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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

This Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Trails (OSPRT) Master Plan carries forward the vision for Broomfield’s open lands originally established in the 1995 Master Plan. It is intended to serve as a road map for elected officials, advisory committees, Broomfield staff, and the community, in translating this vision into measurable achievements: additional open space acquired and developed, new parks developed, and trails constructed. The plan also outlines specific implementation strategies that will assist in achieving the community’s goals.

While the OSPRT plan is intended to provide guidance for a 20-year timeframe, where feasible it is anticipated that many goals, especially those relating to acquisition or preservation, would be achieved in a much shorter timeframe. This is necessary to ensure that valuable open lands properties are protected from development and that easements or acquisitions necessary to support a comprehensive community trails network, are obtained.

As a road map, the OSPRT plan provides:

- Performance goals and objectives which are intended to provide measurable indicators of progress in realizing the vision.
- Land evaluation criteria to assist Broomfield officials in identifying suitable open space and parks sites for acquisition or protection.
- A physical plan identifying potential open space, parks, and trails improvements to be completed as the community grows.
- Design standards for parks and trails that identify the types of amenities to be included in these facilities to balance quality, long-term maintenance and environmental sustainability.
- Guidelines for management and maintenance of community open space, parks and trails.
- Specific implementation strategies for achieving open lands goals, including:
  - Enhancements to the public land dedication requirement
  - Sales tax revenues
  - Other acquisition and protection mechanisms

- Analysis of Broomfield’s current and future needs for open space, parks, and recreation facilities, derived from community trends in utilization, results of a community needs assessment survey, and analysis of comparable communities.
THE PLANNING PROCESS

The OSPRT Master Plan is the result of sustained effort over a 2½-year period by the Open Space and Trails Advisory Committee (OSTAC), the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC), public input received from interested residents, City Council comments from study sessions, and research and analysis by City staff and consultants.

This plan has benefited from extensive public input. In July and August 2002, a statistically representative community needs assessment survey was conducted using a combination of mail and telephone interviews. The community survey provides statistically valid information on residents’ recreation activities as well as on their priorities for acquisition of open lands, development of trails facilities, and need for additional parks and playing fields.

Three public meetings were also held during the planning process. An initial “visioning” meeting was held in April 2002 and helped to identify the core values that would guide plan development. The second meeting, in October 2002, provided an opportunity for residents to provide specific feedback on preliminary plan proposals. The final public meeting, held in June 2003, provided an overview of the completed plan.

OSPRT plan proposals have been, and will continue to be, coordinated with the update of the 1995 Master Plan. It is anticipated that the OSPRT Plan will serve as a supplement to the Master Plan when it is adopted by City Council.

BROOMFIELD’S EXISTING OPEN LANDS SYSTEM

Within the City and County of Broomfield, open lands are defined as public and private lands acquired or preserved in the public interest. They serve a variety of functions, including conserving and protecting natural, cultural, historic or scenic resources; providing opportunities for recreation; shaping the pattern of growth and development; and preserving agricultural resources.

“Open lands” is an umbrella concept that encompasses three subsidiary designations: Park/Recreation Areas, Open Space, and Other Open Lands.

Other Open Lands. Park/recreation areas are the most intensively developed and used types of open lands. They may contain open turf areas for passive recreation, playing fields, hard courts, picnic areas, restroom facilities, and other improvements. Open space areas are parcels intentionally protected from development and set aside for unstructured recreation and the appreciation of natural surroundings. They may contain trailheads and trails, fishing facilities, wildlife viewing...
areas, and other facilities that support uses compatible with site resources and conditions. Other open lands include golf courses, detention areas, and other facilities. Exhibit 1 summarizes existing open lands by type. Approximately 26 percent of Broomfield’s planning area has been preserved as open lands, with the largest share (77 percent) constituting open space. Nine percent is parkland, with an additional two percent represented by school lands covered by joint use agreements.

Private open lands – ranging from agricultural land to private recreation centers – complement the public system. The focus of this plan, however, is on public facilities, as these are provided for the benefit of all Broomfield residents on a permanent basis.

Broomfield has worked actively as a community to acquire, preserve, and where suitable, to develop open lands for public use.

Private open lands – ranging from agricultural land to private recreation centers – complement the public system. The focus of this plan, however, is on public facilities, as these are provided for the benefit of all Broomfield residents on a permanent basis.

Broomfield has worked actively as a community to acquire, preserve, and where suitable, to develop open lands for public

**EXHIBIT 1: EXISTING OPEN LANDS BY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN LANDS ACRES</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Other OL</th>
<th>Total OL</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Owned Acres</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement Broomfield/ Boulder Counties</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks and facilities</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands Maintained by CCB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands not Elsewhere Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield County planning area including Intergovernmental Agreement - Broomfield/ Boulder County</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open lands as a percentage of total planning area acreage</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Space and Parks Statistics at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres:</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Owned Property</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easements</td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield/Boulder Counties IGA Open Space</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Use Agreements with Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acres per 1,000 Persons Compared to Other Communities:

- Boulder: 66 | 5 | 71
- Fort Collins: 57 | 7 | 64
- Broomfield: 56 ¹ | 16 ² | 72
- Westminster: 21 | 6 | 27
- Longmont: 14 | 25 | 39

¹ Includes only City owned Open Space and Conservation Easements
² Includes City owned Property and Joint Use Agreements
PLAN GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Based on extensive input from the community regarding values and priorities, five core goals and associated performance measures and principles, have been developed to anchor the plan. It is anticipated that these goals and performance measures will guide staff decision-making, and will be incorporated into the development review process to ensure that private development provides the level of amenities that residents desire.

While goals and principles are typical components of any planning effort, performance measures have also been added as a way to gauge progress from year to year and communicate that progress to the community. Performance measures may be quantitative or qualitative, and have been framed to allow staff charged with implementation the flexibility to add further definition to the measures and establish a phasing plan for implementation.

Goal 1: Create Connected Public Spaces

Broomfield shall create an interconnected open lands system that allows children to walk or bike safely from home to school to play. Ideally, parks and/or open space properties should be physically connected to provide continuous green space throughout the community, maximizing value to wildlife and, where appropriate, to recreational users. Parks and open space properties should be linked to the community trails system. Neighborhood design shall promote connected public spaces through provision of pedestrian friendly sidewalks and pathways, and through provision of public open space and parks.

Performance Measures:
- Provide neighborhood parks within six blocks of home
- Provide public access to open space that is compatible with underlying resources
- Fund trail segments based on completion of priority missing links that improve neighborhood and community connectivity
- Provide safe trail access within six blocks of home
- Provide parks and open space so as to establish unbroken physical connections throughout the community

Goal 2: Establish a Strong Community Image and Identity

A community’s parks, open space and trails can clearly define its identity if valuable and significant properties are preserved as open space and if high quality parks and trails facilities are developed. Broomfield’s open lands should establish a strong community
image and reflect important community values: creation of a community that values a healthy lifestyle by encouraging recreational activity and the enjoyment of the outdoors, views to the mountains, preservation of wildlife habitat, availability of parks close to residential areas, and a safe, connected trail system. Open space, parks and trails facilities shall be developed that maintain a consistent and high-quality community image. Opportunities to incorporate public art into parks, open space and trail locations are encouraged. Suitable locations for public art should enhance the open space, park, or trail site and also not impact wildlife, critical habitat areas, or recreational activities in a negative manner.

**Goal 3: Maintain Sound Stewardship of Open Lands**

Broomfield shall adopt best practices, standards and guidelines for acquiring and preserving open lands; for managing public use in a manner that is not harmful to underlying resource values; for designing sites and buildings to be environmentally sustainable; and for managing the development review process to ensure that valued resources are preserved in open space areas and high-quality parks facilities are provided.

**Performance Measures:**
- Target acquisitions based on criteria that reflect residents’ values
- Develop baseline management plans and implement guidelines for public use on open space properties of a significant size

---

1 The 1995 Master Plan established an original goal of preserving 44 percent of the community planning area as open lands. In this Plan, however, major roadways, including US 36 and the Northwest Parkway, were counted as open lands (estimated at approximately 9,600 acres total) by buildout. Broomfield staff, OSTAC and PRAC have concurred that roadways should not be included in the open lands acreage, and when their land area is excluded, the remaining open lands shown in the 1995 Master Plan represent 40 percent of the planning area. This goal has been reaffirmed through the OSPRT planning process and the 2004 Community Survey.
Protect wildlife habitat and ensure that any proposed public uses do not result in negative impacts to habitat.

Provide standards in the development review process to insure OSPRT outcomes are achieved (natural features preserved, high quality parks obtained).

Develop or renovate facilities according to Green Building Council guidelines where feasible.

---

Goal 4: Develop a Proactive Approach to Meeting Future Needs

Broomfield shall ensure that facilities and programs are developed proactively, in advance of population growth; and shall develop guidelines for accommodating changing recreational preferences within existing community facilities. Numerical performance measures described below shall apply to all new development in Broomfield. In already-developed areas, efforts to meet these goals shall be undertaken subject to availability of lands and financial resources.

**Performance Measures:**

- Develop neighborhood parks within six blocks of home
- Develop community parks within a two-mile radius of home
- Provide 16 acres of developed parkland through public land dedication for every 1,000 residents
- Provide a minimum of eight acres of appropriately-developed open space through public land dedication for every 1,000 residents
- Adjust future needs for athletic facilities based on current level of service that anticipates changes in utilization patterns
- Develop and implement guidelines to govern adoption of new recreational uses on existing community facilities

---

Goal 5: Ensure Equitable Distribution of Facilities

Broomfield shall strive to enable all areas of the community to have comparable access to open space, parks, recreation facilities.

---

2 The U.S. Green Building Council is the nation’s foremost coalition of leaders from across the building industry working to promote buildings that are environmentally responsible, profitable and healthy places to live and work. Council membership has grown to nearly 3,000 leading organizations including: local and national architectural and engineering firms; product manufacturers; environmental leaders such as the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Rocky Mountain Institute; building industry organizations; developers; and numerous federal, state and local government agencies.
Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Trails Master Plan

Physiological and Policy Recommendations

The OSPRT Plan provides recommendations for protection or acquisition of specific properties, as well as policies for management and maintenance of community open lands, that support achievement of the performance goals and measures summarized above. Principal recommendations include the following.

Open Space

- Establish and attain a standard of eight acres of appropriately-developed open space for every 1,000 residents as provided for through the public land dedication process.
- Preserve sites as shown on the OSPRT Open Space Map that provide connectivity with existing open space, or that provide large expanses of open space that enhance value for wildlife.
- Preserve sites as shown on the OSPRT Open Space Map that provide buffers to the north and west of the community and that provide links to the proposed Preble Creek subdivision.
- Preserve sites in the north area of the community as shown on the OSPRT Open Space Map that provide opportunities to preserve agricultural lands, preserve significant view corridors, and provide a gateway to the community.
A plan for the heart and soul of Broomfield

- Preserve sites in the north area of the community as shown on the OSPRT Open Space Map that provide opportunities for joint open space and parks uses.

- Identify water sources and supplies that may be used to enhance existing waterways and water bodies, such as Le Gault Reservoir, to support a more diverse wildlife population.

- Identify potential locations within open space sites for pavilions for nature program presentations, interpretive signage, and a nature center.

- Implement management and maintenance guidelines as recommended, enabling effective stewardship of community open space.

- Implement the open space and trails signage program as recommended to increase community awareness of existing properties and trails to provide guidance regarding acceptable/appropriate types of public use.

- Prepare a baseline management plan for each large open space property that documents existing resources and assesses their value, identifies opportunities for resource enhancement or restoration, identifies compatible public uses that will not result in negative impacts to resources, and that provides a plan for physical improvements (public access points, parking, trailheads, etc.) that support those public uses. The baseline management plan shall also provide estimated costs for improvements and a phasing plan.

- Establish and work towards near-term goals for open space preservation as follows:
  - Complete baseline management plans for significant properties
  - Complete one to two trails or significant trails segments per year
  - Complete construction of open space and trails signage program

Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programs

- Maintain the existing level of service standard for park acreage at 16 acres per 1,000 residents. Revise level of service standards for large and small parks as recommended to provide a broader range of facilities for residents.

- Acquire sites north of Dillon Road as shown on the OSPRT Parks Map that provide opportunities for future large community parks and a possible third future recreation center.
Acquire sites as shown on the OSPRT Parks Map that protect small parcels adjacent to Broomfield County Commons from development.

Acquire sites as shown on the OSPRT Parks Map that provide opportunities to enhance service in underserved areas, or to expand programming at existing sites (such as expanding Northmoor Park).

Add approximately four multi-purpose fields in the near term, and continue to monitor future needs for athletic facilities based on current level of service and community participation trends. Potential field sites include the area adjacent to the proposed reservoir south of the Northwest Parkway and west of Lowell Boulevard and the land south of the open space adjacent to McKay Lake.

Evaluate the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of adding an outdoor pool in the north area of the community to respond to requests for additional aquatics facilities. Assess possible renovation of the original recreation center.

Continue to evaluate needs for additional aquatics and cultural arts programming once the Paul Derda Center has been in operation.

Community Trails

Develop a hierarchy of regional, community and local trails and on-street bike lanes that address community needs. Connect these trails as a system of long and short recreational loops that, when completed, will increase the amount of multi-use off-street pathway mileage threefold.

Develop designated safe bicycling routes, including on street bike lanes that promote or increase bicycle commuting.

Develop regional trail connections along the Northwest Parkway, US 36 Bike Expressway, and to the Big Dry Creek Corridor. Complete the Broomfield Trail.

Develop major community trail loops that connect major water bodies (Lake Links Loop); connect the southwest to northeast segments of the community (Southwest Community Trail); and connect the emerging north region of the community to the existing developed core (North Community Trail).

Incorporate the specific “missing links” that must be completed to make these
trails functional, in annual CIP planning. Target segments for completion based on cost-to-value measures. Report to OSTAC, City Council, and the community annually on progress.

- Implement modified design standards for trails that improve functionality, experience and safety for users.

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The OSPRT Plan also sets forth a series of regulatory and financial strategies that complement physical and policy recommendations. These include the open space and parks sales tax, General Fund, and public land dedication requirement, as well as a number of new approaches. These new approaches will be particularly important because there is an urgency to acquire potential open space properties, in particular, before they face pressure from development.

Because achieving Broomfield’s open lands goal will entail new strategies, the OSPRT Plan recommends that a more detailed feasibility assessment of proposed new strategies be undertaken to determine their likely revenue yield and contribution to achieving the open lands goal. Because these measures will require Council, and in some cases voter approval, proposed strategies should be refined such that land yields may be estimated and pros and cons evaluated.

Recommended strategies for meeting Broomfield’s open lands goal are summarized below.

- Revise the City’s public land dedication requirement consistent with the recommendations in the OSPRT Master Plan. Codify new development guidelines and/or development regulations that incorporate new open space and parkland dedication requirements.

- Acquire open lands properties prior to approval of all entitlements, where feasible.

- Amend development regulations to:
  - Integrate parks, open space and trails considerations into the City’s development review process.
  - Protect aquatic environments and wetlands.
  - Protect views from parks and open space lands to significant natural features such as the Front Range.
  - Ensure dedication of suitable open space and parkland that protects natural features.
  - Maintain drainageways and floodplains in their natural condition.
  - Ensure dedication of suitable parkland that meets programming needs.

- Actively assess compliance of private development with goals, performance measures and recommendations of the OSPRT Plan.
Utilize General Fund revenues each year in the acquisition of open space or parks properties.

Utilize some portion of the funds received from GOCO each year in the acquisition of open space or park land.

Assess the performance of the open space and parks sales tax (revenues, expenditures, lands acquired) on an annual basis. Report status of sales tax revenues and land acquired to OSTAC, PRAC and the City Council annually and as requested.

Consider establishing a revolving loan fund to accelerate the land banking of large properties which are threatened by development and which could not otherwise be purchased.

Consider a temporary increase of the mil levy for open space and park purchases and/or improvements.

Consider temporary increases to the sales tax rate to fund specific large projects that cannot be funded through existing mechanisms. Also consider the temporary earmarking of some portion of county sales taxes to support similar objectives.

Promote the establishment of a foundation to provide a more flexible mechanism for accepting donations and raising revenue, than is otherwise available to a municipality/county.

Promote partnerships with adjacent communities and counties to leverage dollars toward common open lands preservation goals. By leveraging financial and other resources of other government entities, larger parcels providing greater wildlife or public recreation value may be obtained than could otherwise be available to just one community, ultimately providing benefits for both.

Report at least once a year and as requested to OSTAC and PRAC, City Council, and the community on progress in achieving open lands goals.
CONCLUSION

Exhibit 2 summarizes projected open lands anticipated by the OSPRT Plan when Broomfield is fully built out.

Forty percent of the community’s planning area, or 9,567 acres, would be preserved as open lands. Of this, 70 percent is preserved as open space, 11 percent would be developed as parks, nine percent developed as golf courses, and the remainder would be preserved as other open lands, including a new reservoir.

In terms of level of service, this would provide 126 acres of open lands for every 1,000 persons, ensuring that future Broomfield residents would continue to enjoy proportionately the same level of amenities as current residents. This equates to about 5,500 square feet of open lands for each resident – or roughly the size of an average single-family lot.

Broomfield residents would also enjoy a total of 243 miles of trails and on-street bike lanes at buildout, compared to the 94 miles that have been completed through 2004. Of the total mileage at buildout, approximately 94 miles, or 39 percent, would be concrete off-street trails; 64 miles (26 percent) on-street bike lanes; 13 miles (five percent) crusher fines trails; and 72 miles (30 percent) would be eight-foot detached sidewalks.
## EXHIBIT 2: TOTAL OPEN LANDS AT BUILDOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Other OL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN LANDS ACRES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Owned Acres</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield/ Boulder Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Potential Partnerships and/or IGAs</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks and facilities</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands Maintained by CCB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands not Elsewhere Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,567</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield County planning area including Intergovernmental Agreement - Broomfield/ Boulder County</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OL as a percentage of total planning area acreage</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPEN LANDS ACRES/ POPULATION

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Buildout Population</td>
<td>75,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual acres attained/ 1000 persons</td>
<td>AC/1,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

This Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Trails (OSPRT) Master Plan carries forward the vision for Broomfield’s open lands originally established in the 1995 Master Plan. It is intended to serve as a road map for elected officials, advisory committees, Broomfield staff, and the community, in translating this vision into measurable achievements: additional open space acquired or preserved, new parks developed, and trails constructed. The plan also outlines specific implementation strategies that will achieve the community’s goals.

While the OSPRT plan is intended to provide guidance for a 20-year timeframe, where feasible it is expected that many goals, especially those relating to acquisition or preservation, would be achieved in a much shorter timeframe. This is necessary to ensure that valuable open space and park properties are protected from development and that easements or acquisitions necessary to support a comprehensive community trails network, are obtained.

As a road map, the OSPRT plan provides:

› Analysis of Broomfield’s current and future needs for open space, parks, recreation facilities, derived from community trends in utilization, results of a community needs assessment survey, and analysis of comparable communities.

› Performance goals and objectives which are intended to provide measurable indicators of progress in realizing the vision.

› Land evaluation criteria to assist Broomfield officials in identifying suitable open space and parks sites for acquisition or protection.

› A physical plan identifying potential open space, parks, and trails improvements to be completed as the community grows.

› Design standards for parks and trails that identify the types of amenities to be included in these facilities so as to balance quality, long-term maintenance and environmental sustainability.

› Guidelines for management and maintenance of community open space, parks and trails.

› Specific implementation strategies for achieving open lands goals, including:
  › Enhancements to the public land dedication requirement
OPEN LANDS DEFINED

Within the City and County of Broomfield, open lands are defined as public and private lands acquired or preserved in the public interest. They serve a variety of functions, including conserving and protecting natural, cultural, historic or scenic resources; providing opportunities for recreation; shaping the pattern of growth and development; and preserving agricultural resources.

“Open lands” is an umbrella concept that encompasses three subsidiary designations: Park/Recreation Areas, Open Space, and Other Open Lands. Park/recreation areas are the most intensively developed and used types of open lands. They may contain open turf areas for passive recreation, playing fields, hard courts, picnic areas, restroom facilities, and other improvements. Open space areas are parcels intentionally protected from development and set aside for unstructured recreation and the appreciation of natural surroundings. They may contain trailheads and trails, fishing facilities, wildlife viewing areas, and other facilities that support uses compatible with site resources and conditions. Other open lands include golf courses, water detention areas, and other facilities that are maintained by the City and County but are neither strictly parks nor open space.

