Set as a goal to connect kids in the community to nature and the outdoors. Children and youth will be fascinated by nature and will develop a lifelong affinity as well as a conservation ethic if they have early opportunities to enjoy nature and recreate outdoors in a safe, rewarding way.

6. Conserve energy in all ways. Park and recreation agencies must lead by example, showing the public how and why they should adopt practices that they can see demonstrated in parks and recreation facilities. Park and recreation agencies should adopt energy conservation measures that make sense and save public taxpayer funds.

---

7. Protect natural resources in parks and in the community. A core mission of public parks is to protect land and water resources and to be stewards of natural resources. This means committing personnel and resources to protect natural and cultural resources and creating sustainable long-term methods of funding this conservation mission. Parks and recreation agencies are entrusted with some of the most important public assets of a community and the conservation and long-term protection of this public trust is and should be a core component of every parks and recreation agency’s mission.

8. Create sustainable landscapes that demonstrate principles of conservation. Utilize sustainable landscape practices to save taxpayer funds, to measurably improve conservation benefits, and to educate the public about conservation. For example, agencies can reduce turf grass and mowing frequency, replace turf with native plants, manage floodplains for multiple uses including conservation and public recreation, enhance wetlands for water filtration and groundwater recharge, plant model landscapes of drought tolerant native plants adapted to climate and culture, and promote parks as food sources through edible landscapes and community gardens.

9. Forge partnerships that foster the mission of conservation. The greatest and most beneficial conservation successes most often occur as a result of collaboration. Park and recreation agencies should partner with non-profit and community service organizations, universities and colleges, school systems, other governmental agencies, and non-traditional partners for conservation outcomes. Promote health, education, and other goals while working toward a common mission of conservation.

10. Utilize technology to promote conservation. Park and recreation agencies need to embrace technology to promote conservation. This is not only in applications such as GIS [geographic information systems], but in utilizing social media to engage the public, especially youth. Technology is not to be feared as something that detracts from the conservation mission of parks agencies, but rather it is to be accepted as a means of sharing knowledge and connecting people to conservation and stewardship.

Economic and Health Benefits of Parks
There are numerous economic and health benefits of parks, including the following:

- Trails, parks, and playgrounds are among the five most important community amenities considered when selecting a home.
- Research from the University of Illinois shows that trees, parks, and green spaces have a profound impact on people’s health and mental outlook.\(^62\)
- U.S. Forest Service research indicates that when the economic benefits produced by trees are assessed, the total value can be two to six times the cost for tree planting and care.\(^63\)
- Fifty percent (50%) of Americans regard outdoor activities as their main source of exercise.\(^64\)

---


“The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More City Parks and Open Space,” a report from the Trust for Public Land, makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental, and social benefits of parks and open space:

- Physical activity makes people healthier.
- Physical activity increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Residential and commercial property values increase.
- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and act as natural air conditioners.
- Trees assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency are reduced.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created.

Researchers have long touted the benefits of outdoor exercise. According to a study published in the Journal of Environmental Science and Technology by the University of Essex in the United Kingdom, “as little as five minutes of green exercise improves both mood and self-esteem.” A new trend started in China as they prepared to host the 2008 Summer Olympics. Their aim was to promote a society that promotes physical fitness and reaps the benefits of outdoor exercise by working out on outdoor fitness equipment.

The United States is now catching up on this trend, as parks and recreation departments have begun installing “outdoor gyms.” Equipment that can be found in these outdoor gyms is comparable to what would be found in an indoor workout facility, such as leg and chest presses, elliptical trainers, pull down trainers, etc. With no additional equipment such as weights and resistance bands, the equipment is fairly easy to install. Outdoor fitness equipment provides a new opportunity for parks and recreation departments to increase the health of their communities, while offering them the opportunity to exercise outdoors. Such equipment can increase the usage of parks, trails, and other outdoor amenities while helping to fight the obesity epidemic and increase the community’s interaction with nature.

---

Nature Programming
Noted as early as 2003 in *Recreation Management* magazine, parks agencies have been seeing an increase in interest in environmental-oriented “back to nature” programs. In 2007, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) sent out a survey to member agencies in order to learn more about the programs and facilities that public parks and recreation agencies provide to connect children and their families with nature.67 A summary of the results follow:

- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of public parks and recreation agencies offer nature-based programming, and 61 percent have nature-based facilities.
- The most common programs include nature hikes, nature-oriented arts and crafts, fishing-related events, and nature-based education in cooperation with local schools.
- When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful programs, agencies listed staff training as most important followed by program content and number of staff/staff training.
- When asked what resources would be needed most to expand programming, additional staff was most important followed by funding.
- Of the agencies that do not currently offer nature-based programming, 90% indicated that they want to in the future. Additional staff and funding were again the most important resources these agencies would need going forward.
- The most common facilities include: nature parks/preserves, self-guided nature trails, outdoor classrooms, and nature centers.
- When asked to describe the elements that directly contribute to their most successful facilities, agencies listed funding as most important followed by presence of wildlife and community support.

Figures from the Association for Interpretative Naturalists, a national group of nature professionals, demonstrate that nature-based programs are on the rise. According to Tim Merriman, the association’s executive director, the group was founded in 1954 with 40 members. It now boasts 4,800 members, with research indicating that about 20,000 paid interpreters are working nationally, along with an army of more than 500,000 unpaid volunteers staffing nature programs at parks, zoos, and museums. The growth of these programs is thought to come from replacing grandparents as the teacher about the “great outdoors.” It is also speculated that a return to natural roots and renewed interest in life’s basic elements was spurred as a response to the events of September 11, 2001. 68

In his book, *Last Child in the Woods: Saving Children from Nature Deficit Disorder*, Richard Louv introduced the concept of the restorative qualities of being out in nature, for both children and adults.

---

This concept, and research in support of it, has led to a growing movement promoting connections with nature in daily life. One manifestation of this is the development of Nature Explore Classrooms in parks. Nature Explore\textsuperscript{70} is a collaborative program of the Arbor Day Foundation and the non-profit organization Dimensions Educational Research Foundation, with a mission of helping children and families develop a profound engagement with the natural world, where nature is an integral, joyful part of children’s daily learning. Nature Explore works to support efforts to connect children with nature. More recently, Scott Sampson advanced the cause in a book entitled, How to Raise a Wild Child: The Art and Science of Falling in Love with Nature.\textsuperscript{71} Citing research supporting his case that connecting with nature is vital to the healthy development of individuals, communities, and the world, Sampson offers practical and helpful advice to parents, educators, and any other would-be nature mentors to kids.

**Riparian and Watershed Best Practices**

The ability to detect trends and monitor attributes in watershed and/or riparian areas allows planners opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of their management plan. By monitoring their own trends, planners can also identify changes in resource conditions that are the result of pressures beyond their control. Trend detection requires a commitment to long-term monitoring of riparian areas and vegetation attributes.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) suggests the following steps to building an effective watershed management plan. See water.epa.gov\textsuperscript{72} for more information from the EPA.

- Build partnerships
- Characterize the watershed
- Set goals and identify solutions
- Design and implementation program
- Implement the watershed plan
- Measure progress and make adjustments

**Sports and Recreation Trends**

**General Sports and Recreation Trends**

The National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) survey on sports participation\textsuperscript{73} found that, in 2014, the top five athletic activities ranked by total participation included exercise walking, exercising with equipment, swimming, aerobic exercising, and running/jogging. Additionally, the following active, organized, or skill development activities remain popular: hiking, bicycle riding, basketball, golf, and soccer.

The sports segment that saw the highest percentage increase was the open water segment with a 2.7 percent increase. This increase was driven significantly by boating (motor/power), canoeing, and kayaking activities. The individual sports/activity segment experiences the highest decrease (-2.6%) driven by a decrease in bowling, golf and tennis. Table 12 outlines the top 20 sports ranked by total participation in 2014.

---


**Table 12: Top 20 Sports Ranked by Total Participation (in millions) in 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exercise walking</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exercising with equipment</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Swimming</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aerobic exercising</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Running/jogging</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hiking</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Camping (vacation/overnight)</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workout at club/gym/fitness studio</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bicycle riding</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bowling</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Weightlifting</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fishing (freshwater)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Yoga</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Basketball</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Billiards/pool</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Target shooting (live ammunition)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Golf</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hunting with firearms</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Soccer</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NSGA 2015*

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) produces a report on sports, fitness, and leisure activities in the United States. The following findings were highlighted in the 2013 report:\(^7\):

- Overall participation in sports, fitness, and related physical activities remained relatively steady from 2011 to 2012.
- Fitness sports had the largest increase in participation (2% increase to 61.1%).
- Racquet sports participation also increased (1% increase to 12.8%) but the peak rate of 14% remains from 2008.
- Both team (21.6%) and water sports (12.5%) participation increased slightly while individual (36%) and winter sports (6.6%) participation decreased slightly.
- Outdoor sports participation remained stable at around 49%.
- Spending on team sports at school and lessons/instruction/sports camp was projected to increase in 2013 as it did in 2011 and 2012.
- Twenty-eight percent of all Americans are inactive while 33% are active to a healthy level (engaged in high-calorie-level sport/fitness activities in a frequent basis). Indiana was among the states with the highest activity levels (activity levels of 38% to 43.4%).

Sports and Leisure in the Town of Berthoud

Residents of the Town of Berthoud participate in a wide variety of outdoor recreation and sports, as seen in **Figure 52**. However, in 2015, the most widely participated sport was Walking for Exercise (31.5%), followed by Swimming (18.3%), Jogging/Running (15.2%), and Fresh Water Fishing (8.7%). The least popular activities for Berthoud in 2015 were Auto Racing, Archery, and Horseback Riding.

**Figure 52: Sports and Leisure Market Behavior in Past 12 months in Town of Berthoud (2015)**

Source: GfK MRI, 2015 Forecast by ESRI Business Information Solutions.
Outdoor Recreation

The Outdoor Foundation releases a Participation in Outdoor Recreation Report annually. According to the 2015 “Topline Report,” both the total number of outdoor outings and number of participants dropped in 2014, with extreme weather and an unusually cold winter likely contributing to the decline. Bright spots in outdoor participation include paddle sports, with stand up paddle boarding remaining the top outdoor activity for growth, with participation growing by 38 percent from 2013 to 2014. Participation in snow sports, including telemarking, snowshoeing, freestyle skiing, and cross-country skiing, grew significantly as well.

The foundation reports that the top outdoor activities for adults in 2014 were running, fishing, bicycling, hiking, and camping. Birdwatching and wildlife viewing are also among the favorite adult outdoor activities by frequency of participation. The Outdoor Foundation’s research brought the following key findings for the “2014 Outdoor Recreation Report.”

Participation in Outdoor Recreation

- Return to nature: Nearly 50 percent of Americans ages 6 and older participated in outdoor recreation in 2013. That equates to a total of 143 million.
- Top five participation percentage increase in outdoor activities in the past three years (2014 Topline Report): Adventure racing, triathlon (off-road), stand-up paddle boarding, kayak fishing, recreational kayaking.
- Recreation for exercise: More than 70 percent of outdoor participants were motivated to recreate outdoors as a way of getting exercise.

Youth Participation in Outdoor Recreation

- Good news about outdoor participation rates of female youth: Participation rates among girls and young women increased by two percentage points—bringing young women’s participation to the highest since 2006.
- The influence of family: Most youth are introduced to outdoor activities by parents, friends, family, and relatives.
- Physical education in schools: The importance cannot be understated. Among adults ages 18 and older who are current outdoor participants, 74 percent say they had PE in school between the ages of 6 and 12.

The Outdoor Foundation’s 2015 “Topline Outdoor Recreation Participation Report” lists the most popular (by participation rate) and favorite (by frequency of participation) outdoor activities for youth ages 6-17.

Most Popular Outdoor Activities (ages 6-17)

1. Road, mountain, and BMX biking (27% of American youth participating)
2. Running, jogging, and trail running (24%)
3. Freshwater, saltwater, and fly fishing (21%)
4. Car, backyard, backpacking, and RV camping (20%)
5. Hiking (12%)

Favorite Outdoor Activities (ages 6-17)
1. Running, jogging and trail running (77 average outings per runner)
2. Road, mountain and BMX biking (65 average outings per cyclist)
3. Skateboarding (53 average outings per skateboarder)
4. Freshwater, saltwater and fly fishing (15 average outings per fishing participant)
5. Car, backyard, backpacking and RV camping (15 average outings per camper)

Outdoor recreation trends are also a recurring topic of study by the United States Forest Service through the Internet Research Information Series (IRIS). An IRIS report dated January 2012 \(^{76}\) provides the following recent nature-based outdoor recreation trends: Participation in walking for pleasure and family gatherings outdoors were the two most popular activities for the U.S. population as a whole. These outdoor activities were followed closely in popularity by viewing/photographing wildlife, boating, fishing, snow/ice activities, and swimming. There has been a growing momentum in participation in sightseeing, birding and wildlife watching in recent years.

Adventure Sports
Adventure sports of various kinds have increased in popularity since the 1970. These sports include a spectrum of sports labeled “alternative,” “Extreme,” “X,” “gravity,” “lifestyle,” and “action sports.” As explained by Gunnar Breivik \(^{77}\) from the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, the adventure sports concept contains elements of challenge, excitement, and usually risk. They are individualistic pursuits that take place in demanding environments and tend to represent a freedom from a dominant sport culture. Three distinct alternative “types” of adventure sports participants are prevalent:

- Loose groups of alternative lifestyle people (sea kayaking, back-mountain skiing)
- Those involved in formal sports settings with competitions/associations (snowboard, climbing)
- Those involved with media, sponsors, entrepreneurs, making spectacular films with extreme stunts (extreme skiing, surfing)

In 2015, the following sports were listed as the “Top 10 Adventure Sports You Must Try Before You Die” \(^{78}\):

10. Paragliding -- free flying, light weight glider aircraft launched by foot with flights that can last 1 to 2 hours.
9. Bungee Jumping -- elastic rope suspended around a person with a body harness who then jumps from a very high platform with a free fall of several meters.
8. Whitewater Kayaking -- boat is taken through extreme currents in rivers, weirs, and waterfalls.
7. Glacier Climbing -- an exciting and challengingly dangerous sport that requires you to be fit and aware with basic nuances of ice axes, harnesses and safety ropes.
6. Dirt Biking -- dirt bikes are rugged, lightweight, and powerful with suspension that absorbs impact from obstructions and large jumps, permitting travel through rock terrains and mountain regions.
5. Skiing -- a world championship event sport with fixed-heel bindings or free-heel bindings.
4. Kite Wing -- a wind-shaped sail designed to use wind poser, lifts riders off varying surfaces such as ice, water, snow, asphalt, and packed sand. A kite winger can reach speeds of up to 55 mph.


3. **Bobsledding** -- sport of sliding down an ice covered incline that is replete with curves on a four runner sled that has no functional controls,

2. **Scuba Diving** -- Deep water diving (with a mandatory course) with self-contained underwater breathing apparatus and fins to propel movement, that allows you to experience the world of the sea.

1. **Zorbing** -- Zorbing offers the experience of rolling downhill inside an inflatable ball made of shock absorbent material that protects you while enjoying an amazing ride, varying in time and intensity.

**Golf Trends**
The National Golf Foundation keeps records of golf trends in the United States. Golf participation is a factor of the economy and the weather and participation has been on a downward trend since 2000, but golf participation in 2014 remained relatively steady with the previous two years. A 4.9 percent drop in rounds of golf played in 2013 (a year of poor weather) reveals that the golf economy is recovering at a slower pace than the overall U.S., economy. Nevertheless, golf trend analysts point to a couple factors indicating a stabilization of the golf industry, and perhaps even a move in a positive direction:

1. Despite the fact that participation has remained relatively flat the past several years, the average number of rounds played per golfer continued to increase in 2014.
2. Latent demand (number of non-golfers interested in playing) has grown steadily since 2011.
3. Millennials and Baby Boomers remain active players with Millennials and Boomers each representing about 25 percent of the golfer population. History indicates that golfers reaching retirement age play twice as much as before retirement.
4. The number of first time players being introduced to the sport has remained steady in recent years, and in 2014, the number of beginners in the game rose above the historic average of newcomers to the game.

---


Trail Recreation and Cycling Trends

For trail-related recreation activities such as hiking, bicycling, and running, the 2015 “Outdoor Recreation Topline Report” indicates a positive three-year trend for trail running, running/jogging, hiking, mountain biking and BMX biking. Additionally, participation in trail running and BMX biking is up significantly over the recent three-year period.

Table 13: Trail Recreation Participation by Activity (in thousands) (6 years of age or older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>3 Year Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMX Bicycling</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Mountain/Non-Paved Surface)</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>7,161</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>7,714</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>8,044</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Road/Paved Surface)</td>
<td>40,140</td>
<td>39,320</td>
<td>40,349</td>
<td>39,232</td>
<td>40,888</td>
<td>39,725</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Day)</td>
<td>32,572</td>
<td>32,496</td>
<td>34,491</td>
<td>34,545</td>
<td>34,378</td>
<td>36,222</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>49,408</td>
<td>50,713</td>
<td>52,187</td>
<td>54,188</td>
<td>51,127</td>
<td>49,408</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Running</td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>5,136</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>6,003</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Outdoor Foundation 2015.
Other Cycling Trends

- Bicycle touring is becoming a fast-growing trend around the world, including the United States and Canada. “Travelers are seeking out bike tours to stay active, minimize environmental impact, and experience diverse landscapes and cityscapes at a closer level.”

- Urban bike tours, popular in cycle-friendly cities in Europe, are taking hold in the United States as well. Bikes and Hikes LA, an eco-friendly bike and hike sightseeing company founded last September, offers visitors the opportunity to “see the city’s great outdoors while getting a good workout.” In New York, a hotel and a bike store are partnering to offer guests cruisers to explore the city during the summer of 2014.