Private open lands – ranging from agricultural land to private recreation centers – complement the public system. The focus of this plan, however, is on public facilities, as these are provided for the benefit of all Broomfield residents on a permanent basis.

Broomfield has worked actively as a community to acquire, preserve, and where suitable, to develop open lands for public use. Chapter 2 describes the results of these efforts in more detail. Two major initiatives, a dedicated sales tax passed in 1994 and the 1995 Master Plan, have been instrumental to the community’s progress.

AN INITIAL MANDATE: THE 1994 OPEN SPACE AND PARKS SALES TAX

Preservation of open space has emerged as an increasingly important value for Broomfield residents throughout the past decade. In 1993, a citizens’ group called the Open Space Advisory Committee was appointed by City Council to make recommendations regarding open space, and the following year, the Committee

- Sales tax revenues
- Other acquisition and protection mechanisms
provided a list of recommended “Top Ten” open space acquisition priorities compiled from community input and a site inventory. To facilitate the acquisition of these properties, in November 1994, a one-quarter cent sales tax was passed by the voters, instituting the City’s first dedicated revenue source for open space acquisition. Eighty percent of these sales tax revenues are earmarked for open space acquisition and 20 percent for park and recreation facility acquisition and development.

Sales tax revenues have since been used to acquire many of the properties on the “Top Ten” list and to implement recommendations from the 1995 Master Plan. In 2001, Broomfield voters approved the elimination of the “sunset” provision of the sales tax, allowing it to continue in perpetuity unless altered by the voters. Voters also approved allowing tax dollars to be used for improvements and maintenance of open space properties.

CONTINUING THE MANDATE:
THE 1995 MASTER PLAN

This focus on open space and parks and recreation was sustained with the development and adoption of the 1995 Master Plan. The 1995 Master Plan establishes a strong vision for Broomfield’s open lands system and specific policies designed to facilitate achievement of the vision. For example, the plan’s Goal #2 emphasizes the importance of open lands to the community’s identity:

Make Broomfield’s unique natural setting and its open space system central to its identity. Establish an identifiable edge or boundary to the City by creating a permanent “Green Edge.” Create an interconnected network of greenways that link neighborhoods, schools, community facilities, shopping areas and job sites in order to encourage walking and bicycling and to make Broomfield safe for all. Set guidelines for the reasonable protection of existing wildlife and encourage new development with wildlife habitat preservation in mind.

To facilitate this vision, the Master Plan provides a system of broad policies and design guidelines that address preservation, restoration and enhancement of the natural environment, creation of a comprehensive greenways and trails network, creation of a network of parks that provide a diversity of recreational opportunities, and preservation of indigenous wildlife and habitat.

This OSPRT Master Plan builds on these early mandates. Its major focus, as described earlier, is on translating community values and vision into concrete performance goals and financing strategies that promote implementation. The OSPRT Master Plan is intended to be updated regularly to respond to changing or emerging needs; to update the road map for acquisition and preservation of parks, open space, trail corridors and facilities; and to update priorities and action steps. The OSPRT Master Plan has been, and will continue to be, integrated into the update of the 1995 Master Plan currently underway.

THE OSPRT PLANNING PROCESS

The OSPRT Master Plan is the result of sustained effort over a 2 ½-year period by the Open Space and Trails Advisory Committee (OSTAC), the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC),
public input received from interested residents, City Council comments from study sessions and research and analysis by City staff and consultants.

**OSTAC and PRAC Involvement**

In 1999, the Broomfield City Council formed the current Open Space and Trails Advisory Committee and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee. Council charged both committees with the task of developing recommendations for an open space, parks, recreation, and trails master plan. The plan was to address topics such as locations for future open space and parks acquisitions; the location, type and timing of trail connections; needed recreation facilities, standards for park design, a community open lands goal, revised public land dedication formula, and open lands maintenance measures.

OSTAC and PRAC have played an integral role throughout this planning process, formulating an overarching vision and performance goals for the open space, parks, recreation and trails system; developing criteria to rate future land acquisitions; refining design standards for parks; recommending priorities for acquisition or facility development; and recommending strategies for implementation. Regular OSTAC and PRAC monthly meetings during the 2 ½-year planning period have included updates and study sessions related to the planning effort. Over 25 meetings have been held including many that included the joint participation of both committees. The committees have also edited two drafts of the OSPRT plan document.

**Public Input**

This plan has also benefited from extensive public input. In July and August 2002, a statistically representative community needs assessment survey was conducted using a combination of mail and telephone interviews. As discussed further in Chapter 3, objectives of the survey were to identify residents’ patterns of use of existing community facilities, to identify their priorities for future acquisition, development, or capital repair; and to obtain their opinions on a number of management and policy issues.
Surveys were mailed to approximately 5,000 Broomfield households, with approximately 1,100 returned. Telephone interviews were then completed with another 100 residents, to validate the information obtained in the mail survey and to ensure additional representation of selected population subgroups. The community survey provides statistically valid information on residents’ recreation activities as well as on their priorities for acquisition of open lands, development of trails facilities, and need for additional parks and playing fields.

Three public meetings were also held during the planning process. An initial “visioning” meeting was held in April 2002 and helped to identify the core values that would guide plan development. The second meeting, in October 2002, provided an opportunity for residents to provide specific feedback on preliminary plan proposals. The final public meeting, held in June 2003, provided an overview of the completed plan.

All public meetings were advertised in the Broomfield Enterprise, and an article on results from the community needs assessment survey was credited with stimulating a high level of attendance at the October 2002 public meeting. Updates on the planning process, including survey results and preliminary plan proposals, were also posted on the City’s website.

Research and Analysis

This plan is supported by extensive research and analysis aimed at documenting Broomfield’s current and future needs for parks, recreation facilities, trails and open space. Key elements in this work were estimating the City’s current and future population and the current levels of service provided by the City’s existing parks and recreation facilities. The consultants also developed profiles, design standards and service areas for the different types of parks proposed as part of the citywide system. City Geographic Information System staff developed base mapping showing the location and acreage associated with each park and open space property owned by the City, as well as school playgrounds and playing fields covered by joint use agreements. Neighboring city and county staffs were also contacted to coordinate planning activities.

Coordination with 1995 Master Plan Update

OSPRT planning efforts have been, and will continue to be, coordinated throughout with the update of the 1995 Master Plan. Staff involved with the master plan update has participated in OSPRT work sessions and the master plan update Task Force has received a formal presentation on the OSPRT plan. Coordination will continue as the 1995 Master Plan update is completed.

PLAN ORGANIZATION

The following is a brief outline of the topics covered by this plan:

- Existing Resources and Conditions
- Community Values and Priorities
- Plan Vision, Performance Measures and Principles
- Establishing An Open Lands Goal and Criteria to Guide Land Acquisition
- Recommendations for Open Space
Recommendations for Parks and Recreation Facilities
Recommendations for a Community Trails System
Implementation Strategies to Promote Stewardship: Proposed Municipal Code Revisions

Implementation and Financing Strategies
Recommendations for Revisions to the Public Land Dedication Requirement
Conclusions
Chapter 2
EXISTING RESOURCES AND CONDITIONS

LOCAL AND REGIONAL CONTEXT

Community History

Broomfield is a community of just over 43,000 persons\(^3\), located in the northern Denver metropolitan area. The city and county spans 33.6 square miles with 3,340 of developed residential acres\(^4\).

The City’s heritage is agricultural. Dryland farms dotted the landscape in the late 1800s. In 1873, the Colorado Central Railroad brought a line north from Golden, eventually connecting with the Union Pacific in Cheyenne, Wyoming. By 1908, rail cars were serving Broomfield on a regular basis, taking passengers to Denver, Westminster, Marshall, Boulder, Superior, Valmont and Louisville on its Main Line. Yet the community remained small-town in character: from 1900 to 1957, only about 100 people were counted as residents.

In 1950, construction began on the Boulder Turnpike, one of the first paved roads in the area. In 1955, modern-day Broomfield began to take shape, conceived as a master planned community and a model city. The first filing – the area north of 120th between Main St. and U.S. 287 – was built, and by 1961 when the city incorporated, the population had grown to 6,000.

From these early beginnings, Broomfield has grown significantly, becoming a county in November 2001. Between 1990 and 2000, Broomfield’s population increased by 55 percent, according to Census figures. The community retains a family orientation: approximately 36 percent of households are families with children under age 12. Results of a Citizen Survey undertaken in 2004 rate the community “above average” as a place to raise children, compared to neighboring

\(^3\) Source: Broomfield Planning Department estimates as of March 2003.
\(^4\) Source: Data posted on City of Broomfield website, August 2003.
municipalities along the Front Range. The Citizen Survey also indicates that residents are relatively affluent: 38 percent report total household incomes of between $50,000 and $100,000 in 2002, and another 31 percent report household incomes of over $100,000.

As the community has developed, the rural character that is part of Broomfield’s heritage, and its environmental resources, have become very much prized by its residents. Broomfield’s growth highlights the need for an overall plan for preservation of open space and development of a parks and trails system.

**Regional Setting**

Broomfield is located within close proximity to a number of regional facilities that preserve significant open space and provide recreational amenities for area residents. These include:

1. **Lands Covered by an Intergovernmental Agreement between Broomfield/ Boulder Counties.** Just under 2,400 acres at Broomfield’s western edge have been preserved as open space pursuant to a 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Broomfield and Boulder. This agreement was developed during the early stages of Broomfield’s efforts to create a plan to become a county.

2. **Big Dry Creek Corridor.** The Big Dry Creek corridor abuts the southeastern edge of Broomfield and provides an important stream and riparian corridor. Many ecologically valuable vegetation types, including wetlands, riparian forests, and moist grasslands, occur within the Big Dry Creek drainage. The vegetation communities attract a diverse wildlife population including numerous birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. The creek corridor also provides nesting or migration habitat for raptors, waterfowl, wading birds such as the great blue heron, and migratory shorebirds.

3. **Standley Lake Regional Park.** Located in the City of Westminster, this resource provides 2,327 acres of lake, eagle habitat, trails and spectacular views to and from the Lake.

---

4. Just west of Great Western Reservoir lies the future **Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge**. This 6,250-acre wildlife refuge will be established within the former Rocky Flats Plant and Buffer Lands after clean-up is completed. The refuge will be managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

In addition to these specific resources, cities adjacent to Broomfield have planned and developed trail systems and open space corridors that offer potential linkages to the system of parks, trails and open space in Broomfield described in the OSPRT Master Plan. By coordinating with these communities, Broomfield has the opportunity to extend and enhance its system for the benefit of area residents.

**SIGNIFICANT NATURAL FEATURES**

**The Ecological Assessment Process**

Broomfield contains a number of environmentally significant natural features, many of which have already been preserved as community open lands. To assess the community’s existing natural resource base, a Wildlife and Open Space Study was completed in 1992 by a team of area consultants.\(^6\) This study examined underlying natural features (drainage, topography) within the community’s planning area, and also examined wildlife habitat quality, landscape value and wetlands at 53 specific sites, identified based on conspicuous ecological or physical features that are important to wildlife for food, cover, nesting or reproduction.

As part of the OSPRT Master Planning process, this study was updated in 2002 to re-evaluate the condition of sites that had not been developed in the intervening 10 years, and to evaluate the natural resource potential of additional sites that were acquired through annexation when Broomfield became a county: a total of 21 sites and properties.\(^7\) Also considered were the analysis and recommendations made in the City and County of Broomfield’s Policies for Prairie Dog Conservation and Management (2003). Understanding the inherent natural resource base is an important first step in understanding the qualities that make existing open lands valuable – and how to enhance, restore or maintain them, as well as in identifying potential candidates for future preservation.

Natural features examined through the ecological assessment include water bodies and waterways; areas of native intact vegetation; and areas supporting wildlife habitat. Like its predecessor, this re-evaluation rated sites from high to low resource value based on a composite index of the quality of these natural features. The rating scale for each feature is summarized below.

Topography and views were also examined, though because of the relative lack of variability of topographic features in the

---


\(^7\) This assessment was completed by Walsh Environmental of Boulder, CO, as part of the OSPRT planning process.
Vegetation

**High** = Contains significant areas of (i.e., is dominated by) native plant communities, including areas of relatively intact prairie grassland, riparian woodland or shrubland, and herbaceous wetland.

**Medium** = Contains some areas of native vegetation but is (1) somewhat degraded (with weed infestations, barren areas, low cover, low diversity) or (2) contains significant non-native areas. If the latter, non-native communities are in good condition (e.g., relatively free of weeds and with good plant cover and some diversity). If degraded native vegetation, potential exists for restoration by resting and weed control.

**Low** = Basically lacking significant native vegetation, very weedy, or a near-monoculture (very low diversity).

Wetlands

**High** = Contains significant area of native wetland community that supports wetland wildlife uses and/or provides other functional wetland values such as water quality enhancement, water storage, and channel stabilization. Any impacts to wetland would require a permit from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including mitigation (replacement, enhancement, or mitigation bank credits).

**Medium** = Contains some area of native wetland but not a dominant part of site and can coexist with other uses if wetland is retained with adequate buffer. Any impacts to wetland are likely to require a 404 permit and mitigation.

**Low** = Either contains no wetland or, if present, is too small, too isolated, or too poor in quality to affect decisions concerning acquisition, preservation, or use of parcel. If degraded wetland is present, impacts may require a 404 permit.

Wildlife Habitat

**High** = Provides habitat for either (1) diverse or abundant native wildlife or (2) an ecologically important species or guild (e.g., raptors, carnivores, prairie dogs, neotropical migrant songbirds, amphibians); meets a critical life need of one or more ecologically important species; of sufficient size and/or contiguity to meet home range requirements.

**Medium** = Contains some notable habitat components worthy of preservation (e.g., large trees for raptors, native grassland for ground-nesting songbirds and native mammals) but generally supports fewer species or individuals overall, and specifically fewer ecologically important species or critical life needs than High category.

**Low** = Basically lacking significant wildlife use.
community, ratings were not assigned to specific sites.

Exhibit 2.1 illustrates summary ratings for each of the sites included in our analysis, and identifies those high-quality sites that may be candidates for future acquisition. A brief discussion of resource values, organized by natural feature, is provided below. The site evaluation matrix used in this assessment is provided as Appendix B.

Water Bodies and Waterways

Broomfield’s ponds and reservoirs provide important aquatic and riparian habitat as well as passive recreation opportunities. These areas also provide large stands of cottonwoods that offer nesting sites for raptors. Among the most significant water bodies are the following:

- **Great Western Reservoir**: This area is probably the community’s premier water resource, receiving high ratings because of its importance to waterfowl and other species, its isolation from development, surrounding open space, nearby large trees and cattail wetlands and numerous trees that provide perch/nest sites for raptors and bald eagles that hunt for prairie dogs nearby.

- **Brunner Reservoir**: This area receives substantial use by waterfowl but its resource value could be substantially improved by increasing the diversity of the shoreline.

- **Plaster Reservoir**: This area is highly valued because of its large trees, immediate connection to other open lands (golf course and adjacent open space) that facilitates habitat connectivity, and its proximity to McKay Lake.

Other smaller water bodies, such as Josh’s Pond, provide high quality habitat albeit on a smaller scale. Islands of native vegetation encourage some wildlife use in the context of a developed residential neighborhood.

A number of irrigation facilities and drainageways also traverse the community, including Community Ditch, Equity Ditch,
Quail Creek, Walnut Creek and Bull Canal, and smaller drainageways and ditches on lands which are presently zoned agricultural or rural residential. These smaller drainageways are generally located north of 144th Ave. and south of SH 7. If easements are acquired and channel rehabilitation is undertaken, the current resource value of these water resources could be increased significantly. These drainageways may also offer potential for alternative recreational or wildlife movement corridors if improvements are made.

Areas of Intact Native Vegetation

A number of areas have been identified as valuable because they constitute areas where native vegetation – prairie or grassland – is relatively intact, undisturbed by grazing or agricultural cultivation. These include:

- **Areas of relatively natural prairie habitat.** These include the Lac Amora open space, portions of Broomfield County Commons area, and other large tracts southwest of Preble Creek.

- **Areas of non-native grassland with large trees for raptors.** These include Walnut Creek west of Great Western Reservoir, the area along Big Dry Creek, Quail Creek south of McKay Lake, Le Gault Reservoir, and agricultural parcels with irrigation ditches or small creeks (Sites 12A, 14A, 16A, 24A, 30).

- **Wetlands that might be preserved or enhanced.** These include the northeastern corner of The Field, all of Le Gault Reservoir, a portion of Tom Frost Reservoir, wetlands at Lac Amora, and smaller ponds and drainages (Sites 14a, 16A, 24A, 30).

Areas Supporting Wildlife Use

A number of areas have been identified as valuable because they support wildlife use by multiple species or because they provide connectivity with adjacent open lands. Typical wildlife observed in the Broomfield area includes primarily urban species that are able to coexist at some level with human use and development. Typical mammals include the black-tailed prairie dog, desert cottontail, mule deer, raccoon, coyote, gray and red fox, beaver, and muskrat. Small rodents include the prairie vole, meadow vole, deer mouse and western harvest mouse.

Common birds include such ground nesting species as western meadowlarks, horned larks, lark buntings and three species of sparrows. Ferruginous hawks, northern hawks and short-eared owls nest on the ground in open grassy areas, while burrowing owls nest in abandoned prairie dog burrows. Swainson's and red-tailed hawks, golden eagles, great horned owls and long-eared owls have also been observed.
EXHIBIT 2.1: ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT
Areas supporting high value wildlife use include:

- **Quail Creek Corridor** (Site 16A).

- **The Big Dry Creek corridor**, which provides a perennial water source, regional wildlife movement corridor, and raptor nesting/predation sites. Site 24A is particularly valuable.

- **Great Western Reservoir and parcels adjacent**, valued because of their importance to waterfowl and other species, isolation from development, surrounding open lands, and supporting vegetation.

and Sheridan Boulevard, where it continues northeasterly through the proposed Preble Creek development to the intersection of SH 7 and Lowell Boulevard. This ridgeline defines Broomfield’s drainage patterns, with the area northwest of the ridgeline draining to Rock Creek, and the area southeast draining to Big Dry Creek. The highest points within the county limits are located in this area, east of Lowell Boulevard and at SH 128 and Indiana.

**EXISTING OPEN LANDS WITHIN BROOKFIELD**

Broomfield has worked actively as a community to acquire, preserve, and where suitable, to develop open lands for public use. The term “open lands” is an umbrella concept that encompasses three subsidiary designations: park/recreation areas, open space, and other open lands.

Park/recreation areas are the most intensively developed and used types of open lands. They may contain open lawn areas for passive recreation, playing fields, hard-surface courts, picnic areas, restroom facilities, and other improvements.

Open space areas are parcels intentionally protected from development and set aside for unstructured recreation and the appreciation of natural surroundings. They may contain trailheads and trails, fishing facilities, wildlife viewing areas, and other facilities that support uses compatible with underlying natural and cultural resources.

Other open lands include golf courses, water detention areas, and other facilities that are maintained by the City and County...
but are neither strictly parks nor open space.

Existing open lands currently encompass approximately 6,285 acres, or approximately 26 percent of the community’s defined planning area, which includes the City and County boundaries plus the lands covered under the Broomfield/Boulder County IGA. Exhibit 2.2 below shows the distribution of these lands by type.

Neighborhood and pocket parklands have generally been acquired through dedication from developers, while acquisition of larger community parks has often required special financing approaches. Open space lands have been acquired through the open space and parks sales tax, through negotiation of conservation easements, by the public land dedication process, or through intergovernmental agreements.

The sections that follow describe the components of Broomfield’s open lands in more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 2.2: EXISTING OPEN LANDS BY TYPE</th>
<th>Existing Open Lands As of 5/10/2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN LANDS ACRES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Owned Acres</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement Broomfield/ Boulder Counties</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks and facilities</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands Maintained by CCB</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands not Elsewhere Classified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield County planning area including Intergovernmental Agreement - Broomfield/Boulder County</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lands as a percentage of total planning area acreage</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING OPEN SPACE

Many of the important natural resources and facilities described above have already been acquired as community open space, beginning in 1977 with the dedication of Lac Amora Open Space.

Broomfield’s existing open space presently encompasses some 4,816 acres. Approximately half (2,419 AC) is comprised of community-owned parcels (2,005 AC) and conservation easements (414 AC). The remaining 2,397 AC constitute the lands covered under the Broomfield/Boulder County IGA.

Broomfield presently provides its residents with a level of open space comparable to communities with much larger populations, including Boulder and Fort Collins, as shown in the box to the right.