- One of the newest trends in adventure cycling is “fat bike,” multiple speed bikes that are made to ride where other bikes can’t be ridden, with tires that are up to 5 inches wide run at low pressure for extra traction. Most fat bikes are used to ride on snow but they are also very effective for riding on any loose surface like sand or mud. They also work well on most rough terrain or just riding through the woods. This bike offers unique opportunities to experience nature in ways that wouldn’t be possible otherwise.

Role and Response of Local Government

Collectively, these trends have created profound implications for the way local governments conduct business. Some local governments are now accepting the role of providing preventative health care through parks and recreation services. The following concepts are from the International County/County Management Association.

- Parks and recreation departments should take the lead in developing communities conducive to active living.
- There is growing support for recreation programs that encourage active living within their community.
- One of the highest priorities is a cohesive system of parks and trails and accessible neighborhood parks.

In summary, the United States, its states, and its communities share the enormous task of reducing the health and economic burden of obesity. While numerous programs, policies, and products have been designed to address the problem, there is no magic bullet to make it go away. The role of public parks and recreation as a health promotion and prevention agency has come of age. What matters is refocusing its efforts to insure the health, well-being, and economic prosperity of communities and citizens.

---

Administration Trends for Recreation and Parks
Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed, and more alternative methods of delivering services are emerging. Certain services are being contracted out and cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions are being developed. Newer partners include the health system, social services, justice system, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies. These partnerships reflect both a broader interpretation of the mandate of parks and recreation agencies and the increased willingness of other sectors to work together to address community issues. The relationship with health agencies is vital in promoting wellness.

The traditional relationship with education and the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs.

Listed below are additional administrative national trends:
- Level of subsidy for programs is lessening and more “enterprise” activities are being developed, thereby allowing subsidy to be used where deemed appropriate.
- Information technology allows for better tracking and reporting.
- Pricing is often determined by peak, off-peak, and off-season rates.
- More agencies are partnering with private, public, and non-profit groups.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance
On September 14, 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) issued an amended regulation implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA 2010 Standards)\textsuperscript{85} and, for the first time, the regulations were expanded to include recreation environment design requirements. Covered entities were to be compliant with design and construction requirements and the development of three-year transition plan by March 15, 2012. The deadline for implementation of the three-year transition plan was March 15, 2015.

Funding
According to Recreation Management magazine’s 2015 State of the Industry Report, survey respondents from parks and recreation departments/districts reporting about their revenues from 2012 through 2014 indicated a continued recovery from the impact of the Recession of 2008. From 2013 to 2014, 44.1 percent of respondents reported that their revenues had either had increased and another 44.1 percent reported revenues staying steady. About 48.7 percent of respondents said they expected revenues to continue to increase in 2015, while 44 percent expected no change.

Trends in Marketing by Parks and Recreation Providers
The concept of marketing is rapidly evolving with the changing of technology and social media outlets. Every successful business from start-ups to corporations uses some form of marketing to promote their products and services. For parks and recreation, it can be difficult to stay current with the trends when the “formula for success” has not yet been defined for non-profits and governments.

Municipalities can use marketing to increase awareness of an issue, promote an upcoming program, encourage community participation, or to gain advocacy for a public service. Active Network offers expertise in activity and participation management. Their mission is to make the world a more active place. In their blog, they offered the following marketing mix ideas, which came out of a meeting with park and recreational professionals in the Chicago area.86

- **Updated booths and community event presence**—Bring a tablet or laptop to show programs you offer and provide event participants the opportunity to register on the spot.
- **Facebook redirect app**—This application redirects people automatically to the link you provide. Add it to your Facebook page.
- **Instagram challenge**—Think about how you can use mobile and social tools at your next event. It could be an Instagram contest during an event set up as a scavenger hunt with participants taking pictures of clues and posting them on Instagram.
- **Social media coupons**—Research indicates that the top reason people follow an organization on a social network is to receive discounts or coupons. Consider posting an event discount on your social networks redeemable by accessing on phone or printing out.

Mobile marketing is a growing trend. Social websites and apps are among the most used features on mobile phones. Popular social media marketing tools include Facebook, Instagram, Pinterest, Twitter, YouTube, Tagged, and LinkedIn. Private messaging apps such as Snapchat and WhatsApp are being used more and more for live media coverage.87

Ninety-one percent (91%) of Americans own a cell phone and most use the devices for much more than phone calls. Young adults engage in mobile data applications at much higher rates than adults in age brackets 30 and older. Usage rates of mobile applications demonstrate the chronologically across four major age cohorts, Millennials tend to get information more frequently using mobile devices such as smartphones. For example, 97 percent of cell phone owners ages 18–29 send and receive text messages, compared to 94 percent of ages 30–49, 75 percent of ages 50–64, and 35 percent of those 65 and older.

Minority Americans are significantly more likely to own a cell phone than are their white counterparts. (87 percent of African Americans and 87 percent of Hispanics own a cell phone, compared with 80 percent of whites). Minority Americans also lead the way when it comes to mobile Internet access. Two-thirds of African Americans (72%) and Hispanics (67%) access the Internet in their cell phones, compared to Non-Hispanic Whites (56%).88 By 2015, mobile Internet penetration is expected to have grown to 71.1 percent for Hispanics compared to 58.8 percent for whites.89

---

Appendix B – Questions for Focus Group and Public Meeting Participants
1) What are the strengths and weaknesses of Berthoud Parks and Recreation that should be continued or improved upon over the next several years?

2) What additional programs or activities do you feel the Department should offer that are currently not available?

3) What improvements are needed at existing facilities? Where are these improvements needed?

4) What additional park and recreation facilities would you like to see the community provide?

5) Are there any portions of the community that are underserved? Please explain (i.e., where and what type of amenities are needed, what market segment needs more attention, etc.).
6) What are the key issues and values in the Berthoud community that need to be considered while developing this Master Plan?

7) How do you believe the department (and or future projects) should be financially supported? Should it be through user fees, completely through taxes, a non-tax levy, or a combination thereof?

8) During the next 5-10 years, what are the top priorities for Berthoud Parks and Recreation?
Appendix C – mySidewalk Engagement Results
Post:
Posted: January 12, 2016 11:45 AM
Berthoud, CO
What are the strengths and weaknesses of Berthoud Parks and Recreation that should be continued or improved upon over the next several years?
Likes: 0  Responses: 8

Responses:
Posted: January 29, 2016 12:39 PM
Jeffrey Nielsen
fishing opportunities
Likes: 0

Posted: January 29, 2016 5:6 PM
Amy Lorenz
We just got our parks & rec book, looks like some good stuff coming up in summer. We are new here, but I’ve received information from you twice - that’s a strength :)
Likes: 1

Posted: January 30, 2016 6:37 AM
Wynne Maggi
I love how acessible and responsive our parks and Rec people are.
Likes: 0
Bryce Hawkins
Not sure who to send this recommendation to (Parks and Rec, Public Works or Town Planning), so I’ve addressed to all 3.

I’d like to start by commending the town and those responsible for our great parks here in Berthoud (Fickle Park, Bein Park, Town Park and Pioneer Park to name a few). These parks are well kept up and are great visuals for our town.

One of the most used areas in Berthoud; is the greenbelt and ditch between CR 17 to South 8th Street and over to 5th Street. This is a wonderful walkway used by many people for walking and running and just for general leisure. However the care of this greenbelt is a major concern. I’ve seen reports in the paper about residences who violate city codes to cut down their weeds in a timely manner, but this greenbelt not only violates that ordinance as well, since the growth gets past an average person’s knees well before it is cut down, but once it’s cut down it’s not picked up and cleaned up and is an eye sore to everyone in town. In addition the ditch running through this greenbelt is full of the residue of this ‘prairie grass’ and it’s cut down residuals and not cleaned up in any consistent manner.

Can something be done to improve this eyesore to our community? With such beautiful and well manicured parks, it’s a shame that this area can’t also be maintained in the same manner to enhance our town.

Recommendations
Replace this ‘prairie grass’ with lawn sod that is much easier to maintain and much more attractive

At a minimum get someone to trim along the sidewalk and ditch so whatever grasses do exist they don’t overrun the sidewalks and the ditch.

Ensure that the ditch in cleaned out of debris and ‘grass residue’ on a consistent, regular basis.

If the town administrators don’t feel this need is a priority, can equipment be provided for volunteers to trim the sidewalks?

Again, if town funds are not available to make this a priority, can fund raising be established to acquire sod for improving it?
Likes: 2

Posted: February 3, 2016 4:48 PM  
**Bryce Hawkins**

Perhaps a staged plan to replace this ‘prairie grass’ with more attractive sod could be established if the entire project is too big.

Create a ‘volunteer’ web site on something like [www.justserve.org](http://www.justserve.org) to identify the need and provide a place for volunteers to sign-up for trimming and ditch clean-up (with appropriate equipment provided).

Something really needs to be done to improve this area of our beautiful town.

Likes: 0

---

Posted: February 10, 2016 10:36 AM  
**Annie DeCoteau**

I think the parks and rec department could work on expanding offerings for youth and adults. This would be a benefit to the community and an income stream for the P&R.

Likes: 0

---

Posted: February 19, 2016 10:06 AM  
**Len Guldenpfennig**

Great job with current parks, advocating maintaining a quality of life for residents, striving for open spaces and non-development areas!! We recently relocated to Berthoud, largely in part of the PORT progress & plans! Would like to see strong policy & city code to continue PORT planning, reducing congestion, traffic and costly infrastructure expansion.

Likes: 0

---

Posted: February 23, 2016 6:57 PM  
**Lorie Lane**

Our parks are really well maintained, good job.

Likes: 0
Post:

Posted: January 12, 2016 11:37 AM
Berthoud, CO

**What additional park and recreation facilities would you like to see the community provide?**

Likes: 0  Responses: 8

Responses:

Posted: January 29, 2016 12:39 PM
Jeffrey Nielsen

fishing opportunities

Likes: 0

Posted: January 30, 2016 6:40 AM
Wynne Maggi

I wish the small pond in pioneer park could be made safe and available for swimming ion the summer.

Likes: 1

Posted: February 4, 2016 10:22 AM
Sheryl Gilliland

A controlled dog park would be great. If upkeep etc would be too costly, maybe a club of volunteers could rotate upkeep and monitoring the park.

Likes: 4

Posted: February 10, 2016 10:30 AM
Annie Decoteau

I agree with Wynne. I love the lake on Taft, and it would be wonderful to have a swimming area there for summer use. Also a walking path around the lake would be great.

Likes: 3
Export: What additional park and recreation facilities would you like to see the community provide? - mySidewalk

Jackie McLauchlan
I would like to see a bike lane put in on 1st between Mountain and county rd 12.

Likes: 0

Posted: February 15, 2016 2:30 PM

Diane Kuligowski
Year round swimming pool.

Likes: 0

Posted: February 17, 2016 1:34 PM

Len Guldenpfennig
Bike path connectivity to regional path plans. Aforementioned Waggener recreation conversion & usage. Get outdoors!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 19, 2016 10:24 AM

Lorie Lane
Interconnected paths, dog parks and a golf course would be a huge deal in our family!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 23, 2016 7:1 PM
Post:

Posted: January 12, 2016 11:40 AM

Berthoud, CO

What additional programs or activities do you feel the Department should offer that are currently not available?

Likes: 0  Responses: 5

Responses:

Posted: January 30, 2016 6:33 AM

Wynne Maggi

I’d love to see our parks and Rec department partner with our existing non-profits to offer and advertise art, music, dance and other learning opportunities. We have a lot of talent in our community, and I think that exploring public/private partnership between the town and the townspeople could leverage enthusiasm, creativity and resources.

Likes: 1

Posted: February 10, 2016 10:35 AM

Annie DeCoteau

We just moved from a city that had a very well established and active parks and rec department. I’d love to see a SUMMER CAMP for kids. An all-day, all summer camp would be a huge benefit to the community. Art, music, and dance classes would also be a benefit to the kids. In addition to the all day summer camp that our last city offered, we had the option to sign kids up for special art, music, or sports camps that ran 1 week sessions or 1 day a week for 4 weeks. The city utilized the middle school for this purpose. They also offered a youth nature series. I will say that due to the amount of activities they offered and the number of kids I have, we spent a lot of money through the parks and rec department.

Likes: 2
Export: What additional programs or activities do you feel the Department should offer that are currently not available? - mySidewalk

**Jackie McLauchlan**
I would like to see the Garden at Pioneer Park on the parks Automatic sprinkler system. The Volunteers of the garden put in alot of hours working in the garden to have much of that work die due to watering concerns. This is a GREAT asset in the community!

Likes: 0

---

**Len Guldenpfennig**
Love the partnership ideas (Wynne & Annie above)! Substantial -- and world class -- mtn biking and cycling athletes & coaches reside in the regional area. Partner with them to capitalize on their knowledge to host intermittent biking workshops (at the proposed pump track and skills park).

Likes: 0

---

**Lorie Lane**
The Wildfire Arts Center brings a lot of joy to the people who use it. Kids and adults alike love the arts and finding ways to enjoy classes or unstructured arts activities would benefit all.

Likes: 0
Post:

Posted: January 12, 2016 11:42 AM
Berthoud, CO

During the next 5-10 years, what are the top priorities for Berthoud Parks and Recreation?

Likes: 0  Responses: 13

Responses:

Posted: January 29, 2016 5:4 PM
Amy Lorenz

a nice network of trails/bike paths

Likes: 3

Posted: January 30, 2016 6:35 AM
Wynne Maggi

I agree. A comprehensive trail system connecting our neighborhoods to each other, to the downtown, and to our open space would be my top priority.

Likes: 3
**Bryce Hawkins**

Do something about the greenbelt and ditch between CR 17 to South 8th Street and over to 5th Street, known as Nielsen's Greenway. The slope and native grass use to meet the objective for the Town to carry 100 year flood water, storm drainage might have been an appropriate call at the time, but the maintenance of said slope and grasses is not very becoming to the town or the area. Perhaps a new way to address this objective should be considered.

Apparently the design for 'passive open space areas incorporating low maintenance ideals' isn't working, at least in regards to how it looks. And 'low water usage' is obviously not a fact since a leakage has existed for many years now on the south side of the 5th to 8th street walkway.

Finally, the 'plan' is also inadequate, whether contracted or 'licensed' and should be re-addressed. I understand the town staff and equipment constraints which is why I sent this email to all parties that could address that shortage. Also, you mentioned that "Parks staff edges the curbs/sidewalks during the summer as we have more seasonal summer staff employed;" however, as the summer is nearly 2/3rds over, I question whether that is really planned to occur in a timely fashion. “...should be edging in the next week or so” didn’t occur.

Also, any push or ‘movement’ towards better water conservation policies doesn’t make any sense if the result is what we have seen over the years regarding the look of this Green-way. If it's ugly – then it's not a good push, or movement - something needs to be reconsidered...like maybe xeri-scape or something that doesn’t look as bad as it has over the last several years (high water years and low). The problem with sod versus native grass isn’t the additional on-going maintenance - grass must be easier - - as everything

Likes: 0

---

**Annie DeCoteau**

I’d love to see a trail system for walking and biking, with a parking area, similar to the one in Loveland that you can access from Wilson. I’d also love for the lake to be accessible either with a walkway around it, a small beach/swim area for families, or both. It is such a beautiful spot in Berthoud with wonderful views but highly underutilized. It's not even safe to stop and get out of the car for a photograph there. Additionally, the community building is underutilized. This would be a great space to offer classes for all ages, similar to the chilson classes (art, music, indoor sports, games, etc). An indoor pool would be a bonus.

Likes: 3
Refill Berthoud Lake and create a park/rec area around the lake.

Likes: 2

The "grass" area on East Nebraska Ave. has similar problems with mowing. Many residents mow the grass weekly, but when the city comes to mow, the long cut grass is left becomes an eyesore for those living across from it. More frequent mowing would help. The ditch along 4th needs to be burned or sprayed. The weeds are very invasive and clog the ditch creating minor street flooding during rains.

Likes: 1

In addition to what Jackie McLauchlan said, I live adjacent to 4th St (east boundary of Mary's Farm) and particularly last summer, they came along, cut down the weeds and just left them there. They immediately dried up and created tons of weeds with seeds that blew into the yards of the residences. It was a real mess. In fact that whole ditch is a mess. It’s the drainage for the entire neighborhood and it’s filled with weeds and debris.

Likes: 0

Swimming Pool that is open year round.

Likes: 1

Ditto to Diane on the swimming pool. While our family enjoys the use of the pool in the summer, we have to travel to Loveland or Longmont for indoor pool use from August when ours closes to late May when it reopens. We get maybe 2 1/2 months of time from the outdoor pool.

Likes: 0
Len Guldenpfennig
Conversion of Waggener Farm Park to an outdoor use recreation area, with permeable natural surface paths, pump track, skills park, benches, art & historical kiosks. Connect the paths to regional paths and plans. Natural/reclaimed low-cost low-impact bike skills park pic attached. Get outdoors!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 19, 2016 10:18 AM

Jeanne Aiello
Year-round swimming pool.
Hire lifeguards besides only high school or college students so that the pool remains open through Labor Day.
Bike lane from hwys. 56 & 287 going west.

Likes: 1

Posted: February 22, 2016 6:32 PM

Lorie Lane
Interconnected multi-use trails is a huge deal in CO. Walking your dog, jogging, and biking are cheap ways to experience the outdoors. Berthoud is very behind in this regard compared to neighboring towns/cities. I hope we can develop better local options in the next few years.

Likes: 0

Posted: February 23, 2016 6:59 PM

Tracee Teunissen
Year round swimming pool would be great!