Some of the more substantial and well-known open space properties and their principal features include:

- **Lac Amora Open Space:** The property includes over 100 acres of relatively indigenous prairie that presents an attractive foreground to distant views of the Rock Creek Valley as well as long views of the Front Range.

- **Josh’s Pond Open Space:** This area includes approximately 16 acres of pond and prairie located within the existing Lac Amora subdivision. The site affords Walkable natural area in close proximity to a residential area, as well as expansive views to the Front Range. The pond provides habitat for ducks, grebes, herons and other small shorebirds.

- **Great Western Reservoir:** This area encompasses over 750 acres and supports nesting and migrating waterbirds. The open water in an otherwise dry environment contributes substantially to the wildlife value of the area. The northern portion of the site is designated as a prairie dog relocation site.
The Field: This area is located immediately north of the City and County offices and includes just over 115 acres, including historic Brunner Farmhouse. It was acquired in 1995. An existing master plan for this area calls for the agricultural land to be converted to native grasses with trails, picnic areas, overlooks, an arboretum, and trailhead, over a period of time.

Broomfield County Commons Open Space: This area encompasses 237 acres and includes Le Gault and Tom Frost Reservoirs. Le Gault Reservoir includes a small wetland complex, while Tom Frost provides more limited riparian habitat and is also used for public fishing.
EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Parks

Broomfield’s existing parks have developed over the last five decades, as the community has grown from a very small town to a vibrant city and county. Some parks have been designed and built by the City/County, while others were dedicated through the development of residential subdivisions. Broomfield has also established formal joint-use agreements with the Adams Twelve School District and Boulder Valley School District to use indoor and outdoor athletic courts and playing fields.

Exhibit 2.3 shows the current distribution of Broomfield parks by type, while their locations are shown in Exhibit 2.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Existing Parks in Broomfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Under 3 acres</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>3 to 20 acres</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>21 to 80 acres</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Countywide Park</td>
<td>80+ acres</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARKS STATISTICS AT A GLANCE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACRES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>690</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OWNED PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>537</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOINT USE AGREEMENTS WITH SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACRES PER 1,000 PERSONS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OWNED PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCLUDING JOINT USE</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARISON WITH OTHER COMMUNITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONGMONT</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROOMFIELD</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORT COLLINS</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTMINSTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOULDER</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The smallest facilities are the pocket parks, which range in size from one to three acres, and which generally provide play areas serving children from the surrounding neighborhood. These facilities are also typically maintained by the neighborhood’s Homeowners’ Association (HOA). Neighborhood parks provide open turf lawns and play areas, and may also contain a playground, walking paths, picnic areas, and playing fields, depending on size. The largest facilities are community parks and city/countywide parks, which range in size from 21 to over 80 acres and provide for a variety of active and informal uses. These parks provide open turf lawns and play areas, as well as playing fields and/or hard courts, picnic areas, trails, and special event areas.

The current parks system consists of a total of 60 parks and playing fields, some of which are governed by formal joint use agreements with 14 schools. The majority of the parks are neighborhood parks that average just over 10 acres in size.

There are also 104 acres of private parkland – generally pocket parks that serve individual residential subdivisions and that are maintained exclusively by the relevant Homeowners’ Association (HOA), not by the City. These parks typically range in size from one quarter to three acres in size.

The 1995 Master Plan establishes standards for parks level of service based on the acreage provided per 1,000 residents. Under this Plan, 10.5 acres are to be provided and distributed by park type as shown in Exhibit 2.5. Exhibit 2.5 also shows actual achievements compared with established goals.

Overall, Broomfield provides approximately 16 acres of parkland for each 1,000 residents, which is above the average for adjacent municipalities, and substantially above the 10.5 acres per 1,000 persons referenced in the 1995 Master Plan.

Exhibit 2.5 also shows that Broomfield is providing more than double the neighborhood park acreage called for by the 1995 goals, but is falling short in providing community parks.
EXHIBIT 2.4: EXISTING OPEN SPACE, PARKS
AND JOINT-USE SCHOOL FACILITIES
This page intentionally blank.
In addition to quantity of park acreage, another common measure of parks level of service adopted by many communities is the service radius. These standards specify that facilities must be located within a certain distance of each resident’s home, with the distance varying by type of facility. Neighborhood parks, for example, are typically expected to be within \( \frac{1}{4} \) to \( \frac{1}{2} \) mile of residents’ homes – or within walking distance – while community parks are expected to be within one to two miles of residents’ homes.

Though the 1995 Master Plan did not establish service radius standards, the most common indicators listed above were applied to existing and proposed facilities within Broomfield to identify where current and future gaps in coverage may be evident.

This analysis indicates that there are existing shortfalls in neighborhood-scale parks in the “Original Broomfield/First Filing” area and north of 144th Avenue. Areas of Broomfield that are lacking large community parks include only two sections of the community that are, or are projected to be, predominantly devoted to commercial uses. These include the westernmost section of the community, including the Interlocken development and the area just east of Storage Tek Drive; and the extreme northeastern section of the community, which has been slated primarily for commercial development.

### Recreation Facilities

Exhibit 2.6 shows the number of playing fields and other recreation facilities that are provided within existing Broomfield parks, and at schools that are covered by a formal joint use agreement. Exhibit 2.6 also compares Broomfield’s performance to guidelines developed by the National Parks and Recreation Association (NRPA) to describe baseline service goals for each type of facility.8

---

8 Local Park and Recreation Facilities and Sites, National Parks and Recreation Association, 1999. Since the publication of this report, NRPA has ceased to provide such benchmarks, instead...
These data indicate that Broomfield exceeds these general guidelines for almost every facility type. In Chapter 7, data on community utilization of athletic facilities is used to develop service standards that are unique to Broomfield, and to estimate current and future needs for facilities. A summary of participation rates for major athletic activities, derived from the 2002 Community Needs Assessment survey described in the next chapter, is provided below:

- Swimming: 86 percent of youth participate
- Basketball: 49 percent
- Soccer: 45 percent
- Baseball: 40 percent
- Football: 31 percent
- Tennis: 31 percent
- Volleyball: 27 percent

**Athletic Teams and Leagues**

Athletic teams and leagues covering a variety of youth sports are sponsored by the City/County as well as private, third-party providers. A current roster of athletic

---

**EXHIBIT 2.6: DISTRIBUTION OF EXISTING RECREATION FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Facilities</th>
<th>NRPA Guideline (Facilities/Population)</th>
<th>Facilities Required to Serve Existing Population Based on NRPA Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1/5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football/Soccer Fields</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1/5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1/25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/20,000</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1/25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis Courts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1/2000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball Courts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1/5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>None specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1/1,500</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 Includes fields at Broomfield County Commons.
10 Includes the Paul Derda Recreation Center, which opened in November 2003.
11 Includes the Paul Derda Recreation Center, which opened in November 2003.
organizations serving youth includes the following:

- **Broomfield Baseball League:** A variety of competitive, recreational and instructional teams are offered, including the Competitive Division (JCJBL); ages 7 through 12 non-competitive-recreational level teams; and instructional tee ball (ages 5-6).

- **Broomfield Blast Soccer:** This is a competitive soccer club for players ages 11 through 19. Teams play in a competitive league and travel through the metro area and the state.

- **Broomfield Youth Soccer Club:** This is the City-sponsored recreational soccer league serving boys and girls ages 5 through 10. Approximately 45 teams compete in this recreational league.

- **Broomfield County Jr. Baseball Association:** This association sponsors instructional, recreational and competitive teams serving youth ages 4 to 16. Games are played against other members of the Front Range Amateur Baseball Association, both on home fields and in other communities.

- **Broomfield Youth Football Association:** This City-sponsored association offers flag football for children ages 6-7, as well as competitive recreational leagues for youth ages 8 - 14. The BYFA uses the fields under contract with the Boulder Valley School District.

- **Broomfield CARA Track and Field:** This association sponsors competitive summer track for youth ages 5 through 15, with competition against neighboring communities.

- **Broomfield CARA Tennis.**

---

**Paul Derda Recreation Center and Broomfield Community Center**

The Broomfield Community Center on Lamar Street offers a pool, gymnasium, weight room and aerobics rooms, locker room facilities, multipurpose facilities, and a senior center. Programs are offered in the following areas:

- Youth/Teen/Adult Swim Lessons
- Aqua Fitness
- Scuba Instruction and Certification
- Adult Volleyball
- Men’s and Youth Basketball
- Adult and Youth Inline Hockey
- Gymnastics
- Fitness Classes
- Yoga
- Therapeutic Recreation
- Teen Adventure
- Club 280 (Friday Night Teen Activities)
- Arts and Crafts Classes
- Nature Programs
The Broomfield Community Center is also the home pool for both the Broomfield High School swim team and the Barracudas Swim Club, and provides meeting facilities for a variety of community groups.

The Bay, Broomfield’s outdoor aquatics facility, is located adjacent to the Broomfield Community Center. This facility caters to the needs of families, and children 13 years and younger. This facility provides two water slides, a leisure pool with zero-depth entry, an interactive water play structure, an inner tube slide and a tot pool with slides and a waterfall.

The Broomfield Senior Center is an integral part of the recreation center. A broad range of health, transportation, meals, recreation, general interest and special tour activities are offered, including:

- Wellness and Blood Pressure Programs
- Transportation to Medical Appointments
- Senior Bowling and Volleyball
- Fitness Programs
- Arts and Crafts Classes
- Field Trips

The Paul Derda Recreation Center, an 85,000 square-foot facility, opened in November 2003. This facility includes:

- A large leisure pool with a tube slide and body slides, a zero depth beach, a family whirlpool, current channel, three lap lanes, and water features.
- An outdoor water feature.
- An indoor playground for toddlers and young children.
- Two aerobics/dance studios.
- An indoor running track.
- Several fitness areas including cardiovascular and weight lifting areas.
- 3400 square feet of climbing wall including an arch & bouldering to 12.’
- A gymnasium.
- A gymnastics center.
- One child sitting room.
- One tot activity room.
OTHER OPEN LANDS

Other open lands include properties that are not classified strictly as either park or open space. Examples of other open lands include golf courses, water detention areas, and lands conveyed by dedication but maintained by Homeowners’ Associations. There are an estimated 779 acres of other open lands in Broomfield.

EXISTING COMMUNITY TRAILS

Broomfield’s community trails system includes many popular off-street pathways such as the Lac Amora Trail, as well as designated on-street bicycle lanes.

There are approximately 94 miles of trail in the existing Broomfield system, encompassing a wide variety of facilities ranging from hard- or soft-surface multi-use pathways, to detached sidewalk connections. There are also numerous social or volunteer trails within neighborhoods that provide a useful indication of where formal connections need to be made. Exhibit 2.7 describes the typical characteristics of each facility, while Exhibit 2.8 shows the locations of existing trails by facility type.

As shown in Exhibit 2.8, hard-surface multi-use separated pathway facilities desirable for recreation have generally been developed within individual subdivisions, though do not yet link together to provide a community-wide trails system. The Broomfield Trail, proposed as a major community greenway spine in the 1995 Master Plan, is visible in selected segments of soft surface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIL STATISTICS AT A GLANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MILES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-USE CONCRETE PATHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT-SURFACE TRAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-FOOT DETACHED SIDEWALKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON-STREET BICYCLE LANES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pathway and detached sidewalk, but has yet to display the strong identity envisioned when the 1995 plan was developed.

Detached sidewalks connect the community fairly well from west to east, allowing users to travel from Josh’s Pond to Westlake, but multiple arterial streets must be crossed in the process, posing safety considerations. Detached sidewalks provide more limited connectivity from south to north. Moreover, detached sidewalks do not always safely and simultaneously accommodate different types and speeds of user, such as hikers, dog-walkers, and recreational cyclists.

Many Broomfield residents have expressed a need for more connections to larger regional trails systems, such as Big Dry Creek, the Carolyn Holmberg Preserve at Rock Creek Farm trail system, and the Great Western Trail that will eventually connect to Rocky Flats.

In addition, many residents feel that existing on-street bike lanes do not yet comprise an efficient and functional network that encourages bicycle commuting. Designated bike lanes are available along sections of Main Street and Midway Boulevard, and north of 136th Avenue between Zuni and Sheridan in the Broadlands subdivision, but they do not connect to major employment or civic destinations.
## EXHIBIT 2.7: CHARACTERISTICS OF EXISTING TRAIL FACILITY TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY TYPE</th>
<th>TYPICAL WIDTH</th>
<th>TYPICAL SURFACE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Detached Sidewalks     | 3’-8’         | Concrete or Asphalt  | - Separated by buffer from curb  
- Follows arterial and collector streets with moderate to high volumes of traffic  
- Frequent vehicular conflicts  
- Designed for low speed users (pedestrians) |
| Attached Sidewalks     | 3’-8’         | Concrete             | - Connected to curb  
- Follows local streets with low volumes of traffic  
- Frequent vehicular conflicts  
- Designed for low speed users (pedestrians) |
| Multi-Use Paths        | 6’-12’        | Concrete or Asphalt  | - Typically separated from the adjoining roadway and curb  
- Continuous routes with limited vehicular conflicts and frequent directional signage  
- Designed for higher speed users (runners, bicyclists, in-line skaters, etc.) |
| Soft-Surface Trails    | 4’-8’         | Crusher fines or compacted organic material | - Separated from roadways and land uses  
- Continuous routes with limited vehicular conflicts and frequent directional signage  
- Designed for a variety of users (bicyclists, equestrians, hikers, etc.) |
| Social Trails          | 1’-2’         | Compacted organic material | - Informal trails created by hikers, mountain bikers and other users to connect existing trails and destinations |
| On-Street Bicycle Lanes| 3’-6’         | Concrete or Asphalt  | - Located in the right-of-way between the gutter and travel lane or the parking lane and travel lane  
- Continuous routes with on-street pavement markings to minimize vehicular conflicts  
- Designed for high speed users (bicyclists) |
CONCLUSION

This chapter has described the character of the Broomfield community, and the range of open space, parks, recreation facilities and programs, and trails that are available to its citizens. This background provides a useful context for interpreting community values and needs, and for understanding where augmentation of the existing system may be needed.
EXHIBIT 2.8: EXISTING AND PLANNED TRAILS
Chapter 3
COMMUNITY VALUES AND PRIORITIES

OVERVIEW

The OSPRT Master Plan has been very strongly guided by the values that Broomfield residents hold for their community and its open lands. A “values-driven” planning process helps to ensure that recommendations reflect perceived needs and priorities, and that community support sustains the plan through implementation.

To understand community values and priorities, “visioning” workshops and a community needs assessment survey were conducted early in the planning process. The visioning workshops provided important qualitative information on City Council’s, OSTAC/PRAC members’ and residents’ perceptions and priorities for Broomfield’s open lands system. The open-ended nature of these sessions allowed the planning team to engage in detailed discussions with participants and explore issues in depth. The community needs assessment survey, a statistically representative survey of Broomfield residents, was developed based on the workshop and allowed planners to gauge support for these priorities and perceptions in the wider community.

Highlights of the visioning workshops and needs assessment survey are presented below, with implications for the OSPRT Master Plan summarized in a concluding section.

PRELIMINARY VISIONING WORKSHOPS: THE IMPORTANCE OF OPEN LANDS TO RESIDENTS’ QUALITY OF LIFE

Initial “visioning” workshops were conducted with Broomfield staff, with OSTAC and PRAC members, and with members of the general public. These open-ended workshops were intended to get at the heart of what participants valued most about their community, and about the existing open lands system. They also sought to identify what participants most wanted to change about the existing system, and about precedents or models that they had seen in other communities that might serve as guides for Broomfield. Dominant themes and responses are summarized below.

Community Image and Identity

Individuals were asked what qualities they viewed as special or unique about Broomfield - so special, in fact, that they would want to preserve them for their children. Responses uniformly focused on the following features, suggesting that both open space and developed parkland are very important aspects of Broomfield’s community identity and quality of life:

- Views and access to open space.
- The ability to see wildlife out in the open, and close to residential areas.
Playgrounds and parks in close proximity to home – particularly valued in keeping children safe and occupied.

A connected community – where young children (approximately age 7 and above) can walk or bike safely between home, school, and recreation.

Individuals were also asked to name the single most important thing that they would change about the existing system. Responses included:

- Improved and enhanced connectivity, particularly for the trails system, but also for open space. Many mentioned Boulder’s trails system as a model for what Broomfield could become, and many mentioned the need for connections to regional systems.

- Others mentioned the need for more connected and contiguous open space, improving its functionality for wildlife and enhancing its value as a buffer or “green edge” between Broomfield and adjacent communities.

- Still others mentioned the need for more opportunities for public use of open space, and for open space and recreation to complement and balance each other.

Open Space

- The top two priorities for future open space preservation or acquisition included important wildlife habitat and properties that could accommodate both passive recreation and habitat without conflicts. These responses appear to reflect complementary values about the function of open space, as providing for resource protection, while allowing for low-impact public use.
Most felt that additional guidelines were needed to define appropriate and acceptable levels of public use of open space properties. Many also felt that improved communication of these guidelines was needed. Most also supported closing certain sensitive areas to the public, such as those supporting wetlands or threatened/endangered species.

Participants suggested acquiring very large open space parcels where feasible, and where they would provide connectivity with existing properties or develop a buffer between Broomfield and adjacent communities.

Buffering between Broomfield and Westminster was viewed as desirable, but “probably too late.” More fruitful opportunities, given the pace of development, seem to be present along the north, northeast, and west borders of Broomfield, especially between Broomfield and Boulder County (Lafayette, Erie, Superior).

Connections within neighborhoods (among home/school/park locations) and connections between neighborhoods, were both viewed as very high priorities.

A hierarchical system of routes, providing short and long recreational walking or cycling opportunities, was desirable. Trail alignment, width and surfaces should be designed to reduce conflicts between different types of users.

Boulder and Westminster were mentioned as models for development of Broomfield’s trails system, because of their extensive nature and connectivity.

Trails

**KEY VALUES**

**NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIONS**

**COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS**

**SHORT AND LONG LOOPS SERVING DIFFERENT USER TYPES**
Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programs

KEY VALUES

- Walkable access to neighborhood parks
- Games at larger parks
- Bathrooms and shelters
- Full-service recreation centers

- Reinforcing values described above, walkable access to neighborhood parks was viewed as a major priority, with walkability defined as 10 to 15 minutes from home.

- Relocating baseball, soccer and football games that draw larger crowds to larger community parks and away from smaller neighborhood facilities, was viewed as a medium or high priority. A concurrent emphasis was the need for larger parks that could support these activities.

- Restrooms, picnic areas and playgrounds were the most desired amenities in both neighborhood and community parks.

- “Full service” recreation centers, supporting aquatics, cardio/fitness, gymnasiums, and childcare, were preferred over specialized facilities (e.g. a center focused solely on aquatics).

VALIDATING PERCEPTIONS AND ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES: THE OSPRT NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

To assess broader community support for the values and perceptions identified through the visioning workshops, a statistically representative needs assessment survey was conducted in July and August 2002. Questionnaires were first mailed to a random sample of approximately 5,000 Broomfield households and 1,120 completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 22 percent — very high for a mail survey.

As a spot check against mailback responses to insure that “non-response bias” did not exist and to further increase the accuracy of the results, an additional 100 surveys were completed by telephone with a sample of

the non-respondents to the mail survey. Results have a margin of error of approximately +/- 2.9 percentage points calculated for questions at 50 percent response. Survey findings are summarized below, with supporting graphs provided in Appendix C.

It should be noted that many of the findings from the 2002 Needs Assessment Survey have been corroborated by the 2004 Broomfield Citizen Survey, and these areas have been indicated below where appropriate.

Utilization and Leisure Trends

- A very high proportion of Broomfield residents take advantage of the community’s open lands. Ninety-five percent visited a park at least once in the past year, and close to 80 percent have used open space and trails. Seventy percent have visited the recreation center. These findings are reinforced by the 2004 Citizen Survey, where 89 percent reported visiting a park at least once in the previous year, and 83 percent reported using a trail.

- A very high proportion of residents are “heavy users” of the system: 50 percent report visiting a park, trail, open space or the recreation center 10 or more times in the past year.

- Seventy percent of adults and 80 percent of youth report that they regularly hike or bike – reflecting nationwide trends in support of these “lower-impact” activities.

- Fifty-seven percent of youth and 31 percent of adults report belonging to a league or organized sports team.

- Basketball is the most popular sport among youth, with 49 percent participating. Forty-five percent play soccer, 40 percent play baseball, and 31 percent play football.