Likes: 0
Post:

Posted: February 17, 2016 12:30 PM
Berthoud, CO

What open space opportunities do you use most frequently?

Likes: 0  Responses: 5

Responses:

Posted: February 18, 2016 3:31 PM
Teddy Wright
Walking paths. Would like asphalt or pea gravel surface - much easier on old joints.

Likes: 0

Posted: February 19, 2016 4:14 AM
Scott Slaugh
Walking trails and playgrounds,

Likes: 0

Posted: February 19, 2016 10:0 AM
Len Guldenpfennig
Multi-use paths (walking & biking). See a nice theme of suggestions here -- outdoors, natural surface, low cost & impact!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 23, 2016 6:55 PM
Lorie Lane
Multi-use paths and dog parks.

Likes: 0
Posted: March 2, 2016 2:57 PM

**Whitney Way**

Trails

Likes: 0
Post:

Posted: February 17, 2016 12:34 PM

Berthoud, CO

What park amenities are needed in Berthoud? Are you travelling to other communities for these services?

Likes: 0  Responses: 7

Responses:

Posted: February 17, 2016 1:31 PM

Diane Kuligowski

Definitely an all year swimming pool.

Likes: 2

Posted: February 17, 2016 5:4 PM

Teresa Weston

Year round swimming. Definitely!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 19, 2016 4:13 AM

Scott Slaugh

General: "better" playgrounds (we drive to other cities when we are doing anything more than a quick playtime), and a splash pad for summer months would be fun.
Specific: Collins Park needs benches around the playground, and swings.

Likes: 0
Export: What park amenities are needed in Berthoud? Are you travelling to other communities for these services? - mySidewalk

Posted: February 19, 2016 9:58 AM

**Len Guldenpfennig**
Permeable, natural surface walking/bike path, bike pump track and bike skills area in Waggener Farm Park. Closest locations are FtC & Boulder.
Low cost, low environmental impact, sustainable, consistent with Berthoud master plans (ie - maintain & capitalize on mtn views). Could be a spur path of Larimer Cty Loveland-Lyons path, bringing folks to Berthoud businesses. A few benches along path, Berthoud historical info kiosks, local art statues/fixtures. The pump track & bike skills area align to N front range culture. Maybe a frisbee golf course? See hundreds of persons using Turner track weekly walking in circles; an expanded outdoor park would enhance resident quality of life and experience. Get outdoors!

Likes: 0

Posted: February 23, 2016 3:42 PM

**Daniele Glaser**
We often travel to Loveland in the summer for parks with water play areas/splash pads. Also, for open space trails for hiking and biking (natural surface). In the winter, we use the Loveland Rec Center for indoor swimming and exercise.

Likes: 0

Posted: February 23, 2016 6:34 PM

**Lorie Lane**
We go to Loveland and Fort Collins to use walking/running/biking trails and dog parks. It would be amazing to have local options that we didn't have to drive to!

Likes: 0

Posted: March 2, 2016 2:57 PM

**Whitney Way**
Trails... connect downtown to parks, schools and open space.

Likes: 0
Appendix D – Knievel Property Cost Estimates
### Estimate of Probable Costs - Visionary Plans

**Knievel & Knievel West Property**

**Date:** June 22, 2016

**Approximately 69.6 Acres of Improvements for Knievel Property**

**Approximately 20.7 Acres of Improvements for Knievel West Property**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>3,920,400</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$392,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Grading (Cut, Fill, Compact On-site - approx. 2')</td>
<td>290,400</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$3,484,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,936,840.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,181,052.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$472,420.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,590,312.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE CONSTRUCTION**

| Concrete Flatwork - 4' Depth (plaza & walks - 7' wide) | 200,000 | SF | $5.00 | $1,000,000.00 |
| Curb and Gutter | 4,000 | LF | $20.00 | $80,000.00 |
| Concrete Curb Ramp | 15 | EA | $1,000.00 | $15,000.00 |
| Asphalt Paving - 4' Depth | 285,480 | SF | $3.00 | $856,440.00 |
| Asphalt Access Roads | 84,720 | SF | $4.00 | $338,880.00 |
| Stabilized Crusher Fines Trail/Paving | 53,925 | LF | $3.00 | $161,775.00 |
| Parking Lot and Crosswalk Striping | 1 | LS | $15,000.00 | $15,000.00 |
| **SUBTOTAL** | | | | **$2,467,095.00** |
| Construction/Design Contingency | 30.0% | | | **$740,128.50** |
| Design Development Costs | 12% | | | **$296,051.40** |
| **TOTAL** | | | | **$3,503,274.90** |

**PLAYGROUND AND PLAZA**

| Concrete Curb Wall | 800 | LF | $30.00 | $24,000.00 |
| Concrete Ramp | 2 | EA | $1,000.00 | $2,000.00 |
| Poured-in-Place 3.5" Depth | 21,780 | SF | $20.00 | $435,600.00 |
| Playground EWF | 21,780 | SF | $3.50 | $76,230.00 |
| Play Equipment 2-5 | 1 | LS | $110,000.00 | $110,000.00 |
| Play Equipment 5-12 | 1 | LS | $120,000.00 | $120,000.00 |
| Climbing Wall (includes conc retaining wall) | 1 | LS | $80,000.00 | $80,000.00 |
| Sandblasting & Staining | 1 | LS | $3,000.00 | $3,000.00 |
| Picnic Tables | 6 | EA | $2,000.00 | $12,000.00 |
| Bench | 6 | EA | $1,200.00 | $7,200.00 |
| Trash Receptacles | 2 | EA | $1,500.00 | $3,000.00 |
| **SUBTOTAL** | | | | **$873,030.00** |
| Construction/Design Contingency | 30.0% | | | **$261,909.00** |
| Design Development Costs | 12% | | | **$104,763.60** |
| **TOTAL** | | | | **$1,239,702.60** |

**SPORTS COMPLEX**

| Field Lighting | 8 | EA | $100,000.00 | $800,000.00 |
| Multi Purpose Field (120,000sf - 300x400) | 6 | EA | $360,000.00 | $2,160,000.00 |
| FIFA Soccer Field (157.500sf - 350x450) | 2 | EA | $472,500.00 | $945,000.00 |
| Basketball (Post Tension Slab) | 2 | EA | $40,000.00 | $80,000.00 |
| Basketball Goals and Net | 2 | EA | $1,300.00 | $2,600.00 |
| Court Striping | 1 | LS | $1,000.00 | $1,000.00 |
| Restroom/Concessions Building | 1 | LS | $500,000.00 | $500,000.00 |
| Shade Shelters | 3 | EA | $40,000.00 | $120,000.00 |
| Restroom | 1 | EA | $200,000.00 | $200,000.00 |
| Benches | 15 | EA | $1,200.00 | $18,000.00 |
| Picnic Tables | 30 | EA | $2,000.00 | $60,000.00 |
| **SUBTOTAL** | | | | **$4,806,600.00** |
### OVERALL LANDSCAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sod and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>700,000 SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Seed and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>1,680,215 SF</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$554,470.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Buffer</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation - Sod</td>
<td>1,160,000 SF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2,320,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,599,470.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,079,841.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$431,936.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,111,248.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding and Mobilization</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,670,243.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$23,940,154.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,610,397.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Costs do not include utilities and substantial grading/earthwork. Costs are approximate based on conceptual visioning plans.
Appendix E – Richardson Property Cost Estimates
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
## Richardson Property

Estimate of Probable Costs - Visionary Plans

Date: June 22, 2016

Approximately 94.6 Acres of Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOLITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>4,120,776</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$412,077.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Grading (Cut, Fill, Compact On-site - approx. 2')</td>
<td>305,242</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$3,662,904.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,134,981.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,240,494.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$496,197.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,871,673.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SITE CONSTRUCTION**                     |          |      |           |              |
| Concrete Flatwork - 4” Depth (plaza & walks - 7’wide) | 250,000  | SF   | $5.00     | $1,250,000.00|
| Curb and Gutter                           | 7,000    | LF   | $20.00    | $140,000.00  |
| Concrete Curb Ramp                        | 15       | EA   | $1,000.00 | $15,000.00   |
| Asphalt Paving - 4” Depth                 | 388,282  | SF   | $3.00     | $1,164,846.00|
| Asphalt Access Roads                      | 78,864   | SF   | $4.00     | $315,456.00  |
| Stabilized Crusher Fines Trail/Paving     | 60,000   | LF   | $3.00     | $180,000.00  |
| Parking Lot and Crosswalk Striping        | 1        | LS   | $25,000.00| $25,000.00   |
| Amphitheatre                              | 1        | LS   | $300,000.00| $300,000.00  |
| **SUBTOTAL**                              |          |      |           | $3,390,302.00|
| Construction/Design Contingency           | 30.0%    |      |           | $1,017,090.60|
| Design Development Costs                  | 12%      |      |           | $406,836.24  |
| **TOTAL**                                 |          |      |           | $4,814,228.84|