---

13 For the total sample size of 1,120, margin of error is +/- 2.93 percent calculated for questions at 50% response. This means that if the response for a particular question is “50%,” the real population response could range from 47% to 53%. The margin of error is different for every single question response on the survey depending on the resultant sample sizes, proportion of responses, and number of answer categories for each question. Comparison of differences in the data between various segments, therefore, should take into consideration these factors (as a general comment, it is sometimes more appropriate to focus attention on the general trends and patterns in the data rather than on the individual percentages).

14 This was the second Citizen Survey for the City and County of Broomfield, with the baseline survey conducted in 2002. Surveys were mailed to 2,890 households in March and April of 2004. Twelve hundred and seventy-eight completed surveys were returned for a response rate of 44%. See NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., June 2004.
Open Space Values and Priorities

Acquiring additional open space emerged as the community’s most salient value and priority:

- Sixty percent of residents feel that Broomfield needs more open space, and 80 percent rated acquisition of additional open space properties as the community’s top priority.

- As reported in the 2004 Citizen Survey, support is strong for an open lands goal of at least 40 percent of Broomfield’s planning area. Sixty-two percent of respondents support a goal of 40 percent, and an additional 20 percent of respondents felt that the goal should be higher.

- The most important priorities for acquisition and preservation included lands with scenic quality, trail corridors, lands that support both passive recreation opportunities (e.g. wildlife watching, hiking) and wildlife habitat, wildlife corridors, and wetlands.

- Sixty-two percent of residents support restricting public use and access to open space areas that serve as critical wildlife habitat.

- While the majority of residents are satisfied with open space maintenance, 65 percent would like to improve weed management in open space areas.

- Sixty percent of residents support relocating prairie dogs to suitable open space using volunteers to perform the work, but only 29 percent support relocation if Broomfield privately contracts for the work.

Trails Values and Priorities

Connecting and enhancing Broomfield’s trails system also emerged as an important priority:

- Seventy-nine percent of residents feel that providing more off-street trails in Broomfield is a major community priority. This figure reflects the popularity of these activities among Broomfield residents.

- Trail amenities are almost equally important. Seventy percent of residents would like to see more trailheads with parking, and over 60 percent feel that improved signage and trail maps are needed.

- Three quarters of residents feel that additional designated on-street bike lanes are needed.

Parks and Recreation Facility Values and Priorities

- While 70 percent of residents feel that the existing parks system is meeting the needs of the community, some suggestions were offered for enhancements.

- While 60 percent of residents are satisfied with the availability of
neighborhood parks and playgrounds, 50 percent of residents are satisfied with the number of larger community parks. However, 73 percent of residents feel that acquiring land for new community-scale parks is a major community priority.

- Residents are generally satisfied with the availability of athletic fields. About 45 percent of residents feel more soccer/football fields are needed, while only 35 percent feel that more baseball/softball fields are needed. These figures reflect the relative popularity of these activities among Broomfield youth.

- Residents who feel that additional playing fields of any type are needed are more likely to participate in organized athletic leagues. For these individuals, the top priorities include acquiring lands for additional athletic facilities and acquiring lands for new large parks that are a minimum of 20 acres in size.

- Limited support was offered for developing new specialized facilities (new skate park, disc golf facility, BMX track, indoor soccer facility). Less than one percent of respondents felt that any of these facilities should be a community priority.

- Sixty-three percent of residents supported the creation of off-leash areas for dogs, but an equivalent percentage felt that leash laws should be strictly enforced in areas not so designated.

- Between 70 and 80 percent of residents are satisfied with the maintenance of existing parks facilities.

- Some 70 percent of residents feel a new recreation center is needed - but it should be noted that the survey was conducted before construction of the new Paul Derda Center began.
Level of Importance for Allocation of Financial Resources for Future Amenity Upgrades and Improvements to Open Space, Parks, Recreation and Trails

- Acquisition of open space lands: 80%
- Off-street multi-use recreational parks: 79%
- Acquire and build small neighborhood parks for general use: 79%
- Acquire and build large parks for general purpose: 75%
- Improve the quality of existing recreation programming and activities: 10%
- Enhancement of trails to critical wildlife areas: 11%
- Additional outdoor swimming pool: 16%
- On-street bike lanes: 16%
- Additional paved recreational trails: 16%
- Additional paved recreational trails: 61%
- Add a third larger regional recreation center: 61%
- Expand recreational programming and activities: 58%
- Improved maintenance management of open space lands: 66%
- New neighborhood recreation centers: 66%
- Acquire and build large parks dedicated to organized field sports: 49%
- Increase/improve level of daily maintenance of existing facilities: 40%
- Not Needed (1,2)

Average Rating

- Important (4,5)
- Not Needed (1,2)

Percent Responding

- 100%
Recreation Programming

- Just under 60 percent of residents feel that expansion of existing recreation programming is an important community priority.

- The most popular activities, measured by community participation, include special events (51 percent participating), cultural arts (44 percent), aquatics (43 percent) and athletic leagues (40 percent).

- Top priorities for expansion or improvement include aquatics programs (40 percent) and cultural arts programs (38 percent).

SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PLAN

These data gathering methods together underscore a consistent image of the values and priorities of Broomfield residents:

- Preservation of views and wildlife habitat are important priorities.
- A connected open lands system, with parks and open lands linked by contiguous properties and by trails, is very desirable.
- Safe and walkable access between home, school, and park – especially for children – is also very important.
- Open space and parks should complement each other, and public access to open space should be provided where feasible and where negative impacts to resources will not result.

In the next chapter, these core community values are translated into plan goals, performance measures, and principles to guide plan achievement.
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Chapter 4
PLAN GOALS, PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND PRINCIPLES

PLAN VISION

The previous chapter has described the attributes that residents value about Broomfield and the qualities that make it a special community. It is fair to say that these values define the community’s heart and soul:

- ...the heart represented by parks and other civic spaces that bring Broomfield together as a community, and

- ...the soul represented by those open spaces that provide for contemplation and appreciation, whether viewed from afar, experienced close at hand, or near to home.

This OSPRT Master Plan is a plan to preserve and enhance those special spaces that are the heart and soul of this community.

GOALS, PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND PRINCIPLES

Five core goals, and associated performance measures and principles have been developed to anchor the plan. While goals and principles are typical components of any planning effort, performance measures have also been added as a way to gauge progress from year to year and communicate that progress to the community. Performance measures may be quantitative or qualitative, and in many cases have been framed to allow staff charged with implementation the flexibility to add further definition to the measures and establish a phasing plan for implementation.

Goal 1: Create Connected Public Spaces

An interconnected open lands system – parks and open space linked by contiguous parcels and trails, and allowing children to walk or bike from home to school to play –
has emerged as a recurring theme for Broomfield residents.

### GOAL 1 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- **NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS PROVIDED WITHIN SIX BLOCKS OF HOME**
- **PUBLIC ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE IS COMPATIBLE WITH UNDERLYING RESOURCES**
- **TRAIL SEGMENTS FUNDED BASED ON COMPLETION OF PRIORITY MISSING LINKS AND IMPROVED CONNECTIVITY**
- **SAFE TRAIL ACCESS PROVIDED WITHIN SIX BLOCKS OF HOME**
- **CONTIGUOUS PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ACQUIRED**

### Principles:

1.1 Design trail connections to link open space, parks, recreation facilities and other public places (schools, libraries) into an integrated system.

1.2 Utilize existing natural or man-made corridors (drainageways, utility corridors) to support connections where feasible.

1.3 Where off-street trail connections are infeasible, ensure that safe and user-friendly on-street connections are provided that maximize separation between pedestrians/cyclists and vehicles that make arterial street crossings safe and that provide a pleasant experience.

1.4 Identify parks and open space acquisitions that provide physical connections to adjacent open lands and fill in “gaps” in the system. A physically connected “green space” system can strengthen community identity and buffer Broomfield from adjacent communities.

1.5 Working in concert with broader land use objectives, identify infill sites that can support parks that fill gaps in the system and meet walkable access goals.

1.6 Partner and coordinate with municipal, county, state and local neighbors to complete inter-community and regional connections.

### Goal 2: Establish a Strong Community Image and Identity

This goal speaks directly to the qualities of the places that are the “heart and soul” of Broomfield. The qualities that residents value provide direction regarding the types of properties that should be acquired in the future, and the care with which they should be developed.

The following concepts represent just some of the ways open lands can shape community image, form, and identity:

- creating park sites for the celebration of community events such as Midway Park for Broomfield Days;
- preserving farmland that reminds the community of Broomfield’s agricultural history;
protecting natural features that are landmarks for the community such as large cottonwood trees along Community Ditch or the view to Long’s Peak from Kohl Street by Water Tank Park;

incorporating public art into parks, open space and trail locations to represent Broomfield’s appreciation of artistic expression. Suitable locations for public art must enhance the open space, park, or trail site and also not impact wildlife, critical habitat areas, or recreational activities in a negative manner;

distinguishing Broomfield’s boundaries and entries with open lands to allow for a visual break in development; and

creating an interconnected system of parks, open space, and trails within easy walking distance of residential neighborhoods to underscore the value placed on community health by offering residents the chance to:

- enjoy the beauty of open lands,
- cross paths with other residents,
- have space for reflection, and
- participate in passive or active recreation.

GOAL 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- ACQUIRE OR PROTECT THE HIGHEST-VALUE LANDS TO REACH A MINIMUM STANDARD OF 40 PERCENT OF THE COMMUNITY AS OPEN LANDS (ESTIMATED 9,567 ACRES TOTAL) BY BUILDOUT

- ALL ACQUISITIONS TARGETED BASED ON EVALUATION CRITERIA THAT REFLECT RESIDENTS’ VALUES

- FACILITIES DEVELOPED OR RENOVATED ACCORDING TO EXPLICIT DESIGN STANDARDS

Principles:

2.1 Develop and implement evaluation criteria for assessing potential acquisitions that capture important community values: views, ability to experience natural areas and wildlife “close to home.”

2.2 Acquire and/or develop “signature” facilities or properties that become important landmarks for the community. These may include premium open space properties, developed parkland, and a well connected trails system.

2.3 Acquire and/or develop properties that are physically contiguous and form a connected system. A well-connected “green space” system will help to establish a strong community identity as well as to create a “green edge” between Broomfield and adjacent communities.
2.4 Establish design standards for parks, trails and facilities that encourage durability and response to unique site conditions.

2.5 Establish a consistent identity and signage program that allows residents and visitors to easily recognize Broomfield properties and facilities.

2.6 Incorporate distinctive public art into open space and parks where feasible and appropriate.

**Goal 3: Maintain Sound Stewardship of Open Lands**

This goal addresses several values that residents hold dear: preservation of significant natural resources, accommodating human use in a manner that preserves the underlying resource, and using materials and technologies that are environmentally responsible and sustainable.

### GOAL 3 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- **ACQUISITIONS TARGETED BASED ON CRITERIA THAT REFLECT RESIDENTS’ VALUES**
- **BASELINE MANAGEMENT PLANS DEVELOPED AND GUIDELINES IMPLEMENTED FOR PUBLIC USE ON ALL SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE PROPERTIES**
- **WILDLIFE HABITAT PROTECTED**
- **CLEARER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS AND OUTCOMES (NATURAL FEATURES PRESERVED, HIGH QUALITY PARKS OBTAINED)**
- **FACILITIES DEVELOPED OR RENOVATED ACCORDING TO GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL GUIDELINES WHERE FEASIBLE**

**Principles:**

3.1 Develop and implement a varied menu of tools and strategies to creatively protect and preserve significant lands and wildlife.

3.2 Establish clear guidelines for public use of open space areas that are grounded in their inherent natural resource values, and that provide for public enjoyment that does not compromise these inherent qualities.
3.3 Develop area management plans for open space areas of a significant size that define appropriate and allowable uses, management strategies, and restoration or remediation activities needed to enhance the health and functioning of the resource.

3.4 Apply practices for site and building design that are environmentally sustainable and implementable where feasible.

3.5 Develop environmental quality protection standards that can be implemented in conjunction with Broomfield’s development review process to provide additional protections for valued resources.

3.6 Develop management and maintenance guidelines to ensure stewardship of community open lands.

3.7 Establish policies for change of use that are applicable to open lands.

**Goal 4: Develop a Proactive Approach to Meeting Future Needs**

This goal is designed to ensure that facilities and programs are developed proactively, in advance of population growth, rather than simply reacting. It also addresses the need to accommodate yet-unknown future recreational desires and preferences within the community.

**Principles:**

4.1 Regularly analyze performance against established measures for access and acreage to identify areas for improvement. Regularly update buildout projections and locations for residential growth to update projected needs for facilities.

4.2 Ensure that growth “pays its own way” by incorporating established service standards for parks and open space as public land dedication requirements that are part of the municipal code.

**GOAL 4 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

- **NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS DEVELOPED WITHIN SIX BLOCKS OF HOME**
- **COMMUNITY PARKS DEVELOPED WITHIN A TWO MILE RADIUS OF HOME**
- **16 ACRES OF PARKLAND PROVIDED THROUGH PUBLIC LAND DEDICATION FOR EVERY 1,000 RESIDENTS**
- **A MINIMUM OF EIGHT ACRES OF OPEN SPACE PROVIDED THROUGH PUBLIC LAND DEDICATION FOR EVERY 1,000 RESIDENTS**
- **FUTURE NEEDS FOR ATHLETIC FACILITIES BASED ON CURRENT LEVEL OF SERVICE ADJUSTED FOR CHANGES IN UTILIZATION PATTERNS**
- **GUIDELINES DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED TO GOVERN ADOPTION OF NEW RECREATIONAL USES ON EXISTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES**
4.3 Regularly analyze resident participation in organized athletic leagues, and league utilization of Broomfield facilities, to ensure that an appropriate level of facilities is provided. Analyze other communities’ participation in Broomfield-sponsored leagues, and out-of-community utilization of Broomfield facilities, to develop reimbursement policies that ensure that their utilization of Broomfield facilities is accompanied by appropriate compensation.

4.4 Establish clear guidelines for accommodating emerging recreational needs and preferences into existing community lands, and on lands that may be provided by private partners.

4.5 Establish strategic partnerships with surrounding communities to provide for shared facilities and “specialized use” facilities that may serve the entire region.

**Goal 5: Ensure Equitable Distribution of Facilities**

This goal is intended to ensure that all areas of the city and county have comparable access to open lands, parks and recreation facilities and programs, and trails.

**GOAL 5 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

- **Neighborhood Parks Developed Within Six Blocks of Home**
- **Community Parks Developed Within a Two-Mile Radius of Home**
- **16 Acres of Parkland Provided Through Public Land Dedication for Every 1,000 Residents**
- **A Minimum of Eight Acres of Open Space Provided Through Public Land Dedication for Every 1,000 Residents**
- **Areas Falling More Than 50 Percent Short of These Standards Shall Receive Priority for Future Improvements**
Principles:

5.1 Regularly analyze performance against established measures for access and acreage for major geographic areas of the city. Identify areas falling below 50 percent of the established service standard and target these areas for improvements.

5.2 Ensure that all facilities are physically accessible to populations with disabilities.

5.3 Ensure that facilities and programs are available to all residents regardless of income.
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Chapter 5
OPEN LANDS GOALS AND CRITERIA TO GUIDE LAND ACQUISITION

BROOMFIELD’S OPEN LANDS GOALS

Open Lands to Comprise a Minimum of 40 Percent of Land Area

To respond to community values and priorities, the OSPRT Plan has established a minimum open lands goal of 40 percent of the community’s planning area, representing approximately 9,567 acres. As described in Chapter 2, Broomfield’s current open lands comprise 6,285 acres. Open lands designated in the approved Preble Creek PUD dated January 28, 2003, will add approximately 865 acres, and a proposed reservoir/open lands site west of Lowell Boulevard.

15 Open lands have been defined in Chapter 1. This “umbrella” term encompasses parks, open space, and other “green spaces” such as golf courses and water detention areas.

16 The planning area includes all of Broomfield County and lands covered by the Broomfield/Boulder County IGA, and encompasses 23,917 acres.
These additions will bring Broomfield’s total open lands to 7,480 acres, meaning that an additional 2,087 acres will need to be acquired through a variety of funding strategies, including the open space and parks sales tax, the community’s General Fund, public land dedication requirements, bond issues, partnerships, and other mechanisms, to meet the overall goal.

The 1995 Master Plan established an original goal of preserving 44 percent of the community planning area as open lands. The OSPRT Plan has validated a goal of this magnitude, but has applied some conceptual refinements regarding what is counted in the definition of open lands.

In the 1995 Master Plan, any areas within the planning boundary that were not shown as commercial, residential, or civic uses were counted as open lands contributing to the 44 percent goal. Major roadways, including US 36 and the Northwest Parkway, were counted as open lands. Broomfield staff, OSTAC and PRAC have concurred that roadways should not be included in the open lands definition, and when their land area is excluded, the remaining open lands shown in the 1995 Master Plan represent 40 percent of the planning area. This goal has been reaffirmed through the OSPRT planning process, and is shown as a minimum that may be exceeded, if feasible.

**Specific Service Standards for Parks and Open Space**

In addition to the 40 percent open lands goal, specific service standards have also been established for parks and open space, as distinct from other open lands such as golf courses.

For parks, a service standard of 16 acres of improved parkland per 1,000 residents has been established. Members of PRAC and the public felt strongly that current achievements should set the future standard for parkland, even though the 1995 Master Plan had established a lower standard of 10.5 acres per 1,000 people. They also recommended that the existing level of service should be maintained for neighborhood-scale parks, but increased for community-scale facilities.

For open space, a minimum open space public land dedication requirement of eight acres of improved open space per 1,000 persons has been established. Improved or enhanced open space refers to dedicated undeveloped land with weed management, trails, benches, fencing, picnic shelters, overlooks, interpretive areas and other passive recreation and wildlife protection improvements, as appropriate to each individual site. This requirement is based on the significance that residents place on open space, as demonstrated through the needs assessment survey and community open houses, as well as their demand for compatible passive recreation uses such as hiking, birdwatching, and similar activities. The dedication requirement will be supplemented with acquisitions and with conservation easements and other forms of property protection, so that the actual open space acres per 1,000 residents will be substantially higher.

Under extraordinary circumstances, parks and open space standards may be adjusted
for individual developments, subject to Council approval. Examples may include relaxing the parks dedication requirement so that more of an area rich in natural resources could be dedicated as open space. Conversely, the parks dedication may be increased and the open space dedication reduced, for an area seriously lacking in playing fields and whose natural resource value is minimal. Such deviations from established standards are to be allowed only under exceptional circumstances, as inconsistent application of service standards could quickly result in minimum levels of service not being met.

No specific goals have been established for other open lands, such as golf courses and detention areas. While other open lands do contribute to achievement of the overall goal, the very nature of these properties makes it infeasible and unrealistic to establish numerical goals. Where golf courses and/or detention areas are proposed, however, they may be credited toward a portion of the required parks and open space acreage as provided for in Chapter 11.

EVALUATING AND PRIORITIZING POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE AND PARKLAND

The OSPRT Master Plan Criteria as the Framework to Prioritize Potential Open Lands

To guide the achievement of parks and open space goals, the OSPRT Master Plan provides a framework and criteria for evaluating the suitability of candidate parcels for acquisition or preservation, and for establishing priorities. Separate evaluation criteria have been developed for open space and parks, that reflect community values and plan goals as described in the previous two chapters. Characteristics that the community values most, as identified earlier in this document, were assigned a weighting factor of two, reflecting their significance. Finally, for each criterion, High, Medium and Low rankings were defined. Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3 outline the criteria, rating system, and weights applied. Below we describe these criteria and their intended application in more detail.

**Open Space Suitability Criteria**

Exhibit 5.1 defines the open space suitability criteria used to evaluate candidates for acquisition. An area should possess most of the following physical characteristics to be considered further, except in certain instances where one unique characteristic outweighs other factors.
### EXHIBIT 5.1: OPEN SPACE SUITABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Land Quality</strong></td>
<td>Protect scenic quality and community identity</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Land is scenic, covers a ridgeline, provides a backdrop to a prominent landscape such as Rocky Mountains or foothills, or is in the viewshed of an important entryway into or corridor through Broomfield.</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Medium (2)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: visual quality assessment from</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong>—Land provides scenic quality or enhances the image of Broomfield, but is not a major entryway or viewshed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field review)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>—Land does not contribute to scenic quality of Broomfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>Create a system of connected open spaces, parks, trails, and community</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Land is adjacent to large protected or planned open space area or “Broomfield Trail” corridor.</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Medium (2)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: proximity to existing open</td>
<td>facilities throughout Broomfield</td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong>—Land is adjacent to planned open space, trails, or parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space or trails as identified through</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>—Land is not adjacent to existing or planned open space, parks, trails, or other protected land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing mapping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Environmental Quality and Wildlife</td>
<td>Protect environmental quality, including critical wildlife habitat and</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Land provides habitat for wildlife (e.g., may include rare, threatened, endangered species, or habitats or plant communities, or may serve as a wildlife movement corridor).</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Medium (2)</td>
<td>Low (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Value**</td>
<td>natural features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: ecological assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</td>
<td>Weight Factor</td>
<td>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Recreation and/or Education Value (data: staff site assessment)</td>
<td>Provide passive recreation and educational opportunities</td>
<td>High—Land would offer unique passive recreation and/or educational opportunities. Medium—Land may offer some passive recreation or educational opportunities. Low—Land is not likely to be of value for passive recreation or education.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizeable (data: acreage mapped through GIS)</td>
<td>Provide a visual green buffer, wildlife connectivity and a mix of opportunities for conservation and passive recreation with larger parcels</td>
<td>High—Land area is larger than 100 acres, or is physically connected to other open space or parkland, making it functionally larger. Medium—Land area is between 50 and 100 acres, or is physically connected to other open space or parkland</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5.1: OPEN SPACE SUITABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>—Land area is less than 50 acres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic or Archaeological Value</td>
<td>Preserve historic or archaeological resources</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Land contains historic resources or known archaeological resources. <strong>Medium</strong>—Land potentially contains archaeological resources. <strong>Low</strong>—Parcel does not contain historic or archaeological resources.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: staff reports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Edge</td>
<td>Create a buffer between Broomfield and other communities</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Location of land contributes to the creation of a green edge around Broomfield. <strong>Low</strong>—Location of land does not contribute to a community buffer.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: location mapped through GIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land</td>
<td>Conserve agricultural lands and foster an awareness of Broomfield's history as a farming community</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Land is currently in agricultural or ranch use, contains high quality soils (based on SCS system), and/or is irrigated land. <strong>Medium</strong>—Land is currently or has been in agricultural or ranch use and/or contains medium quality soils. <strong>Low</strong>—Land is not currently in agricultural or ranch use, contains low quality soils, and/or is not irrigated.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: existing use, mapped through GIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Acquire open space and trails facilities</td>
<td><strong>High</strong>—Parcel or area is within a 15-minute walk</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data: location)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5.1: OPEN SPACE SUITABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| mapped through GIS) | that are accessible to the community via designated trails and bikeways, transit, and auto | from neighboring areas.  
Medium - Parcel is more than a 15 minute walk but otherwise accessible by multiple travel modes.  
Low - Parcel is accessible only via one travel mode (auto). | Low (1) | | |
| Located on OSPRT Master Plan Map | Acquire properties that are located on the OSPRT Master Plan Map | | Yes (2) No (1) | 1 |

**TOTAL POINTS**

---

**Parks Suitability Criteria**

Exhibit 5.2 defines the parks suitability criteria used to evaluate candidates for acquisition. An area should possess most of the following physical characteristics to be considered further, except in certain instances where one unique characteristic outweighs other factors.

The first and most important set of criteria evaluate whether the candidate parcel or area can accommodate the type of park space and associated programming that Broomfield has determined to be necessary to accommodate level of service standards, current population, or future population needs. As each site will obviously not accommodate all park types and programming intensities, some of the criteria in this section will not be applicable to each and every area given the size of the parcel.

Once an area is rated according to its ability to meet established acreage and programming needs, additional environmental criteria are then applied. An area should possess most of the following physical characteristics to be considered further, except in certain instances where one unique characteristic outweighs other factors.
### EXHIBIT 5.2: PARKS SUITABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates Specific Park Type and Program as Identified in OSPRT Master Plan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates city/countywide park program and facilities 81 - 150 AC) (data: acreage and site configuration from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>Address needs for large, multipurpose facilities with significant civic character, as identified in the OSPRT Master Plan</td>
<td>High – Area meets/exceeds size criteria and could accommodate both required and optional program elements as described in Park Design Standards. Medium – Area meets size criteria and could accommodate required program elements. Low – Area does not meet size standards, or could not accommodate required program elements.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1) (Note: Only applicable where citywide park facility is needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates community park program and facilities (21 - 80 AC) (data: acreage and site configuration from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>Address needs for community parks as identified in the OSPRT Master Plan</td>
<td>High – Area meets/exceeds size criteria and could accommodate both required and optional program elements as described in Park Design Standards. Medium – Area meets size criteria and could accommodate required program elements. Low - Area does not meet size standards, or could not accommodate required program elements. Recreation Facility - - varies</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1) (Note: Only applicable where community park facility is needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates neighborhood park program and facilities</td>
<td>Address needs for neighborhood parks as identified in the OSPRT Master Plan</td>
<td>High – Area is 12 acres or larger and could accommodate both required and optional program elements as described in Park Design Standards.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1) (Note: Only applicable where</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 5.2: Parks Suitability Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 - 20 AC) (data: acreage and site configuration from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>identified in the OSPRT Master Plan</td>
<td>in Park Design Standards. <strong>Medium</strong> – Area is between 3 – 12 acres and could accommodate required program elements. <strong>Low</strong> – Area does not meet size standards, or could not accommodate required program elements.</td>
<td>applicable where neighborhood park facility is needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates joint school-park program and facilities (8 - 15 AC approximately; ability to meet program is paramount) (data: acreage and site configuration from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>Provide for joint school-park facilities that accommodate active recreation needs of associated neighborhoods</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> – Area could accommodate both required and optional program elements as described in OSPRT Park Design Standards. <strong>Medium</strong> – Area could accommodate required program elements. <strong>Low</strong> – Area could not accommodate required program elements.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1) (Note: Only applicable where joint school-park facility is needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates specialized active recreation facility (data: acreage and site configuration from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>Address needs for specialized recreation facilities as identified in the OSPRT Master Plan</td>
<td><strong>High</strong> – Area is appropriately sized to accommodate desired number of playing areas and program elements as described in Park Design Standards. <strong>Medium</strong> – Area is appropriately sized and could accommodate required program elements. <strong>Low</strong> – Area does not meet size standards, or could not accommodate required program elements.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1) (Note: Only applicable for specialized recreation facility)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 5.2: Parks Suitability Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional environmental criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offers suitable terrain</strong> (data: topography as mapped through GIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High – Area is highly suitable for intended uses, with minimal earthwork required. <strong>Medium</strong> – Area can accommodate intended uses with minimal to modest earthwork. <strong>Low</strong> – Area could not accommodate intended uses without extensive earthwork.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offers significant natural features or views</strong> (data: topography as mapped through GIS; field review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High – Area possesses significant unique natural features such as mature trees or stands of trees; wetlands; drainageways or other water features; geologic formations such as rock outcrops; native/indigenous vegetation; or views. These facilities would not be compromised by intended park use. <strong>Medium</strong> – Area possesses at least one unique feature as described above; would not be compromised by intended park use. <strong>Low</strong> – Area has no apparent natural features or significant views.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimizes parking and circulation impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High – Area can accommodate intended park use without significant traffic and parking impacts.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5.2: PARKS SUITABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating and Points Assigned (H/ M/ L)</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Total Points (Points x Weight factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(data: land use and transportation mapping through GIS)</strong></td>
<td>neighborhoods from intended park use</td>
<td>Medium – Area can accommodate intended park use with some traffic and parking impacts that could be mitigated Low – Area could not accommodate intended park use without creating significant parking or traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximizes Accessibility</strong> (data: transportation mapping through GIS)</td>
<td>Acquire park sites that are accessible via car, transit, designated bikeway and trails</td>
<td>High – Area is accessible by multiple modes and will accommodate intended use. Medium – Area is accessible by some but not all modes. Low – Area is accessible only by one mode.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates connectivity</strong> (data: location and proximity to existing amenities, from GIS mapping)</td>
<td>Create a system of connected open space, parks, and trails throughout Broomfield</td>
<td>High - - Area would help to create significant connections between existing and/or planned open space, parks, and trails and other community facilities. Medium – Area would offer some opportunity for connection to existing or proposed facilities. Low – Area offers little opportunity for connection to existing or proposed facilities.</td>
<td>High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (for neighborhood parks only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Located on OSPRT Master Plan Map</strong></td>
<td>Acquire properties that are consistent with the OSPRT Master Plan Concept Map</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2) No (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS**

1741
Application of Suitability Assessment Criteria

In developing physical framework plans for open space and parks, a “universe” of land types that represent appropriate and realistic candidates for potential acquisition/conservation, was developed. These lands, located within Broomfield, or adjacent to its boundaries, include:

- Areas shown as potential open lands on the 1995 Master Plan or subarea plans;
- Areas with significant ecological value as described in Chapter 2;
- Areas that are presently vacant or are considered significant opportunities for redevelopment;
- Areas that are now agricultural or rural residential, where the use is anticipated to change in the near future; and
- Areas adjacent to the community’s borders that have significant ecological value or may be well suited for intergovernmental partnerships for regional open space or park sites.

For areas where an existing PUD or redevelopment plan is already in place, it was assumed that that the approved plan will continue to govern. A total of 46 candidate sites were identified through this process. The final list of potential acquisitions highlights 40 locations.

Each candidate site was evaluated against both parks and open space criteria, and was ranked as High, Medium, or Low relative to each criterion. For example, each site was ranked High, Medium or Low according to its scenic land value; wildlife habitat value; passive recreation value; buffer/Green Edge value; and so on. Weightings were applied to criteria as shown in the exhibits and a final summary score developed for each site, reflecting its value as an open space or parks acquisition. Some sites were clearly more suitable for preservation as open space or as parks properties, while others were suitable for both.

Feasibility Evaluation Criteria

An additional set of criteria that address feasibility of acquisition, were developed and applied once candidate sites were ranked according to the criteria above (see Exhibit 5.3). Unlike the environmental and functional criteria listed in Exhibits 5.1 and 5.2, a site’s ranking against these feasibility criteria may change over time: for example, the property owner’s willingness to sell may increase, making the site a higher priority for acquisition. It is expected that staff will re-evaluate candidate sites against these criteria periodically and adjust priorities accordingly.
## Exhibit 5.3: Feasibility Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threat from Development</td>
<td>Protect properties that face imminent development or resource extraction.</td>
<td>Parcel is for sale or is likely to be developed or have resources extracted within one year. The potential for mineral development and cost of purchasing mineral rights should be evaluated.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Use of Program Funds</td>
<td>Use program funds efficiently and leverage local funds whenever possible.</td>
<td>Funds or options are available to leverage Broomfield’s cost of purchasing the parcel (e.g., partial gift, grants, conservation easement). Price is fair and reasonable to Broomfield given land sale comparisons or an appraisal, and future infrastructure costs are identified as these costs will potentially now become the responsibility of Broomfield if the land becomes public—infrastructure includes road, water, sewer, and other improvements. Other potential uses that could be developed on the property need to be considered in light of designating the parcel for open space or park uses.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller Motivation</td>
<td>Work with willing and motivated landowners.</td>
<td>Landowner is willing to negotiate and may be willing to consider financing options to reduce Broomfield’s cost.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Community Support</td>
<td>Conserve properties that receive a high level of community support or are high visibility.</td>
<td>The local community has evidenced strong support for the project (e.g., organized efforts such as letters, meetings, or background research), and the project will benefit more than one neighborhood.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Participation</td>
<td>Work with partners to acquire and manage open lands.</td>
<td>Another partner or partners are committed to participating in sharing capital or maintenance costs for the parcel.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Manage and maintain properties over the long term in a manner that is efficient and effective.</td>
<td>Parcel will be monitored and maintained over the long term by an entity other than Broomfield, or Broomfield will share management responsibilities and costs.</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Ease</td>
<td>Make efficient use of staff resources and time.</td>
<td>Parcel will not require excessive staff resources or time to acquire when weighed against the benefit of the acquisition</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>Limit Broomfield’s liability in the open lands program</td>
<td>Parcel has no significant liability implications (e.g., oil and gas well environmental concerns, storage of vehicles, etc.).</td>
<td>✓ Yes ✓ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the Parks and Open Space Maps as Part of the Master Plan

The OSPRT Master Plan maps depict one possible way of achieving Broomfield’s vision and goals for a citywide parks and open space system. It is expected that over time, as staff act to implement this system, some opportunities shown on the map will not be realized and other unanticipated opportunities will emerge that fit with the vision and goals of this master plan. It is expected that suitability criteria will be applied to these new or emerging opportunities and the map updated if needed. In this regard, while the OSPRT Master Plan maps provide important guidance for future acquisitions, the maps are intended to be a dynamic, not static, tool for staff.

One of the purposes of the OSPRT Master Plan is to provide a basis for City Council’s decisions on the use of the open space and parks sales tax. In that regard, City Council may undertake parks, trails and open space projects consistent with the vision and goals contained in this plan but not necessarily shown on the map in its efforts to implement this plan.

Methodology and Mapping Limitations

When considering the open space and parks maps presented in succeeding chapters, there are four important points to keep in mind:

1. The maps show general patterns, not exact locations.

   The lines on the maps do not represent exact boundaries. Only the general locations of characteristics are indicated, and the boundaries shown are relative. Ultimately, specific parcels will be identified within the general areas identified in the maps.

2. The maps are dynamic.

   The maps are the result of today’s information and technology. They will need to be periodically updated as new information is desired and/or becomes available.

3. On-site analysis and field verification are absolutely necessary.

   When evaluating and prioritizing specific parcels of land for acquisition, detailed site analysis and field verification must be conducted.

4. The maps are just part of the decision-making process.

   The maps are not an absolute predictor or determinants for decision-making. Rather, they are tools that, in combination with common sense and good judgment, can be used to enhance decisions for acquisition or preservation and to communicate the basis for those decisions. Final decisions about specific acquisitions will be made by the City Council, with input from the public, City staff and the Parks and Open Space Advisory Committees.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPEN SPACE

This chapter provides specific recommendations for future open space acquisitions in Broomfield, and for maintaining and managing open space properties. Recommendations for acquisition are presented in the form of an Open Space Map, which has been developed based on the application of suitability assessment criteria presented in the previous chapter.

As noted in Chapter 5, candidate sites were developed based on a number of factors, including their identification as potential open lands in the 1995 Master Plan or sub-area plans; areas that were vacant, or zoned agricultural or rural residential; and areas of significant ecological value based on the assessment presented in Chapter 2. This ecological assessment indicates that there are approximately 2,700 acres of high or moderate value lands available within the City and County of Broomfield boundaries – sufficient to achieve the overall open lands goal. The same group of sites was rated against both open space and parks suitability criteria.

The map presented in this chapter does not fully reveal high and moderate priority sites, because to do so might compromise Broomfield’s ability to negotiate with landowners. The map does reveal the locations of sites that are under consideration, however. The map has also indicated areas that are potential joint open space and parks acquisitions, as well as areas that might be opportunities for partnering with adjacent municipalities and counties.

The discussion in this chapter uses the terms “site” and “area” interchangeably, and these areas are indicated on the Open Space map as circles. This approach ensures that the general locations of potential acquisitions are shown, without revealing their actual identity and potentially compromising negotiations with affected landowners.

CITIZEN SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS CONCERNING OPEN SPACE

78 PERCENT OF RESIDENTS USE OPEN SPACE
60 PERCENT OF RESIDENTS FEEL BROOMEFIELD NEEDS MORE OPEN SPACE
80 PERCENT FEEL ACQUIRING MORE OPEN SPACE IS THE COMMUNITY’S TOP PRIORITY

TOP FIVE TYPES OF LANDS THAT RESIDENTS WISH TO SEE PRESERVED:
› VIEWS
› TRAIL CORRIDORS
› PASSIVE RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES
› WILDLIFE CORRIDORS
› WETLANDS
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION

Exhibit 6.1 illustrates potential open space acquisition opportunities. In keeping with community values, a large number of these areas have been located to connect with existing properties, creating opportunities for large expanses of open space that also have increased value for wildlife.

Many sites are also located adjacent to the Broomfield County Commons site, creating opportunities to connect that area to Plaster Reservoir to the north, and connecting adjacent neighborhoods to the site.

Other sites are located in the north and west region of the community, extending the buffer provided by the lands covered by the Boulder/Broomfield IGA and previous Broomfield acquisitions, and providing a link to open space planned for the Preble Creek subdivision.

A number of sites are also located in the northeast corner of the community. This area is still highly agricultural and undeveloped, and the locations indicated on the map represent opportunities to preserve significant view corridors, drainageways and ponds, and visual gateways to Broomfield as experienced from the north.

Nine sites have been identified that may provide opportunities for joint open space and parks uses. Two are located northwest of the existing Broomfield Industrial Park; three adjacent to the Broomfield County Commons site; one in the vicinity of a new proposed reservoir, one north of McKay Lake, and two sites along the southern Broomfield boundary.

Sites that may provide opportunities for collaboration with adjacent municipalities and counties, include two sites near the Jefferson County airport; a site in Westminster which would provide a direct link to the Big Dry Creek corridor; a site in Boulder County which would extend the emerging buffer; and several sites in Weld County that would provide buffering from development.
EXHIBIT 6.1: POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE ACQUISITIONS
EXHIBIT 6.2: CANDIDATE AREAS FOR RESTORATION
CANDIDATE AREAS FOR RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT

In addition to new acquisition opportunities, the OSPRT Master Plan has also identified a number of areas that are candidates for restoration and enhancement. Broomfield already owns a number of these properties, including the Field and open space at Broomfield County Commons. Other properties may be purchased in the future. Some of the more significant opportunities include:

- The Field, encompassing restoration of native grassland, trees and shrubs.
- Broomfield County Commons, including enhancement of riparian areas adjacent to Le Gault Reservoir and the channel connecting Tom Frost and Le Gault Reservoirs.
- An open space area north of Great Western Reservoir where native grassland could be restored.
- The Quail Creek drainage south of McKay Lake.
- Several large, formerly agricultural parcels north of West 136th Avenue that could be restored to native grassland.
- As described below, a Baseline Management Plan shall be prepared for each significant and large open space property owned and managed by the City and County. A major element of each plan shall be an assessment of opportunities and potential for restoration as well as a detailed restoration and enhancement plan.

BASELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN

To ensure that public use is compatible with each open space parcel’s natural features, the OSPRT Master Plan establishes a requirement for a Baseline Management Plan for each significant open space property. This plan shall be prepared in collaboration with an ecologist and shall assess the quality of vegetation, wetlands, wildlife habitat and waterways that may be present on the property and their potential for enhancement and restoration. The plan shall also assess water resources that may be present on the site (lakes, ponds, reservoirs) and shall examine the potential for enhancing these features using existing water rights or possibly purchasing...
additional water rights if Council so desires.\textsuperscript{17}

The plan shall also identify areas suitable for public access without risk of degradation of sensitive habitat or native landscapes. Appendix D lists public uses that may or may not be appropriate for open space areas, but this list is intended as a guide and the Baseline Management Plan is expected to provide more detailed guidance based on the specific attributes of each property.

**MUNICIPAL CODE REVISIONS TO PROMOTE STEWARSHIP**

To provide staff with the tools to act as good stewards of Broomfield’s open lands, the OSPRT Master Plan has recommended a number of modifications to the municipal code. These are summarized briefly below and presented in more detail in Chapter 9.

**Proposed Code Revisions for Planned Unit Development Review Standards**

Section 17-38-120 and 220 of Broomfield’s municipal code set forth the PUD process and standards that Broomfield uses as the basis for requiring detailed studies and to address open space, parks, recreation, and trails. Broomfield further requires that the proposed plan or use conform to the 1995 Master Plan. Some of the proposed code revisions will be incorporated into the PUD section of the municipal code, while other proposals may be better addressed as new code sections. Areas where code revisions have been recommended are as follows:

- Promote Conservation of Significant Natural Resources and Features through Site Plan Design Standards and the Public Land Dedication Requirement
- Provide Connected Parks and Open Space
- Dedicating Detention Areas as Open Space or Parks
- Using Wetland Swales for Stormwater Conveyance
- Drainageway and Stream Corridor Protection
- Ridgeline Protection
- Tree Preservation
- Restoring Native Vegetation
- Wildlife Protection
- Open Space Zone District Section 17.07
- Ownership, Disposal and Change of Use Section 2-74-010

**MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES**

As part of the OSPRT Master Plan, Broomfield’s existing management and maintenance guidelines were reviewed and strengthened where necessary to enhance good stewardship of open space properties. Relevant guidelines are summarized below, with detailed language contained in Appendices D (Management Classifications

\textsuperscript{17} Ultimate decisions regarding the use of Broomfield water rights will be made by Council based on economic, environmental and other factors.
and Guidelines for Public Use) and E (Management and Maintenance Guidelines).