| **PLAYGROUND**                            |          |      |           |              |
| Concrete Curb Wall                        | 1,100    | LF   | $30.00    | $33,000.00   |
| Concrete Ramp                             | 2        | EA   | $1,000.00 | $2,000.00    |
| Poured-in-Place 3.5” Depth                | 21,872   | SF   | $20.00    | $437,440.00  |
| Playground EWF                            | 43,565   | SF   | $3.50     | $152,477.50  |
| Play Equipment 2-5                        | 1        | LS   | $150,000.00| $150,000.00  |
| Play Equipment 5-12                       | 1        | LS   | $180,000.00| $180,000.00  |
| Climbing Wall (includes conc retaining wall) | 1       | LS   | $80,000.00| $80,000.00   |
| Sprayground                               | 1        | LS   | $500,000.00| $500,000.00  |
| Sandblasting & Staining                   | 1        | LS   | $40,000.00 | $40,000.00   |
| Picnic Tables                             | 15       | EA   | $2,000.00 | $30,000.00   |
| Bench                                     | 10       | EA   | $1,200.00 | $12,000.00   |
| Trash Receptacles                         | 15       | EA   | $1,500.00 | $22,500.00   |
| **SUBTOTAL**                              |          |      |           | $1,639,417.50|
| Construction/Design Contingency           | 30.0%    |      |           | $491,825.25  |
| Design Development Costs                  | 12%      |      |           | $196,730.10  |
| **TOTAL**                                 |          |      |           | $2,327,972.85|

| **SPORTS COMPLEX**                        |          |      |           |              |
| Field Lighting                            | 4        | EA   | $100,000.00| $400,000.00  |
| Backstops                                 | 4        | EA   | $30,000.00 | $120,000.00  |
| 8’ Ht. Chain Link Fence                  | 6,200    | LF   | $35.00    | $217,000.00  |
| Chainlink Double Swing Gate               | 4        | EA   | $2,000.00 | $8,000.00    |
| Dugout Gates                              | 8        | EA   | $850.00   | $6,800.00    |
| Foul Poles                                | 4        | SET  | $2,200.00 | $8,800.00    |
| Home Plate and Pitcher’s Rubber           | 4        | SET  | $300.00   | $1,200.00    |
| Infield Mix                               | 45,000   | SF   | $1.75     | $78,750.00   |
| Sod and Irrigation (90,000sf ea)          | 360,000  | SF   | $3.00     | $1,080,000.00|
| Bleachers                                 | 8        | EA   | $12,000.00| $96,000.00   |

6/22/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Players Benches</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td>$7,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugouts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$320,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Flatwork (Dugout Pads)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batting Cages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Post Tension Slab)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Goals and Net</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Striping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>20,020</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$60,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom/Concessions Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Shelters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,284,410.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$985,323.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,663,862.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL LANDSCAPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sod and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Seed and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>2,663,147</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$878,838.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Buffer</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation - Sod</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,153,838.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$646,151.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,058,450.68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding and Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,555,214.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$22,291,402.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$23,846,616.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Costs do not include utilities, substantial grading/earthwork/drainage, recreation center and fieldhouse.
Costs are approximate based on conceptual visioning plans.
Appendix F – Waggener Property Cost Estimates
### Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>2,469,852</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$246,985.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Grading (Cut, Fill, Compact On-site - approx. 2’)</td>
<td>182,952</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$2,195,424.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $2,482,409.20

### Site Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Flatwork - 4&quot; Depth (plaza &amp; walks - 7'wide)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Curb Ramp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving - 4&quot; Depth</td>
<td>310,218</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$930,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Access Roads</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$44,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilized Crusher Fines Trail/Paving</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $1,624,814.00

### Playground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Curb Wall</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Ramp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured-in-Place 3.5&quot; Depth</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$217,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground EWF</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$38,118.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Equipment 2-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Equipment 5-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandblasting &amp; Staining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $466,438.50

### Little League Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backstops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugout Gates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$3,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foul Poles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Plate and Pitcher's Rubber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infield Mix</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sod and Irrigation (30,000sf ea)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players Benches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Flatwork (Dugout Pads)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** $315,700.00

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little League Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $3,525,021.06

**Construction/Design Contingency:**
- 30.0% of the Total Cost
- 12% of the Total Cost

**Design Development Costs:**
- 30.0% of the Total Cost
- 12% of the Total Cost

**Total Estimates:**
- $2,482,409.20
- $1,624,814.00
- $466,438.50
- $315,700.00

**Total Cost:**
- $3,525,021.06
- $2,307,235.88
- $662,342.67

**Total:**
- $4,494,600.51

Date: June 22, 2016

**Waggener Property**

Estimate of Probable Costs - Visionary Plans

Approximately 56.7 Acres of Improvements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASKETBALL COURTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Post Tension Slab)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Goals and Net</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Striping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,001,788.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,536.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,214.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,422,538.96</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNIS COURTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Tension Concrete for Tennis Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing and Striping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts and Nets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SET</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$5,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Screens</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$7,238.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,962,915.92</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$888,874.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$355,549.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,207,340.61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4' Wood Estate Fence</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$19,954.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Shelters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$62,954.10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,886.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,554.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$89,394.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. PARK AMENITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Soccer field (200X400)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$240,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use field (300x400)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX/pump track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Shelters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,901,828.88</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200,548.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,680,219.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$19,882,597.01</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL LANDSCAPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sod and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Seed and Soil Preparation</td>
<td>1,236,594</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$408,076.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Buffer</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation - Sod</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,908,076.02</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Design Contingency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$572,422.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Costs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$228,969.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,709,467.95</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding and Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$29,086,664.57</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/22/2016
Grand Total |   |   | $33,449,664.25

Note:
Costs do not include utilities, substantial grading/earthwork/drainage and a Community Center. Costs are approximate based on conceptual visioning plans.
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Appendix G – Berthoud Reservoir Property Cost Estimates
## Berthoud Reservoir Property

### Estimate of Probable Costs - Visionary Plans

**Date:** June 22, 2016

Approximately 82 Acres (52 Acre reservoir). 30 acres of improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMO</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLEAR AND GRUB</strong></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ON-SITE GRADING (CUT, FILL, COMPACT ON-SITE - APPROX. 2')</strong></td>
<td>16,296</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EROSION CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION/DESIGN CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCRETE FLATWORK - 4&quot; DEPTH</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CURB AND GUTTER</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONCRETE CURB RAMP</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ASPHALT PAVING - 4&quot; DEPTH</strong></td>
<td>73,203</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ASPHALT ACCESS ROADS</strong></td>
<td>34,272</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STABILIZED CRUSHER FINES TRAIL/PAVING</strong></td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PARKING LOT AND CROSSWALK STRIPING</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION/DESIGN CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER RECREATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECREATION DOCK</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESTROOM/CONCESSIONS BUILDING/RENTAL OFFICE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SHADE SHELTERS</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESTROOM SHELTERS</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PICNIC TABLES</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BENCH</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TRASH RECEPTACLES</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FITNESS STATIONS</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION/DESIGN CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL LANDSCAPE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOD AND SOIL PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NATIVE SEED AND SOIL PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPE BUFFER</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IRRIGATION - SOD</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION/DESIGN CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BONDING AND MOBILIZATION</strong></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:
Costs do not include utilities and substantial grading/earthwork. Costs are approximate based on conceptual visioning plans.
Appendix H – Fee and FILO Comparisons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Developed Park Acres</th>
<th>Developed Park Acres per 1,000 Persons</th>
<th>Land Dedication Requirement</th>
<th>FILO</th>
<th>Building Permit Impact Fee (per dwelling unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berthoud, CO</td>
<td>64.66</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7% of appraised value of raw land in the development unless dedication of 7% of the land in the subdivision is accepted by the Board of Trustees, or unless it is a parcel in the already developed part of Town, in which case it is $800 per SFE.</td>
<td>SF $2,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO*</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SF $1,519 (900sf) to $4,690 (3700sf) $1,604 (600sf) to $3,754 (1600sf) Plus Excise Tax of $1,170 detached and $814 attached or mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton, CO</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NP/CP = 3ac/1000 ppl; @ 2.96 ppl /du</td>
<td>The fee in lieu of land dedication shall be determined according to a land dedication rate of three (3) acres per one thousand (1,000) population, based upon the fair market value of the unimproved land in the development as zoned for urban development. The fair market value of the land shall be established by an appraisal commissioned by the City at the developer’s expense.</td>
<td>Community Park: Construct park to city standards; OR Pay $400/unit with land dedication Pay $720/unit without land dedication Neighborhood Park 337 units or less: Pay $1,380/unit with land dedication Pay $1,700/unit without land dedication Neighborhood Park 338 units or more: Construct park to city standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield, CO</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>24 acres per 1000 ppl; cap at 25% of land area of development</td>
<td>$1/sf or $43,560</td>
<td>No, builder constructs (reimbursement may be custom negotiated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>SF TOTAL: Dedication or cash-in-lieu requirement: .008 acres/person or .024 acres/du (NP - .002 ac/pp or .006 ac/du) (CP - .006 ac/pp or .018 ac/du)</td>
<td>Dedication or cash-in-lieu requirement: .008 acres/person or .015 ac/du (NP - .002 ac/pp or .0039 ac/du) (CP - .006 ac/pp or .0117 ac/du)</td>
<td>MF TOTAL: Dedication or cash-in-lieu requirement: .008 acres/person or .024 acres/du (NP - .002 ac/pp or .006 ac/du) (CP - .006 ac/pp or .018 ac/du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock, CO</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>SF TOTAL: Dedication or cash-in-lieu requirement: .008 acres/person or .024 acres/du (NP - .002 ac/pp or .006 ac/du) (CP - .006 ac/pp or .018 ac/du)</td>
<td>Yes, per type of DU (Single-Fam/Multi-unit/Mobile) ... Fee is different between parks and trails</td>
<td>SF $2,009 (2099sf) to $4,373 (3700sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette, CO</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Dedicated at the ratio of .0055 acre per resident, 2.73 residents per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$49,839.00 (per acre fee) X # acres = payment in lieu of land dedication</td>
<td>Community Park-$1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor, CO</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Dedicated at the ratio of .0055 acre per resident, 2.73 residents per dwelling unit</td>
<td>$49,839.00 (per acre fee) X # acres = payment in lieu of land dedication</td>
<td>Community Park-$1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont, CO</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>All residential subdivisions shall reserve land for public parks, or dedicate land, or pay fees in-lieu of dedication, for the purpose of providing a proportionate share of public parks, greenways, and open space (most land purchased with PIF).</td>
<td>Yes, estimated pop</td>
<td>SF = $5,337 per targeted LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland, CO</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A, however open space play fields required at 1 acre/100 single family lots, not required for plats less than fifty lots; maintained by HOA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SF=$3,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, CO</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Not be less than 8.5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents; 8.5 acres X (number of dwelling units) X (persons per dwelling unit) = area to be dedicated</td>
<td>Based on appraisal, by Town approved, qualified appraiser, of fair market value based on developable land</td>
<td>SF/MF= $2,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Collins, CO</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Not by code; negotiable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NP $1,262 (700sf) to $1,966 (2200+sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden, CO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5% of development area; no less than 3 contiguous acres unless an addition to an existing park; not be more than ten percent average slope; wetlands, land within a floodway and/or drainage detention areas not accepted; must be consistent with the comprehensive plan.</td>
<td>FILO determined by appraisal, or comparing the cash value of comparably zoned land in the county.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you know that the typical park and recreation agency has one park for every 2,277 residents served, with 9.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents?
SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
Family Oriented • Walkability • Downtown • Community • Budget Sensitivity