**Existing Open Space Management Guidelines**

- Guidelines governing Mowing and Trimming, and encouraging non-mechanical methods such as grazing. Under proposed guidelines, less area will be mown than under current guidelines. (Many of these new guidelines have already been implemented.)
- Guidelines encouraging non-chemical methods for Pond Maintenance
- Guidelines for Noxious Weed Control that encourage integrated chemical, biological, and mechanical control methods
- Guidelines for protecting threatened, endangered, or state-listed species and for addressing “nuisance” urban wildlife
- Guidelines for prairie dog management
- Guidelines for Tree, Plant, and Vegetation Management that provide for restoration and fire mitigation
- Guidelines for Vehicular Control that restrict vehicular access on open space properties
- Guidelines for Wetland Preservation and for mitigation
- Guidelines for Drainage Area Maintenance that introduce best management practices
- Guidelines for Trash/Debris Control, including dog and equine feces
- Guidelines for Site Amenities
- Guidelines for Chemical Usage that emphasize integrated management methods

**Recommended Additional Open Space Management Guidelines**

- Guidelines that require a Baseline Management Study to be conducted for open space properties of a significant size to determine ecological value and identify compatible types and level of public use
- Guidelines for Fencing
- Guidelines for Domestic Animal Control that provide on-leash restrictions in open space areas
- Guidelines for enhancing Wildlife Species Diversity
- Guidelines that prohibit Encroachment of private property owners onto open space areas
- Guidelines for a uniform signage program for open space and trails

**OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS SIGNAGE PROGRAM**

Following the guidelines above, an open space and trails signage program has been designed to:

- Increase residents’ awareness of community open space properties
- Provide maps of the trails system and wayfinding information
- Provide directional and regulatory information, including prohibited uses
- Provide interpretive information

Exhibit 6.3 illustrates the sign prototypes that have been developed. Other signs may be developed consistent with these prototypes, for special purposes on an as-
needed basis. Materials and technology have been selected that ensure that signs can be maintained easily by Broomfield’s Public Works Department. Where feasible, preference will be given to the use of recycled materials. The goal is to complete open space and trails signage for existing properties within the next three years.
EXHIBIT 6.3: OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS SIGNAGE PROTOTYPES
Chapter 7
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

This chapter examines current and future needs for parks and recreation facilities, provides recommendations for acquisition, establishes enhanced design standards, recommends additional management and maintenance guidelines, and estimates capital and operations costs. Recommendations for acquisition are presented in the form of a Parks Map, which has been developed based on the application of suitability assessment criteria presented in Chapter 5.

As noted in Chapter 5, candidate sites were developed based on a number of factors, including their identification as potential open lands in the 1995 Master Plan or sub-area plans; areas that were vacant, or zoned agricultural or rural residential; and significant ecological value based on the assessment presented in Chapter 2. The same group of sites was rated against both parks and open space suitability criteria.

The map presented in this chapter does not fully reveal high and moderate priority sites, because to do so might compromise Broomfield’s ability to negotiate with landowners. The map does reveal the locations of sites that are under consideration, however. The map has also indicated areas that are potential joint open space and parks acquisitions, as well as areas that might be opportunities for partnering with adjacent municipalities and counties.

The discussion in this chapter uses the terms “site” and “area” interchangeably, and these areas are indicated on the Parks map as circles. This has been done because many sites/areas consist of multiple parcels, and the underlying parcels’ identity was deemed important to protect to avoid compromising negotiations with affected landowners.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

The OSPRT Plan recommends that the 16 AC per 1,000 persons be adopted as the new level of service standard, to ensure the current level of service is maintained or exceeded. It also would contribute to achieving the minimum 40 percent open lands goal established in the OSPRT and 1995 Master Plans.

Just as important as achieving overall parkland acreage goals, the mix and distribution of parkland and types of parks should accomplish the objectives of the OSPRT Plan. The guidelines contained within the 1995 Master Plan have resulted in a well-distributed system of neighborhood parks, but relatively few large

CITIZEN SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS CONCERNING PARKS

95 PERCENT OF RESIDENTS USE PARKS
50 PERCENT VISIT AT LEAST 10 TIMES PER YEAR
50 PERCENT OF RESIDENTS WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE LARGE PARKS
A NEIGHBORHOOD PARK SHOULD BE NO MORE THAN 10-15 MINUTES FROM HOME
community parks and in certain cases, too many small pocket parks with limited public recreational use.

Exhibit 7.1 recommends modifications to the service standards to be achieved for each type of park facility. The intent of the revised service standards is to ensure that the mix of park types reflects the community’s needs and expressed values.

**PROJECTING FUTURE NEEDS**

Given these revised service standards, future needs for park facilities and fields were examined using quantitative data compiled by Recreation Services managers and Broomfield planning staff, as well as qualitative observations of staff regarding changes in leisure trends and participation in program activities. Estimation of future needs attempt to identify the quantity of park acreage as well as the number of playing fields and related facilities that will need to be provided over the planning horizon to ensure that service levels are maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 7.1: LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC PARK FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Countywide Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Greens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Future Needs for Parkland

Broomfield staff has estimated the community’s buildout population to be 75,668 persons when the community is fully developed\(^{18}\). Given the current population, this projection suggests that Broomfield will add about 30,000 people when fully developed, and that approximately 524 additional acres of parkland will be needed to accommodate this growth and to achieve the level of service standard of 16 acres per 1,000 persons.

The timing of these needs is a challenge to predict at this point, as it is difficult to pinpoint the projected pace of buildout. The OSPRT Master Plan thus recommends that Broomfield staff develop projections in five-year increments, and monitor the growth that is realized, on at least an annual basis.

Most of the future buildout is projected to take place north of W. 144\(^{th}\) Ave./Dillon Road, so opportunities for new park acquisitions were identified in these areas. Because these areas are comparatively undeveloped, opportunities for large community parks may be more promising here than in other locations of the community. Opportunities for smaller, neighborhood parks have been identified throughout the community.

\(^{18}\) Source: Broomfield Planning Department estimate, April 2003.

Projected Future Needs for Athletic Fields and Other Facilities

The OSPRT Master Plan also projects future needs for athletic fields and other recreation facilities. This analysis uses Recreation Services’ assessment of the adequacy of the current level of service as a starting point; adjusts this level of service where necessary based on staff judgment and the participation rates in current programs; and then projects this level of service into the future to identify the needs that will need to be met at buildout. For purposes of this analysis, level of service is defined as the number of facilities per 1,000 persons. Results of this analysis are shown in Exhibit 7.2.
2002 Community Needs Assessment survey provides benchmark data on the relative popularity of the activities above:

- Swimming: 86 percent of youths participate
- Basketball: 49 percent
- Soccer: 45 percent
- Baseball: 40 percent
- Football: 31 percent

Based on these participation figures, needs for pool facilities, basketball courts, and soccer fields might be revised upwards. The OSPRT Master Plan recommends that Recreation Services staff monitor changes in participation in these activities on an annual basis in order to reliably track future demands for facilities.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARKLAND ACQUISITION

Exhibit 7.3 illustrates potential parks acquisition opportunities. In keeping with community values, a number of these areas...
EXHIBIT 7.3: POTENTIAL PARKLAND ACQUISITIONS
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are sizeable enough to support larger community parks or specialized athletic complexes. Others would expand or extend existing facilities, such as Broomfield Industrial Park.

Many sites are located adjacent to the Broomfield County Commons site, protecting small parcels adjacent to the BCC site from development or providing connections to adjacent neighborhoods. Four sites are located near Broomfield Industrial Park, providing an opportunity to expand this facility.

Several sites are located north of Dillon Road, to accommodate projected future growth in this area of the community. Many of these sites are large enough to support community-scale parks, collectively providing opportunities to attain the additional acres of parkland estimated to be needed at buildout.

Other sites are smaller in scale and offer the opportunity for “infill” parks where they are now lacking, or opportunities to enhance existing facilities, such as expanding Northmoor Park. Nine sites have been identified that may provide opportunities for joint open space and parks uses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS**

Though not expected to be needed for some time, sites for an additional recreation center have been identified near the Northwest Parkway corridor to respond to the location of projected future population growth. This facility should respond to needs for additional indoor pools and gymnasiums, as well as staff input regarding additional programming.

**Recommendation:** Develop a facility program for a new recreation center and evaluate the suitability of alternative potential locations for the center within the north region of the community.

There have been many requests for an off-leash dog park, and results from the statistically representative needs assessment survey suggest that 65 percent of residents support the creation of such a facility. Active involvement of advocacy organizations serving the “canine community” should be solicited in the planning for this facility as well as in developing guidelines and expectations for management and maintenance.

**Recommendation:** Develop a pilot project to test the feasibility of implementing an off-leash dog park and alternative approaches to its management.

Criteria for siting fenced off-leash areas should consider the following issues:

1. Provide a buffer from surrounding residents such as dense vegetation or opaque fencing.
2. Maintain a 100-foot buffer from a playground or children’s facility.
3. Clear separation from athletic fields should be provided.
4. Existing off-street parking should be available.
5. The site should be easily and safely accessible from adjacent/surrounding neighborhoods using pedestrian/bicycle trails.

6. The site must have positive drainage.

7. The site should have an ADA accessible paved path.

8. The off-leash area should be a minimum of two acres.

9. The site should be nonlinear to maximize useable space.

10. The site should have either shade trees or a shade structure.

11. The site should be free of toxic residue from prior site uses.

Criteria for siting un-fenced off-leash areas should consider the following issues:

1. The area should not have a playground or children’s facility.

2. The area should be clearly separated from athletic fields, regional trails, and picnic shelters.

3. The area should not be adjacent to arterial/busy streets.

4. The area should be easily and safely accessible from adjacent/surrounding neighborhoods using pedestrian/bicycle trails.

5. The area must have positive drainage.

6. The area should have an ADA accessible paved path.

7. The area must be minimum of two acres.

8. The area should be nonlinear to maximize useable space.

9. The site should be free of toxic residue from prior site uses.

10. The area should not be adjacent to critical wildlife habitat, especially wetlands.

Regarding recreation programming, the community needs assessment survey identified the need for expanded or improved programming for aquatics and cultural arts. Because the survey was conducted prior to the opening of the new Paul Derda Recreation Center, some of these needs may be met by that facility. The OSPRT Master Plan recommends that Recreation Services staff survey center users on an annual basis, to identify where needs for additional programming are occurring.
MUNICIPAL CODE REVISIONS TO PROMOTE OPEN LANDS STEWARDSHIP

To provide staff with the tools to act as good stewards of Broomfield’s open lands, the OSPRT Master Plan has recommended a number of modifications to the municipal code. These are summarized briefly below and presented in more detail in Chapter 9.

- Parkland Suitability
- Provide Connected Parks and Open Space
- Design Compact Parks and Open Space
- Develop Parkland that is Accessible, Secure and Visible to Residents
- Dedicating Detention Areas as Open Space or Parks
- Using Wetland Swales for Stormwater Conveyance
- Drainageway and Stream Corridor Protection
- Tree Preservation
- Restoring Native Vegetation
- Ownership, Disposal and Change of Use

DESIGN STANDARDS FOR PARKS

To ensure that facilities are constructed that reflect Broomfield’s commitment to quality, design standards have been developed to guide parks construction. These standards address size, location, typical facilities, parking, and amenities for the following types of facilities:

- City/Countywide Parks
- Community Parks
- Neighborhood Parks
- Joint School/Park Sites
- Pocket Parks
- Village Greens
- Specialized Active Recreation Facilities

Additionally, the standards distinguish between core elements, which must be provided in each facility, and optional elements, which may be provided at the discretion of Broomfield staff based on neighborhood or community need. The intent of the “core” and “optional” elements is to define a consistent level of program elements to be provided for in Broomfield parks, but to allow staff the flexibility to work with developers to define optional elements to be provided based on need.

Detailed design standards are found in Appendix F.

MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES

As part of the OSPRT Master Plan, Broomfield’s existing management and maintenance guidelines were reviewed and strengthened where necessary to enhance staff’s ability to provide high quality parks and recreation facilities. Relevant guidelines are presented below.
**Recommended Additional Parks**

**Design and Management Guidelines**

1. **Water Conservation**

1.1 Establish a repair, renovation, and replacement/ new construction matrix that addresses and prioritizes replacement or implementation of the following components and practices:

- Landscape – reduction or consolidation of bluegrass lawn areas, increase areas of xeriscape plantings, groundcovers, and native grasses (include recommended plant species, grass species, and seeding recommendations and best practices for planting, establishment, and maintenance).

- Hardscape – increase areas of naturalistic hardscape (sandstone, river rock, colored/textured concrete) and water-efficient curbs and aprons.

- Soil preparation, amendments, drainage systems, and mulches (provide details and costing).

- Irrigation Systems – consider upgrades to water efficient systems and components (provide details and costing).

1.2 Establish a protocol for a hierarchical approach for designating areas that receive normal, reduced, or no irrigation during increasingly extreme drought conditions. Include a prioritized recovery plan for refurbishing or replacing damaged plantings or turf.
Chapter 8
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMUNITY TRAILS

This chapter presents a proposal for a comprehensive community trails system, identifies and prioritizes the “missing links” that must be completed to make this system function well, enhances existing design standards for different trail types, and enhances existing management and maintenance standards so that the system can be maintained adequately.

Residents responding to the community needs assessment survey had numerous recommendations about key “missing links” that should be completed. Among the areas and concerns most frequently mentioned were:

- Completion of the connection from the US 36 Underpass by East Park to Hoyt Street.
- Continuation of the Lac Amora Trail to the west to Interlocken and FlatIron Crossing and to the east to Plaster Reservoir and McKay Lake.
- Safe connections to the Big Dry Creek regional trails system.
- Safe bike lanes to allow for commuting.

ATTRIBUTES OF A COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS SYSTEM

Reflecting residents’ values, four major goals have guided the development of proposals for a comprehensive trails system in Broomfield.

CITIZEN SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS CONCERNING TRAILS

75% OF RESIDENTS USE TRAILS
90% FEEL MORE OFF-STREET TRAILS ARE NEEDED
75% FEEL MORE ON-STREET BIKE LANES ARE NEEDED
70% FEEL TRAILHEADS WITH PARKING ARE NEEDED

Goal: Create and Connect
Recreational Opportunities

Creating a system of trails that provides access to recreation facilities and parks is the cornerstone of the proposed trail network. The general premise is to develop trail connections that provide safe access to and from neighborhood parks, community wide recreation centers, regional parks, open space properties and places of employment. The trail system itself is also envisioned as a recreation facility, offering a diverse system of long and short routes for a variety of users.

Goal: Support a Variety of Uses

The trails system should serve many different types of users, including walkers, joggers, cyclists, horseback riders, children traveling to school, adults walking to work or to shopping and restaurants. The system should be designed to minimize conflicts between different types of users.
Goal: Enhance Community Image

The trail system should convey an overall image for the community. Guidelines for trail design and signage have been developed to help achieve this objective.

Goal: Offer Alternatives to Motor Vehicle Travel and Commuting

Given the mild climate and topography of Broomfield, the trail system offers a feasible alternative to driving for short and long trips. The proposed trail system is designed to make safe and direct bicycling and pedestrian connections to local trip destinations such as employment centers, shopping areas, schools, libraries, and recreation centers.

THE PROPOSED TRAILS SYSTEM

The proposed trails system provides a hierarchy of long and short recreational and commuting routes that connect important community destinations and substantially expand the existing trails system. The proposed system is shown in Exhibit 8.1. When completed, the system will substantially increase the miles of multi-use pathways and on-street bike lanes.

The hierarchy of routes includes regional links, community trails, neighborhood connections and on-street bicycle lanes.
EXHIBIT 8.1: PROPOSED COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM
Regional Links

Regional links connect Broomfield to adjacent municipalities and the wider metro-area trails system. Major regional links include:

- **The Broomfield Trail.** The Broomfield Trail is the spine of the primary trail system providing connection from the southwest to northeast areas of Broomfield. The alignment follows the community ditch corridor and offers scenic and wildlife viewing opportunities. Access to the major shopping centers, employment centers, schools, city hall, parks, recreation centers and open space are provided along the route.

- **The Rock Creek Trail** connecting to Lafayette.

- **The Northwest Parkway Trail.** This trail parallels the Northwest Parkway and will serve to connect Broomfield to Louisville and the I-25 corridor. It also will eventually provide a link to the metro-wide trails system that parallels C-470 in the west and south suburbs.

- **The US 36 Bike Expressway.** The bike expressway offers connections between regional employment centers, shopping centers, and regional transportation within the US 36 corridor.

- **The Big Dry Creek trail system.** Stronger connections are made with the regional Big Dry Creek trail at the southeast edge of the community. This trail extends along the Big Dry Creek corridor at the southeast edge of the community.

Community Trails

Community trails provide short and long recreational loops that connect existing parks, open space, commercial areas, and community facilities. Major community trails include:

- **The Southeast Community Loop Trail.** The Southeast Community Loop Trail connects the southwest, southeast, and northeast neighborhoods of the community, providing access to the schools, neighborhoods, government facilities, commercial businesses, parks and open space.

- **The Lake Link Trail.** The Lake Link Trail offers access to Josh’s Pond, Sagar Reservoir, Plaster Reservoir, and McKay Lake.

- **The North Community Link Trail.** The North Community Link Trail provides a connection between the developed and soon to be developed north side of Broomfield. The North Community Link Trail will provide a safe and direct connection to the north and south side of the Northwest Parkway, and will offer access to the Northwest Parkway Trail, Preble Creek open lands, and a future community reservoir.

Neighborhood Connections

Neighborhood connections comprise the secondary trail system and provide the necessary connection to primary trail facilities. Neighborhood connections are also intended to link together short trips in neighborhoods to destinations such as parks, schools, and local retail centers.
On-street Bicycle Lanes and Signed Bicycle Routes

On-street bicycle lanes are part of the primary trail system and provide connections to employment, shopping and commercial destinations. They also are intended to offer bicycle commute routes to promote the use of bikes as an alternative to cars.

Community Recommendations for Potential Equestrian Trails

Members of Broomfield’s equestrian community have recommended a number of areas in which equestrian trails would be desirable. These include:

- A portion of the Broomfield Trail, running northeasterly from Aspen Street to the Northwest Parkway, then looping back along the North Community Link trail just south of the new proposed reservoir, to complete a loop.
- A spur from the Broomfield trail in the vicinity of Federal Boulevard that would connect to McKay Lake.
- The existing Lac Amora Trail (excluding Josh’s Pond).
- A possible loop trail in the far northeast area of the community, connecting to Thornton via Big Dry Creek.
- These proposed corridors will need to be carefully evaluated to determine if equestrian use will be viable.

MISSING LINKS IN THE EXISTING TRAILS SYSTEM

To achieve this comprehensive community-wide trails system, the “missing links” in the existing system must be identified and constructed. Locations where existing trail connections are missing or inadequate have also been identified and inventoried. Exhibit 8.2 shows the location of the missing facilities (links).

Trail network missing links were then prioritized to identify the “Top Ten” projects based on results from the 2002 Community Needs Assessment Survey and the goals and objectives developed to guide the trails planning. Criteria used to prioritize trails improvements included the following:

1. Does the proposed improvement provide a connection to a park, school, or open space area?
2. Does the proposed improvements connect to RTD routes?
3. How many trail routes are served by the connection?
4. Does the improvement present the opportunity to share capital costs with other partners?
5. How many miles of continuous trail are available when the proposed improvement is completed?
6. Does the proposed improvement meet safety standards set by the community?

Does the proposed improvement address concerns cited in the 2002 Community Needs Assessment?
EXHIBIT 8.2: MISSING LINKS IN THE TRAILS SYSTEM
The missing link trail projects listed in Exhibit 8.3 below address the community-wide and neighborhood needs in a strategic format. It is important to note that many of the projects outside of the “Top Ten” list could be constructed as related infrastructure projects, such as roadway construction, are addressed. This is possible due to the developing nature of the north area of Broomfield and plans for redeveloping the existing arterial roadway system. When large capital projects are in the planning stages, Open Space and Trails staff/advisory committee should explore opportunities to provide missing connections that are listed outside of the “Top Ten” list. As projects are constructed and the trail network begins to develop it will also be important to re-prioritize the missing links with the aid of the community.

**EXHIBIT 8.3: TOP TEN MISSING LINK PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Segment Label</th>
<th>Trail Segment</th>
<th>Trail Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BT2</td>
<td>US 36 underpass to Richard Steele Park and Hoyt St.</td>
<td>Broomfield Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LL2</td>
<td>Ridgeview Trail to Outlook</td>
<td>Lake Link Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SECL5</td>
<td>Highland Park to new Sheridan Underpass</td>
<td>SE Community Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BT3</td>
<td>Richard Steele Park to Zang Spur Park</td>
<td>Broomfield Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>Flatiron Crossing to Storage Tek Drive</td>
<td>Regional Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SECL6</td>
<td>Country Vista/W. 122nd St. to Lowell Boulevard</td>
<td>SE Community Loop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Connections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Segment Label</th>
<th>Trail Segment</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NC16</td>
<td>Country Vista/Tennyson Street to S.E. Community Loop</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NC19</td>
<td>Bronco Park to S.E. Community Loop</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NC15</td>
<td>Perry Street to Southeast Community Loop</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NC 20</td>
<td>Paul Derda Recreation Center to Westlake Neighborhood and Willow Park North</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G (not included here) details all of the missing links necessary to complete the trails system, including the location and type of trail for proposed trail improvements.

**DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TRAILS, WALKWAYS AND BICYCLE LANES**

Design standards for trails and sidewalks have been established in Broomfield’s Standards and Specifications, 2003. These standards and specifications were reviewed and modifications proposed where appropriate and warranted to promote a unified network of trail facilities for existing and future development.

**Multi-Use Pathways**

Multi-use pathways are typically separated from a roadway and offer continuous routes with limited vehicular conflict. In most situations multi-use pathways do not parallel arterial roadways. They may be hard- or soft-surface, with width and surfacing decisions guided by the following considerations:

- **Volume of use**: higher-volume pathways are typically hard-surface and are the widest facilities.
- **Speed**: pathways that cater to higher speed users (bikers, rollerbladers) are typically hard-surface. Pathways that cater to low-speed or a mixed user population, should receive a surface treatment that slows down the highest speed users and reduces conflicts. Alternatively, if space allows, the pathway may be wider to provide for slow- and high-speed lanes, or parallel pathways may be constructed. For example, an equestrian trail could be separated from the primary trail.
- **Connectivity**: pathways that directly connect to a regional or community system will likely receive a higher volume of use and so should typically be hard-surface OR of the same material as the trail to which they are connecting, to avoid sudden or abrupt changes for users. Pathways that are totally contained within a park or open space site may be hard or soft-surface as compatible with surrounding context.
- **School route**: pathways that are school routes will be plowed in winter and so should be hard-surface.
- **Proximity to wildlife habitat**: pathways passing near wildlife habitat should typically be soft-surface to discourage high-speed and noisy users who may disrupt nesting and denning sites and startle wildlife. Persistent activity in these areas may drive away wildlife and reduce the amount of available habitat.

Current standards provided in the 1995 Master Plan indicate the use of 10-foot concrete pathways along major corridors where intense use is anticipated and eight-foot concrete pathways where lower use is expected. It is recommended the higher use corridors (Broomfield Trail and S.E. Community Loop) use the 10-foot standard for width and the lower use corridors (Lake Links Loop and neighborhood connections) use a maximum width of eight feet.
Regional connections will need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Broomfield’s current specification for soft surface trails (Table 800-15 Standards and Specifications, 2003) requires an eight-foot maximum treadway, but also allows for much narrower trails in lower-use or more naturalistic settings. The specification has been modified to provide a more rigorous standard for crusher fines material and its application to ensure that the trail surface that results is suitable for a variety of uses, and will not be maintenance-intensive.

**Detached Sidewalks**

Detached sidewalks are typically separated from the roadway curb by a landscape buffer. The current development standards (Table 500-3 Standards and Specifications, 2003) require the use of such facilities on new local, connector and arterial roadways. The specification varies by traffic volume (i.e. arterial streets require a wider walkway than local streets) and calls for walkways ranging from four to eight feet in width, with a five-foot tree lawn buffer from the roadway. The plan recommends that an eight-foot walkway be required where the walk will carry multi-use traffic, while a four-foot walkway may be acceptable for walks intended to carry pedestrians only in very low density developments.

**Attached Sidewalks**

Attached sidewalks are “attached” to the roadway curb and offer limited separation from vehicular traffic. The existing standard calls for a four-foot minimum walkway. This standard is acceptable in areas with very low speeds (less than 15 mph) but if attached sidewalks are placed in higher speed areas, the plan recommends a six-foot minimum walkway width. Because of potential conflicts on a narrow surface and the lack of separation from vehicular traffic, attached sidewalks should not be designated as multi-purpose pathways.

**On-Street Bicycle Lanes**

On-street bicycle lanes are designated areas within a roadway for bicyclists to travel. The current development standards for arterial streets (Table 500-3 Standards...
and Specifications, 2003) require on-street bicycle lanes along arterial roadways. The current design standard requires three-foot bicycle lanes on both sides of the right of way. In some instances the bicycle lane uses the roadway gutter to achieve the required width. This situation offers a compromised minimum width for bicyclists to operate because the travel lane surface (typically asphalt) and the drainage gutter (concrete) do not share the same seam height.

An alternative treatment for this problem is to construct the drainage gutter pan and the bicycle lane with the same material (concrete) to eliminate the need for a seam in the center of the bicycle lane. This treatment is feasible for asphalt and concrete roadway sections and would offer an uninterrupted bicycle lane. The most desirable bike lane width is four feet excluding curb and gutter. On particularly busy principal arterials and roads having heavy truck traffic, five feet plus curb and gutter is appropriate.

As recommended in Exhibit 8.4 below, on-street lanes have the potential to expand to better accommodate bicyclists in these large volume corridors. It is important to note that providing a high quality off-street trail in the arterial corridor should not be a substitute for providing four-foot on-street bike lanes.

**Signed Bicycle Routes**

Where appropriate given traffic volumes, some local streets might be able to be designed as bicycle routes if a formal bike lane could not be provided. Locations for such facilities would need to be carefully reviewed and traffic studies conducted to determine the feasibility of this alternative.

**Opportunities to Retrofit Existing Roadway Corridors to Provide Pathways and Bike Lanes**

To accommodate parallel use on existing arterial streets, an additional three to four feet might be obtained from the landscape buffer or utility easement to allow for a multi-use path. The current width for travel lanes could be reduced where feasible to allow an additional foot for on-street bicycle lanes. A similar configuration has been used on Zuni St. south of 144th St. The current section uses 12-foot travel lanes, five-foot bike lanes and two and one half foot curb sections.

Connector Streets that provide for on-street parking might be retrofitted to provide an on-street bike lane in lieu of one lane of parking, if demand for parking is low. Alternatively, on roadways which have been designed for higher traffic volumes than they are carrying, or are projected to carry, travel lanes may be narrowed to provide for on-street bike lanes assuming other traffic engineering concerns can be addressed.
Grade Separated Crossings

Grade separated crossings have been proposed at key intersections with significant traffic volumes, to provide for cyclist and pedestrian safety. Key intersections include the following:

- Connection from existing US 36 underpass to Hoyt Street (via overpass)
- 144th and Sheridan
- Sheridan south of Midway
- Storage Tek Drive to Parkway Circle (Rock Creek culvert)
- Parkway Circle to east side of Burlington Railroad tracks (Rock Creek culvert)

Desirable design standards for underpasses and overpasses are illustrated in Exhibit 8.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge/ Overpass</th>
<th>Underpass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum vehicle clearance under structure if crossing right-of-way:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minimum clearance for users:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17’ typical</td>
<td>10’ for non- equestrian use trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23’ at railroad tracks</td>
<td>12’ for equestrian use trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum width:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minimum width:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’ trail surface</td>
<td>12’ trail surface with 1’ stamped concrete rumble strip each side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum slope:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maximum slope:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Railings &amp; Fences on structure:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Railings &amp; Fences to approach:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42” for pedestrian only facilities</td>
<td>42” for pedestrian only facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54” for multi-use facilities</td>
<td>54” for multi-use facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12’ for structures with equestrian use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation for underpasses with natural drainage features:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is preferable to avoid walls separating the drainage from the pedestrian trail, as the underpass will have a more open character that improves safety and visibility as well as appearance. If walls are necessary, heights should be minimized. Boulders should be used for retainage where feasible, and landscaping should be compatible with the natural character of the drainageway. Temporary closure of the underpass during relatively infrequent peak flood events is preferable to constructing large retaining walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bicycle Parking**

Providing bicycle parking where feasible at public buildings, employment and commercial centers, trail heads, parks, and along trails would help to promote the network for recreation and short trips. Currently a standard for bicycle parking does not exist in the Standards and Specifications. A standard should be developed for a bike rack that does not require users to remove wheels or lift the bike off the ground to securely lock a bicycle. The preferred location for bicycle racks is in a highly visible area near the trailhead or activity center.

**Trailheads**

Trailheads should maintain consistency with enough variety to be unique to each specific location. In this section, three different types of trailheads are identified.

- Trailheads with Parking (Type 1)
- Trailheads without Parking (Type 2)
- Trailheads at various trail junctions (Type 3)

**Security and Lighting**

Lighting and security measures should be focused in areas where there is dense vegetation or at under/overpasses. Impacts to adjacent residential areas or wildlife should be minimized. The use of white light that highlights the pavement and omits a limited amount of light pollution is preferred for major trail facilities in areas where safety is a concern. Open space trailheads will typically not be lighted but trailheads in commercial or highly developed urban areas may call for lighting.

**TRAILS MANAGEMENT, MAINTENANCE AND USE GUIDELINES**

Existing trails management and maintenance guidelines were reviewed, and modifications suggested where necessary; modifications as well as new proposed guidelines are shown in italics. Additional new guidelines have been proposed to encourage design that supports the needs of wildlife.
| Type 1                  | Intricate system of parking, transit access, information and in essence, a gateway to the trail system.  
|                        | Most complete of all the trailheads discussed in this section.  
|                        | When possible it will be necessary to explore shared used parking options with other facilities (e.g., schools, parks, churches, etc.). Parking for this type of trailhead should be provided in a specific parking lot configuration, rather than shoulders of roadways, and may either be paved, unpaved or a combination of both.  
|                        | Provision for transit access. When a trailhead is located along a designated RTD fixed-route, at a minimum a transit stop should be provided with adequate access to the trail. |
| Type 2                  | Located at junctions where streets bisect trails, or where trails start without parking. When streets bisect trails either side of the trail then becomes an access point, therefore, a trailhead.  
|                        | Should be readily accessible by a variety of trail users.  
|                        | Should be easily visible from the street and fit within the context of the surrounding development.  
|                        | Both sides of the trailhead should complement each other, given the type of adjacent development. |
| Type 3                  | Occur when trails spur off of one another.  
|                        | Least comprehensive of all of the trailheads.  
|                        | Consist of a sign with trail name and directional arrows.  
|                        | Also be referred to as trail junctions.  
|                        | It is important to let the user become aware of what type of facility, or the name of a specific trail that they are approaching. This leads to a safer trail environment and tends to be a more cohesive trail network. |
Existing Trails Management and Maintenance Guidelines

1. Snow Removal

1.1 On concrete trails, snow will be removed per City code. Snow will be removed after all other park maintenance snow removal priorities have been completed. School trail routes will receive the highest priority. Sweeping will be done on an as-needed basis.

1.2 On soft surface trails no snow removal will be done. Surface grading and trail repairs will be addressed as needed. Weeds will be controlled using mechanical, biological, grazing, or chemicals controlled as needed.

Recommended Additional Trail Management Guidelines

2. Trail Alignment and Design for Wildlife Management

2.1 Conserve high-quality habitats and manage human uses as follows:

- Consult with a wildlife biologist to determine appropriate setbacks from critical wildlife habitat and other site-specific wildlife issues for each trail early in the design process.
- Provide a minimum 50-foot trail setback for wetlands where feasible.
- Where possible, avoid locating trails near large trees that currently or could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptors or where hanging branches create safety concerns for pedestrians.
- Close trails with occupied raptor nests during the breeding season. If the trail is a school route it may remain open.
- Establish vegetation screening (thickets of tall shrubs) between a parallel trail and wildlife habitat, at least intermittently.
- Avoid disturbing areas of native prairie or high-quality non-native grassland, since it may be difficult to regenerate such habitat once disturbed. Trails should skirt these areas if possible.
- Trails provided near wildlife areas should be slow-speed and soft surface where possible, to avoid startling wildlife and disrupting habitat. Where possible, buffers between the trail and nesting or denning sites should be established.

3. Trail Maintenance

3.1 Minimize mow swaths along trails through open space parcels if possible. If mowing is necessary to address weed control or safety visibility issues, limit the swath to 24 inches where feasible to minimize the amount of habitat fragmentation. The standard dimension for mowing is five feet along a trail if needed and 15 feet behind homes if terrain allows for the mowing.

3.2 If mowing is done because of concerns about fires from tossed cigarette butts, place no-smoking signs at the access point of trails through areas that are particularly fire-prone. An example would be an open space area within a residential development.

3.3 If trails pass through areas that are highly erodible or tend to remain wet for long periods following rainfall or snowmelt,
consider some type of surface improvement, coupled with “please stay on trail” signs, to reduce the tendency for soft-surface trails to become wider, especially when mountain bikes are a permitted use.

3.4 Provide for routine weed eradication on crusher fines trails. Alternatively, amend the existing construction specification to provide for a geotextile fabric weed barrier to be placed over the subgrade to inhibit weed growth.

4. **Trail Use**

4.1 Prepare an ordinance to amend the Municipal Code to identify appropriate uses allowed on the trails. This would include hours of use, limitations (if any) on motorized or equestrian use, smoking and alcohol restrictions, and the like.
Chapter 9
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE STEWARDSHIP: PROPOSED MUNICIPAL CODE REVISIONS

A major goal of the OSPRT Master Plan is to establish Broomfield as a model for good stewardship of community open lands. The plan offers a number of tools to meet this objective, including the guidelines for public use presented in Appendix D; the management and maintenance guidelines presented in Appendix E; and proposed revisions to the municipal code, presented in this chapter.

Proposed revisions to the municipal code are expected to directly influence the types of natural resources and features that are preserved as Broomfield develops. They are also expected to influence the quality of lands received in fulfillment of parkland dedication requirements, and the ability of these properties to fulfill desired program objectives. These revisions to the municipal code would affect Section 17-38-120 and 220, which set forth the PUD process and standards that Broomfield uses as the basis for requiring detailed studies and to address open space, parks, recreation, and trails. Recommendations for revisions are summarized below. Other code amendments may be best served by creating entirely new code sections.

PROMOTE CONSERVATION OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCES THROUGH SITE PLAN DESIGN STANDARDS

Issue
Currently the 1995 Broomfield Master Plan contains guidelines suggesting that developers orient open lands around natural areas and protect sensitive environmental features, but the Code does not implement these plan policies with specific open space standards. The result is that in some cases significant resources are well preserved, and in other cases they may not be.

Because the OSPRT Plan is recommending an explicit open space public land dedication requirement, it is in Broomfield’s interest to provide clearer guidelines regarding the types of natural and/or cultural resources to be preserved in whole or part, to ensure that the types of lands acquired through dedication are those that residents most value.
Recommendation: Amend the development code to identify the types of natural areas and features that should be conserved through the open space public land dedication requirements for new residential development. Such natural areas and features, if preserved, will benefit all residents by achieving community-wide open space goals identified in the OSPRT Plan.

For example, open space public land dedication criteria might state that open space is preferred when the natural feature is adjacent to an existing community park or open space; provides a necessary link in the off-street trail system; provides for significant public use; or would establish a “green edge” to separate the Broomfield from adjacent communities.

Significant natural areas or features that have been identified through the OSPRT Needs Assessment Survey include:
- Drainageways, and associated setbacks from wetlands and/or floodplains;
- Wetlands (Wetlands deemed to have minimal ecological value may be excluded at staff discretion);
- Lakes, ponds, reservoirs, irrigation ditches and other water features;
- Critical wildlife habitat and migration corridors;
- Ridgelines or steep slopes;
- Significant areas of undisturbed native vegetation;
- Significant geologic features;
- Areas providing for significant passive recreation opportunities;
- Trail corridors;
- Views;
- Green edge community separators; and
- Other key features as identified through site-specific environmental assessments.

The developer should conserve these features in whole or part, where identified on the OSPRT Plan map or through site-specific ecological assessment at the time of application.

These criteria shall also be used as guidelines in site plan review for non-residential development even though no dedication is required.

Broomfield should retain the discretion to accept any dedication of land containing significant natural resources and features. In all cases, whether these features are dedicated to the public or retained in common or private ownership, the regulations should make clear which party is responsible for ongoing maintenance of such lands.

Mapping efforts undertaken using the City’s GIS data and an independent ecological assessment completed as a part of this OSPRT planning process, suggest that approximately 2,700 undeveloped acres are presently available which would meet some or all of the above criteria.
PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
LOCATION AND DESIGN
STANDARDS

In addition to ensuring an appropriate quantity of publicly dedicated land, it is important to ensure that dedicated land is of sufficient quality and meets the OSPRT Plan objectives for location and character of parks and open space in all districts, including PUDs. This section recommends additional design and location standards for dedicated parks and open space land.

Parkland Suitability

Recommendation: Amend the Code to stipulate that parkland should meet the specific program and environmental criteria defined in the OSPRT Plan, including land that:

- Meets specific park size requirements as follows: City/countywide park (81 to 150 acres), Community park (21 to 80 acres), Neighborhood park (three to 20 acres), and Joint school park (eight to 15 acres).
- Accommodates programming requirements defined through the park design standards set forth in the OSPRT Plan.
- Offers suitable terrain to accommodate intended uses without extensive earthwork.
- Contains and preserves significant natural features.
- Minimizes parking and circulation impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

The parkland location should be either identified on OSPRT Plan or located in a manner that complements the existing context of open lands.

Provide Connected Parks and Open Space

Recommendation: Amend the Code to include development standards for parks and open space to include the following:

Parks and open space should be organized to create integrated systems that connect with the following types of lands within or adjacent to the development:

- Dedicated public parklands;
- Dedicated school sites;
- Other dedicated or purchased open space areas;
- Portions of the Broomfield Trail (or other community trails system);
- Neighborhood shopping and activity centers;
- Entertainment areas; Transit corridors; and
- Adjacent employment centers.
Design Compact Parks and Open Space

Recommendation: Amend the Code to include development standards for parks and open space to include the following:

- To prevent dedication of irregularly shaped parcels that are generally “left-over” pieces of land in a subdivision, developers should provide parks and open space where appropriate, that are compact and regularly shaped, unless the land is an extension of an existing greenbelt, trail, or other linear park, or unless specific topographic features require a different configuration (e.g., provision along a creek or rock outcropping).

Develop Parkland that is Accessible, Secure and Visible to Residents

Recommendation: Amend the Code to include development standards for parks to include:

- Parks, particularly neighborhood, community, and regional parks, should be centrally located and accessible to the residents they are intended to serve. These parks should front on a minimum of two local or collector streets with reasonable frontage on each street, unless the decision-making body determines there is a more desirable location for the park that is equally as accessible to the served lots.
- Landscaping and grading should not block visibility into the park. Neighborhood-scale parks (three to 20 acres in size) are to be located within 1/2 mile of each resident’s home. Community-scale parks of greater than 20 acres are to be located within a two-mile radius.

Dedicating Stormwater Detention Areas as Open Space or Parks

Issue
Detention areas should first and foremost serve as stormwater detention facilities and meet environmental quality standards. Currently, the Code allows for a 50 percent credit for detention areas to meet the public land dedication requirement. More guidance is needed to insure that detention areas that are being credited to meet the public
land dedication requirement provide either open space that has a natural character, or useable parkland, so that the intent of the public land dedication is met more fully.

Recommendation: Amend the Code to include standards for detention areas that are credited towards the public land dedication requirement according to the following language:

- Developers receive up to 50 percent credit for public land dedication for the useable portions of detention areas that accomplish the following objectives:

**For Open Space:** The 10-year storm storage capacity area is designed as a wetland amenity. The landscaping creates a natural wetland appearance by using plant materials such as native grasses, trees, and shrubs. Trail access and seating areas are provided for pedestrians where appropriate that are located above the 10-year storm capacity area.