Town of Berthoud PORT Plan
Active Recreation Subcommittee Proposal

HOPES FOR BERTHOUD PARKS, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION & TRAILS
Our group hopes that we can continue to nurture and grow the Town of Berthoud’s wonderful relationships with the great outdoors by expanding the community’s offerings of places to go and activities for all ages. Our proposal emphasizes accessibility, walkability, community and our historic and picturesque downtown.

We hope to pick the “low hanging” fruit and show a clear and direct path towards a BUDGET CONSCIOUS solution for recreation.

We hope to “keep the ball rolling” and show thoughtful and tangible results we CAN USE SOON as well as a plan for the future.

Our proposal’s short range priorities focus on Waggener Farm Park (WFP) and Berthoud Town Park. As Berthoud grows WFP is a central location for recreation activities because of its accessibility and close proximity to downtown Berthoud, schools, and current recreation facilities.

Values driving our proposal:
- Providing areas and activities that can be used by families and a variety of ages
- Promote connectivity and walkability
- Foster community involvement
- Draw people to our historic and vibrant downtown
- Budget sensitivity
- Maintain and update current facilities, taking advantage of existing infrastructure in place

Guiding considerations:
- Town maintenance and staff requirements
- Waggener Farm Park Conservation Easement and Deed Restrictions
- PORT Survey findings by Green Play
- Current comprehensive plan goals and objectives with respect to recreation
- Future Berthoud development
- Existing recreation programs and facilities in Berthoud

Park Amenity/Activity – Short Range Priorities
- Walking trails with trees and landscaping throughout WFP
  - #2 of citizens Top 6 priorities per PORT survey
  - Passive recreation is a condition of the WFP deed restrictions
  - Multi-use: walk, jog, bike, rollerblade, skate board, enjoy view, bird watching
- Playgrounds in WFP and Berthoud Town Park
  - #4 of citizens Top 6 priorities per PORT survey
  - Building updated playgrounds are a desired amenity at a low cost
  - Family focused passive activity
- Spray pad in WFP in conjunction with playground area
• Disc/frisbee golf throughout WFP
  o Inexpensive recreation and low cost maintenance
  o Family focused passive activity
  o Year round activity

• BMX & bike pump track
  o Re-establish amenity previously located north of Berthoud High School
  o Family focused passive activity
  o Low cost and low impact
  o Designed for all ages and skill levels (progressive options)
  o Especially popular with pre-teens and teens, offering this age group a healthy outlet
    (particularly those not involved in organized sports)
  o Year round (closed only when muddy)

• Ball fields in WFP. The construction of little league field(s) would allow for conversion of
  the Little League Field at Town Park.
  o High demand for ball fields in Berthoud
  o Potential to rent to organizations outside of Berthoud

• Open green space (unstructured and unfenced open field)
  o #1 of citizens Top 6 priorities per PORT survey
  o Multi-use: kite flying, picnic, frisbee, leisure, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing,
    uninhibited views of Front Range, community events, etc

• Field House to accommodate Berthoud Parks and Recreation activities and offer rooms for
  additional activities (i.e. martial arts, yoga and CrossFit).
  o High demand for gym space in Berthoud and all of Northern Colorado
  o Weight room and indoor basketball courts
  o Public use restrooms and showers

• Pavilion/Shelter(s) with restrooms and trees that can be reserved for private events and
  utilized for larger community activities
  o #6 of citizens Top 6 priorities per PORT survey
  o Promote community cohesion
  o Multi-use: community events and festivals, music in the park, private reservations,
    weekly farmers market
  o WFP is a perfect location for these events, bringing “old town” and new northern
    developments together toward Berthoud rather than further north toward Loveland

• Renovate and reinvent Berthoud Town Park: update playground, restrooms, swimming
  pool area, picnic shelters, consider replacing little league field with downtown accessible
  parking, dog park, and tree lined sidewalks.
  o We don’t want to see this important central Berthoud park continue to deteriorate.

• Outdoor pool. Scrape it. Build a new water park, slides, splash pad and swim lanes. Hot
  summer days... cool times at the pool swimming, splashing, sliding.... reading a book under
  a tree.
  o Current outdoor pool is on its last leg, design is outdated
  o Combination of lap lanes and water features accommodate Berthoud Parks and Rec
    swimming classes, youth and teens playing in the pool, and lap swimmers

• Fenced dog park in WFP or Town Park
  o Budget sensitive
  o Minimize dogs off leash in the community elsewhere
Recreation – Long Range Recommendations

- Full connectivity of multi-use paths and trails throughout Berthoud. Connect the Front Range Trail and the new developments, enabling pedestrian access to downtown parks, businesses and events.
- Berthoud Reservoir – picnic area, docks, fishing, camping, and no wake boating activities (SUP board, canoe, kayak)
- Loveland Reservoir/Richardson Property – picnic area, fishing, camping, trails, no wake boating, and a potential for a larger sporting complex and/or recreation center

IN SUMMARY
Let’s “strike while the iron is hot” and put a ribbon on a plan that we all agree upon. The PORT Plan Committee may not agree on every detail... regardless our community has a dire need for more recreation possibilities.

Waggener Farm Park is such a strategic location that is accessible by all and will breathe new life into our “old town”... let's leverage it to the best of our ability now and reap the benefits.
October 3, 2016
Berthoud PORT Facilities subcommittee conclusions:

- Motion: Barb moved to recommend to the Town of Berthoud that the timeline requirement of Jones Trust funds ($500,000) not drive the decision on a future facility and its location; depend on this money only if it is available once the town decides on the recreation facility. Maureen seconded.
  - The motion carried unanimously.

- Motion: Barb moved to recommend that the Town of Berthoud should pursue a recreation center-type facility at Waggener Farm Park with a cohesive design that integrates the agricultural heritage of the property with active recreational use. Kelsey seconded.
  - The motion carried, 5 to 1.

September 7, 2016
http://www.berthoud.org/home/showdocument?id=4564
The Milliken Athletic Complex, which opened just this summer, is similar to what BPRD believes would assist in their mission

- Facility is a field house run by Thompson Rivers Parks and Recreation District (http://www.trpr.org/about/)
- project costs were $7.5 million
- there are adjacent outdoor fields
- this is considered a “programming facility”, rather than a recreation center; it does not have a swimming pool or other aquatic features.

The committee reviewed the language in the proposal by the Thompson School District for a field house associated with the proposed pool at Berthoud High School. The primary goals of the field house appear to be storage, additional bathrooms, and protection from inclement weather during outdoor sporting events; indoor training is also mentioned. However, this facility will clearly not be readily available to BPRD and does not address its current needs.

August 24, 2016
- The committee discussed multiple aspects and questions regarding the guidance and recommendations the committee is to provide to the Town Board; this helped focus the committee’s work for future meetings:
  - Should the town move quickly to use the Jones donation ($500,000) that is available for some sort of recreation facility, or should that be allowed to expire rather than rush a facility?
    - Bruce Fickel confirmed that the $500,000 will become unavailable to the town if a contract for facility construction is not signed by December 2017
  - Should the town use the additional town funds available to the Jones donation to build a facility?
  - Should a facility be a recreation center, a community center, or both?
Berthoud PORT
Facilities Subcommittee Report
November 7, 2016

- A recreation center is loosely defined as one where physical exercise is undertaken
- Community center might include a kitchen, meeting space with screens and projectors, tables, chairs, etc.

  - If the committee recommends moving forward with a facility, should the aim be a large, relatively complete facility, or should we start small with the intention of adding new modules/buildings as funding becomes available?
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August 10, 2016  Windsor/Erie Tours & Discussion:
http://www.berthoud.org/home/showdocument?id=2424
Erie Documents:  http://www.erieco.gov/188/Facility-Information
Windsor Documents:  http://www.windsorgov.com/189/Community-Recreation-Center

- If a facility is recommended, where should it be located? Potential sites discussed included:
  - Waggener Farm Park
  - Richardson Property site north of Loveland Lake (identified as a potential site in the PORT Draft Master Plan Report produced by GreenPlay)
  - Property (not currently owned by the town) located east of the car wash on CR 17
  - Provide Town Board with multiple possible locations, prioritized

- Will the committee make recommendations regarding funding of any proposed facility – e.g., would a Recreation District be proposed?
  - Developers for upcoming communities may be willing to provide additional funds for future facilities, enhancing the community in a way that is attractive to their clients/buyers

- Potential negative impact of any future facilities on current recreation businesses should be considered, as well potential positive impact for other local businesses
TRAIL PROJECT PRIORITIES FOR BERTHOUD PORT PLAN

Working Assumptions, and direction from PORT Master Plan and Berthoud Comprehensive Plan

In Colorado a well-designed network of trails has proven to be one of the best investments a town can make. Trails can provide Berthoud residents of all ages and abilities a wide range of recreational, health, and lifestyle amenities. These investments in trail infrastructure are particularly appropriate when a community is growing so that these amenities can balance potential impacts of growth on traffic, pedestrian safety and access to open lands. Berthoud has many opportunities to work with State and County programs to build and maintain a system that will be of benefit to both visitors and residents of Berthoud, and to promote economic opportunities for businesses in Berthoud. It is no wonder that trails received one of the highest priorities by Berthoud residents in the PORT master plan survey.

Following direction provided in the Berthoud Comprehensive Plan the trails system for Berthoud needs to provide safe pedestrian access to all major neighborhoods and to connect to all major parks and open space areas. It is especially important that Berthoud has trail connections to regional trails, so that people can take either long or short trips on these trails and to use trails for commuting, exercise and a wide range of recreational activities. National and regional surveys consistently show that people give the highest priority to trails close to major water features such as streams and reservoirs, and to trails that go through natural areas, so we gave the highest priority to trails that have these features. Trails should also provide a safe and convenient means to walk, run, or bike between parks and from Berthoud to Loveland and other nearby towns. One critical issue that will only become more important over time as Berthoud grows is ensuring safe road crossings. As documented in the PORT master plan, crossings over main street (highway 56), county road 17 (Taft) and state highway 287 are now major barriers to safe pedestrian travel and will require at least good pedestrian lights if not overpasses or underpasses to make them safe, similar to what you see at road crossings for bike trails in Loveland and Fort Collins today.
Top priorities for trail projects to be worked on during the next 10 years.

1. **Waggener Farm Park.** This property is viewed as the keystone or hub of the Berthoud trails system. Trails are needed that loop around park area with junctions to trails going north on 17 to connect with trails to Heron Lakes and towards Berthoud Reservoir, south to Neilson Greenway and Hillside Park and the Little Thompson River and east to connect with downtown commercial and residential neighborhoods. Waggener Farm Park is a key green open space area close to downtown. It will be important to develop a management plan that emphasizes natural vegetation and/or water features, forests and gardens, especially on the southern conservation easement portion of the property, which will enhance opportunities for recreational trails.

2. **Trail to Heron Lakes and connections to the regional Loveland-Ft Collins trail.** This trail project is the closest trail to completion so it will be important to make the last connections so that it can soon become Berthoud's first multi-use regional trail connection from Waggener Farm Park. It is a high priority because of the scenic value, especially next to McNeil and Lonetree reservoirs, abundant wildlife and fish habitat, and its connection to the Loveland-Berthoud trail, which in turn will provide access to the entire Larimer County and Weld County trail systems with safe access to Loveland, Fort Collins, La Porte, Timnath, Windsor, and Greeley. This trail has a great potential for promoting economic development in Berthoud. A key challenge will be to create safe crossings across major road intersections.

3. **Trail around Berthoud Reservoir.** This is our best opportunity to provide residents in downtown and northwest neighborhoods in Berthoud access to an easy ADA accessible trail around a major water feature. It also has potential areas for parking and developed recreation infrastructure that will complement the trail system. This will be a trail that will allow for people with a wide range of abilities to enjoy a leisurely walk around a prime recreational area. In nearby towns these kinds of trails receive the heaviest overall use, which is why we give this trail a high priority. Trail connections should be made for residents in PrairieStar to the north and to Waggener Farm park to the SW.

4. **Southern Berthoud loop trail.** The existing Neilson greenway trail should be connected to new developments so that a loop trail can connect to Hillside Park, Little Thompson River, and up to the High School, Bein park and Waggener Farm Park. Travel on 1st street south to the Little Thompson river is now unsafe for pedestrians. A safe biking/walking trail will connect many new and old neighborhoods to all the major parks and
schools in this part of town as well as providing a safe means to connect to downtown and parks on the north part of town. The connection of Hillsdale Park to the Little Thompson and the Neilson greenway should happen as the developments are completed in that part of town. The rest will be possible when the Rose Farm development is completed.

5. Little Thompson River provides a unique opportunity for a recreational trail that follows a beautiful riparian cottonwood forest and natural stream system, a rare feature in this part of Colorado. These kinds of habitats are the highest priority for land conservation according to our comprehensive plan, and for priorities set by the county and the state. This could be an equestrian as well as biking/hiking trail similar to what you now see along the northern portion of the Poudre River trail. It also will provide a connection to planned developments near I-25 and to the evolving Johnstown and Weld County regional trails, and could then eventually go westward towards the new Malchow Farm Larimer County open space.

Submitted by:

Trails and Open Space Subcommittee, PORT plan advisory committee
NOTES ON MAP

1. Waggener park trail: Proposed trail connects existing trail on south end of park to Bunyan Ave and then to Turner Middle School parking lot.

2. Heron Lakes Trail: Key missing segment that will not be built by town or by current development plans is the stretch from north of Loveland Reservoir to county road 10E. Completion of this fairly short segment will provide a trail all of the way from Waggener Farm Park to Heron Lakes and on to Loveland regional trails. In addition this map shows connecting north to the Prairiestar and other new developments along 17. This would then allow any resident from downtown or any of the new developments in the NW to access this critical regional trail either to Heron Lakes or south to downtown. This second segment may not be critical if the Berthoud Reservoir trail system is built first, since that would connect PrairieStar to the Berthoud Reservoir and to 17. For commuting it will be critical to have a good trail along 17 where so much residential development is planned, so all the residents to the NW have fast easy access to downtown. This will presumably be built as the rest of this area is developed; but if it can be built sooner rather than later it will connect many important neighborhoods of Berthoud together.

3. Berthoud Reservoir. Key part is a trail that surrounds reservoir, and secondly access trails north to PrairieStar development and SW to 17 making a connection to trails to Heron Lakes, Richardson property and Waggener Farm Park. An access trail to NW could then make loop trails both on north and south sides of reservoir.

4. South Berthoud loop. The committee talked about the desirability of having good access to the Little Thompson, and connecting Hillsdale Park to other parks in area. Right now trails are being built that should connect Hillsdale to the Neilson greenway trail; When the Rose Farm development is completed trails could then complete the loop and connect Hillsdale to Bein park and the high school and up to Waggener connecting south Berthoud to the rest of the Berthoud trail system.

5. Little Thompson trail: Highest priority is securing lands so that it can connect with the south Berthoud loop trail and east to I-25 and the neighborhoods planned in that area.
TOP 5 TRAIL PROJECT PRIORITIES

1. Development Built Trails
2. Future Town Trails
3. Existing Town Trails
4. Trails Proposed in Master Plan
5. Priority Trails
6. Busy intersections