**For Parks:** The benched area above the 10-year storm storage capacity is designed so that it is useable park area for activities such as playfields. The proposed park area is useable by the public a majority of the time.

Coordination with the 1995 Master Plan Update will be necessary to refine the recommendation for implementation.

---

### Using Wetland Swales for Stormwater Conveyance

#### Issue
Whenever practicable, it is beneficial in terms of ecology, visual aesthetics, and water quality to use open wetland swales for stormwater conveyance, in lieu of storm sewers. Techniques for ensuring adequate conveyance while achieving a natural appearance are widely used and often available “off-the-shelf.” These include “natural” drop structures and channel sinuosity to achieve a stable grade and support for wetland vegetation.

Recommendation: Amend the Code to add general language or guidelines to encourage the use of open wetland swales for stormwater conveyance, in lieu of storm sewers where practicable. The open swales should be constructed with a natural, vegetated bottom and side slopes and can be planted with trees and shrubs (placed to not obstruct flood conveyance). Some relief from setbacks or other development standards may be appropriate to create incentives to use this design to overcome the fact that development can occur on top of storm sewers but not open swales.

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PROTECTION STANDARDS

The following additional standards for protection of environmental features, including wetlands, streams, and water features, mature trees and stands of vegetation, ridgelines, and wildlife habitat are proposed.
Drainageway and Stream (Riparian) Corridor Protection

Issue
The 1995 Broomfield Master Plan recommends preservation of riparian corridors defined as the “area at least 50 feet outwards from the edge of the outer bank” of the stream channel. The 1995 Plan also recommends that riparian corridors be dedicated for public use, and that setbacks are sufficient to accommodate habitat conservation, flood management, and trails and landscape buffers. Many communities are choosing to require setbacks that vary based on the type of stream, water corridor, or wetland to be protected and that are wider than 50 feet to protect water quality and other ecological values. The following recommendation sets forth more specific setbacks to allow for protection of riparian areas and allows for mitigation when it is not feasible to meet the setbacks.

Recommendation: Amend the Code to include stream corridor and wetland protection language such as the following:

- Establish a minimum 50-foot setback requirement from the edge of perennial and seasonal stream banks to the lot line that does not have mature trees. When the stream bank is not determinable, measure 50-feet from the centerline according to the Broomfield drainageway master plan.
- Establish a minimum 100-foot setback from the edge of perennial and seasonal stream banks to the lot line for riparian corridors with mature trees to minimize disturbance to wildlife habitat. The setback should preserve the outermost edge of the land beneath the tree canopy and allow for a buffer area between the developed area of the site and the vegetation located along the stream. In areas where significant habitat exists along the stream bank, a setback greater than 100 feet may be necessary to preserve habitat and wildlife corridors. A site-specific assessment will assist staff in determining the appropriate setback.
- Establish a minimum 50-foot setback from the edge of wetlands.
- Establish a minimum 100-foot-wide setback for high-quality wetlands along a drainageway around a marsh or pond to minimize disturbance to wildlife habitat.
- If no feasible alternatives exist for complying with the setback and it creates a physical hardship, a variance may be requested or a portion of the stream channel may be altered, relocated, or piped if restoration is provided. Restoration of wetlands should occur at a 2 to 1 ratio. On-site restoration is strongly encouraged if the end result will be a wetland similar in character to the naturally occurring wetland or stream corridor. In some instances, it may be appropriate to create a wetland that differs in plant species from the impacted wetland to encourage plant community diversity.
Ridgeline Protection

Issue
Broomfield is interested in protecting views and scenic quality and a ridgeline guideline is one approach to protecting scenic views. Such a guideline might be useful in evaluating proposals for development in and near the high points identified in Chapter 2.

Numerous Front Range communities in Colorado have adopted ridgeline guidelines or standards. The City of Fort Collins, for example, requires that developers establish “limits of disturbance” lines and natural buffer zones that include ridgelines so that structures blend naturally into the landscape. Ridgelines include “the crest of any hill or slope so designated, plus the land located within 100 horizontal feet (plan view) on either side of the crest of the hill or slope.” Many mountain communities have adopted these standards where ridgelines are more prominent in the landscape. Routt County, Colorado (Town of Steamboat) has recently adopted a ridgeline protection ordinance.

Recommendation: Amend the Code to add language to protect ridgelines, such as requiring that structures blend naturally into the landscape so that they do not loom above the ridgeline.

Tree Preservation

Issue
The 1995 Broomfield Master Plan recommends conserving natural features such as woodlands and existing trees, but the Code does not contain tree preservation standards.

The City of Fort Collins is the model for the recommendations below. The City of Arvada has similar tree preservation and replacement requirements. Another useful resource is: “Tree Conservation Ordinances,” (Duerksen and Richman, 1993) for an example of tree conservation ordinances and rationale for conserving trees.

Recommendation: Amend the Code to require preservation of trees during site development. Preservation standards include:

- Protect large mature trees or “specimen trees” (e.g., trees greater than six-inch caliper at diameter breast height (DBH) should not be removed),
- Protect certain species (e.g., cottonwoods or other desirable species should not be removed, but invasive species such as Russian Olive Trees should be removed), and where it is not feasible to protect and retain significant existing tree(s) or to transplant them to another on-site location, the developer shall replace trees to mitigate the loss of value of a removed significant tree, and follow a schedule and requirements for replacement trees.
- The value of trees to be lost is to be determined by a qualified landscape appraiser using the most recent published methods established by the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers.
The developer must replace trees lost with a tree or trees that are equally valued — up to six replacement trees per every removed tree.

- Replacement trees must meet the following minimum size requirements:
  - Canopy shade trees three-inch caliper balled and burlap or equivalent;
  - Ornamental trees two and one-half inch caliper;
  - Evergreen eight-foot height balled and burlap.

- Adopt tree protection specifications, including no cut or fill within drip line, and erection of barriers prior and during construction.

**Restoring Native Vegetation in Disturbed Areas**

**Issue**

By encouraging the restoration of native vegetation in areas that have been disturbed due to construction the need for water to maintain landscaping in the future can be minimized.

**Recommendation:** Amend the Code to add general language to require the use of native seed mixes, as well as shrubs and trees if water is deemed adequate for use in disturbed open space areas and other areas disturbed by construction where appropriate. Broomfield will develop several approved seed/plant palettes for moist or dry sites. A developer may propose another plant palette but it would need to be approved by Broomfield Open Space and Parks Maintenance staff. Temporary irrigation may be necessary for some restoration plans.

**Wildlife Protection**

**Issue**

The 1995 Master Plan contains a number of policies that address wildlife preservation, but the code does not contain wildlife protection standards that provide guidance on the protection of federally or state-listed threatened and endangered or sensitive species. The City of Fort Collins, for example, requires that sites within 500 feet of an established “natural area” shall provide a development plan with provisions.
to ensure that habitat is not disturbed or diminished. The City of Fort Collins also requires that development plans show connections to natural areas and preserve natural area connections. Other communities require measures such as buffers and setbacks from natural areas, restrictions on planting non-native vegetation, fencing design, and domestic animal control.

Recommendation: Amend the code to require a Wildlife/Environmental Analysis and methods to mitigate wildlife impacts for proposed development projects. Standards would provide protection for habitat and species identified by the state (i.e., CDOW, accessible at http://wildlife.state.co.us/), federal surveys (i.e., United States Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”) accessible at http://endangered.fws.gov/) or Broomfield local surveys and the high value ecological areas mapped as part of the OSPRT Plan.

For purposes of this document, wildlife species and habitats addressed by the wildlife plan include the following:
(1) Threatened or endangered plant and wildlife species present on the site.
(2) Prairie dog colonies, including the estimated population size, presence or absence of burrowing owls, and proposed method for compliance with the Broomfield Prairie Dog Conservation and Management Policies.
(3) Presence and preservation or replacement of mature trees (greater than 6 inches in diameter) that provide potential habitat for nesting birds of prey (“raptors”) or native migratory or resident songbirds.
(4) Presence and preservation, enhancement, or mitigation of wetlands greater than 0.1 acre in size, regardless of whether considered jurisdictional by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, that provide potential water quality benefits and habitat for wetland birds; and
(5) Presence and preservation, enhancement, or mitigation of aquatic habitats, including permanent or seasonal ponds and drainages that provide potential habitat for fish or amphibians or that support, or are capable of supporting through enhancement, desirable wetland or riparian communities.

The PUD Wildlife/Environmental Analysis should address measures to minimize conflicts between wildlife and residents. Additionally, the plan and analysis shall also conform to applicable federal and state statutes regarding the management of wildlife, including:

- Colorado Division of Wildlife permit or permission from a district wildlife manager is required to relocate wildlife. See Chapter 3 - Article 1 - #302-A-3.
- Colorado Division of Wildlife permit is required to possess wildlife alive. See Chapter 13 - Article 1 - #1300.
- Colorado Revised Statutes 33-3-106-3 Excessive damage - permit to take wildlife - harassment by dogs states: "Nothing in this section shall make it unlawful to trap, kill, or otherwise dispose of bears, mountain lions, or dogs in situations when it is necessary to prevent them from inflicting death or injury to livestock or human life and additionally, in the case of dogs, when it is necessary to prevent them from inflicting death or injury to big game.
other than bear or mountain lion and to small game, birds, and mammals. The division may bring a civil action against the owner of any dog inflicting death or injury to any big game other than bear or mountain lion and to small game, birds, and mammals for the value of each game animal injured or killed."

- **Colorado Revised Statutes 33-6-107(9)**
  Licensing violations - penalties
  states: "For the purposes of this section, any person, any member of such person's family, or any employee of the person may hunt, trap, or take black-billed magpies, common crows, starlings, English or house sparrows, common pigeons, coyotes, bobcats, red foxes, raccoons, jackrabbits, badgers, marmots, prairie dogs, pocket gophers, Richardson's ground squirrels, rock squirrels, thirteen-lined ground squirrels, porcupines, crayfish, tiger salamanders, muskrats, beavers, exotic wildlife, and common snapping turtles on lands owned or leased by the person without securing licenses to do so, but only when such wildlife is causing damage to crops, real or personal property, or livestock. Any person may kill skunks or rattlesnakes when necessary to protect life or property."

- **Colorado Revised Statutes 33-6-128**
  Damage or destruction of dens or nests - harassment of wildlife
  states: "Unless permitted by the division, it is unlawful for any person to willfully damage or destroy any wildlife den or nest or their eggs or to harass any wildlife." For purposes of this subsection (1), nothing shall prohibit the removal of wildlife dens or nests when necessary to prevent damage to property or livestock or while trapping.

- **Colorado Revised Statutes 33-6-130**
  Explosives, toxicants, and poisons not to be used
  states: "Unless permitted by law or by the division, it is unlawful for any person to use toxicants, poisons, drugs, dynamite, explosives, or any stupefying substances for the purpose of hunting, taking, or harassing any wildlife."
Open Space Zone District

Issue
The current Open Space District (Section 17-07) establishes provisions for open space conservation areas within Broomfield. This district helps prevent conversion of open space to other urban uses without adequate public review and approval. Many open space areas are not currently zoned as open space. In addition, the standards for lots and yards are not relevant for conservation of open space. Several of the allowable uses such as parks and cemeteries should also be removed from the zone district, as the purpose of the district is to preserve open space.

Recommendation: Amend the Open Space Zone District by updating the zoning map to ensure that all city-owned and dedicated properties are zoned as open space, if deemed necessary by Council as individual PUDs may already provide for adequate protection of open space areas. In addition, make text revisions to update the provisions of the district. The following text changes would make the district consistent with the OSPRT Plan:

- Expand the “Intent” section to reflect OSPRT Plan goals.
- Expand by-right permitted uses to include any others defined as part of the OSPRT Plan. Remove parks from the permitted uses section and define recreation as including only passive uses.
- Remove cemeteries from the permitted uses by special review.

- Amend Section 17-07-020 to require that public utility structures, public utility buildings, water storage reservoirs, street, road, or highway rights of way require special review and are no longer permitted uses by right.
- Remove the minimum lot area and yard requirements that are not relevant to open space areas, but retain the maximum building height requirement.

Public Parks and Open Space Land—Ownership, Disposal, and Change of Use

Issue
Broomfield currently has a regulation in the Municipal Code (Section 2-74-040) to require approval by registered electors during a regular or special election to dispose of city-owned open space land. However, Broomfield does not currently have a policy or rule to govern the process for a change in use, trade, or lease of open space land. Furthermore, the existing rule does not apply to parkland.
Recommendation: Amend Chapter 2-74 of the Municipal Code to require that for any proposal to change the use of a property or portion of a park or open space property that is owned as fee simple by Broomfield the following process applies:

- Publish notice of the OSTAC or PRAC meeting regarding the discussion of the change of use, sale, or trade of property. Notify adjacent property owners of record title by mail of the OSTAC or PRAC meeting.
- OSTAC or PRAC (depending on if the land is open space or park land) makes a recommendation to the Council on the proposed change of use, trade, or sale of the property.
- Publish public notice prior to the Council meeting to discuss change of use, sale or trade of property;
- Provide notice to adjacent property owners of record title by mail of the City Council meeting;
- Require a 60-day waiting period after a City Council vote to allow citizens to petition to hold a referendum to approve/disapprove of change of use, sale, or trade of public open space or parkland; and
- Upon sale, disposal, or change of use, reimburse either the open space fund or park fund with monies equivalent to the appraised value of the property at the time of the action.

The planning team conducted research to determine how local Colorado Front Range jurisdictions address the issue of disposal, trade, conveyance, lease, or change in use to open space land. Results from the research are presented in Appendix H and are summarized below. Of the nine municipalities and counties contacted, which included Boulder, Boulder County, Colorado Springs, Douglas County, Fort Collins, Jefferson County, Longmont, Thornton and Westminster, the majority have rules on the books—either in their codes or in sales tax resolutions—to govern change in use, trade, or lease of open space land.

The rules vary among communities as follows: Some require only a vote of the council or commission to dispose of or change use of open space property (City of Fort Collins, Jefferson County, City of Thornton, Douglas County). Others require advisory committee review and recommendation prior to elected body vote. Still others require that the jurisdiction postpone actual disposal or change in use of property for a 60-day period after the elected body votes to allow citizens to petition to hold a referendum to approve/disapprove of sale, lease, or trade (Boulder County, City of Boulder, City of Colorado Springs, and City of Longmont). Jefferson County requires that the trade would result in a greater financial gain or the quality of the property proposed for trade would have to be greater. Almost all jurisdictions require that proceeds from sale
or change in use must be returned to the open space or park fund depending on the type of land.

IDENTIFYING PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS AS IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED OF SUBDIVIDERS

Finally, Section 16-32-20 of Broomfield’s municipal code does not presently identify parks, open space and trails as specific improvements that are required to be installed by subdividers. Section 16-32-20 (K) does provide for “Other improvements, both on-site and off-site, not specifically mentioned, but found necessary due to impacts created on existing or proposed public facilities” but parks, open space and trails are not called out explicitly.

Recommendation: Amend Section 16-32-20 of the Municipal Code to clearly state that parks, open space and trails are improvements that must be provided, consistent with quality and quantity standards established in the OSPRT Plan, by any subdivider.
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Chapter 10
IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCE STRATEGIES FOR ACHIEVING OPEN LANDS GOALS

This chapter discusses a range of implementation and finance strategies that may be used to enable Broomfield to meet the open lands acreage goal established in this Plan. While the OSPRT plan is intended to provide guidance for a 20-year timeframe, it is highly desirable that valued open space and parks properties and trails easements be preserved or acquired in a much shorter timeframe, before they are threatened by development.

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

Exhibit 10.1 provides a summary of the overall open lands goal, the current level of attainment, acres to be provided through projects currently in progress, and level of attainment expected at buildout.

After accounting for the 865 acres of open lands designated in the approved Preble Creek PUD, and for a proposed 330 acre reservoir/open lands site west of Lowell Boulevard and north of 144th Avenue, 2,087 acres remain to be preserved or acquired to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 10.1: SUMMARY OF OPEN LANDS GOALS AND CUMULATIVE ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Open Lands Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing open lands as of 5/7/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lands as Designated in the Approved Preble Creek PUD as of 1/28/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Reservoir/Open Lands Site (W. of Lowell Blvd./N. of 144th Ave.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Open Lands to be Added at Buildout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meet the overall open lands goal. Approximately 2,700 undeveloped acres of high and moderate value lands are available within Broomfield to meet this goal, but these lands are facing competing pressures from development and their continued availability cannot be taken for granted. To achieve the open lands goal, Broomfield must employ a variety of creative financing and acquisition strategies and proactively secure those properties that can best complement the existing open lands system before they are lost to development.

Broomfield to achieve 87% of the overall open lands goal.\(^{22}\)

Achieving the remainder of the goal will require other strategies, which may include encouraging the formation of a foundation that would have more flexibility to solicit gifts or donations and independently raise funds; a temporary increase in the open space and parks sales tax rate to fund specific and potentially time-sensitive acquisitions; and financial partnerships with other communities. More aggressive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 10.2: SUMMARY OF OPEN LANDS TO BE ADDED AT BUILDOUT, BY SOURCE</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Parks, Including Joint School Parks</th>
<th>Other Open Lands</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Open Lands to be Added at Buildout</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided for via public land dedication as specified in OSPRT plan (includes 36 acres of joint school parks)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided for via sales tax</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided via purchase, deed restriction, gift or other methods</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OSPRT plan has proposed a revised parkland dedication requirement of 16 acres and an open space dedication requirement of eight acres per 1,000 persons, as discussed in more detail in this chapter and in Chapter 11. As shown in Exhibit 10.2, these new requirements would yield approximately 363 acres of parkland and open space. Projected sales tax revenues are estimated to provide for 766 acres of open space and 46 acres of parkland. Together, the revised public land dedication requirement and projected sales tax revenues, coupled with open lands acquired to date or projected to be acquired in the immediate future, will allow pursuit of conservation easements and other types of deed restrictions may also be necessary.

\(^{22}\) This is computed as follows: 6285 acres of open lands currently existing + 865 acres open lands as designated in the approved Preble Creek PUD as of 1/28/2003 + 363 acres from revised public land dedication, including joint use school parkland + 766 acres from open space sales tax + 46 acres from parks sales tax = 8,325 acres or 87% of 9,567 acre open lands goal
It should be noted that this analysis is sensitive to assumptions made about the cost of acquiring raw land, as well as factors such as inflation. The OSPRT plan thus recommends that a more detailed financial feasibility analysis be completed for strategies and options that are deemed viable. This analysis should ideally attempt to project the revenues raised and resulting acres that could be purchased. In cases where an increase to the current sales tax might be considered, candidate projects or project types should be identified. Assumptions made in these more detailed analyses should then be revisited from year to year. Additionally, an annual “implementation progress report” showing the acres obtained from dedication and existing sales tax should also be prepared, to aid in determining at what time point additional revenue sources might need to be initiated.

PROJECTED CAPITAL AND OPERATIONS COSTS

This section estimates capital costs associated with improving open lands not provided for through public land dedication, and also discusses operational and maintenance costs associated with adding the open lands acreage called for in this plan.

Projected Development Costs for Lands Not Provided through Dedication

Approximately 363 acres of parks, open space, and joint school parks are expected to be provided through the proposed public land dedication requirement. These lands will be dedicated with all improvements, such as playing fields, trails, parking, and the like, provided. This is not the case for lands acquired via the sales tax or other methods. For such lands, projected development costs are estimated below.

Open space development costs are very difficult to estimate because they will vary greatly according to the natural resource value and level of public use anticipated for each individual property. Some properties may function as preserves, with limited public access, and development costs for these properties may be very low or even zero. Other properties may support trails and trailhead access, passive recreation and/or may be suitable for ecological restoration or enhancement. Because the level of improvements will vary so significantly with each property, attempts to develop a per-acre cost for open space would be highly speculative and perhaps misleading. At the time of acquisition, it will be appropriate to identify in general terms the types of uses that are anticipated. Once the property is purchased, a management and master plan should be developed to provide detail on uses and improvement costs.

In the case of parks, however, there is general agreement among metro-area communities on “rules of thumb” for estimating development costs. Per-acre development costs typically range between $100,000 and $160,000, depending on the type and scale of the park (e.g., neighborhood vs. community). To gauge costs associated with improving the 137 acres of parkland not provided for through dedication, development costs of $120,000 per acre have been applied. This figure reflects the level of development in a roughly 15-acre neighborhood park, and might include picnic areas, open lawns,
playground, practice fields, trails, and a small parking area. Using this figure, total costs for developing the 137 acres of parkland are estimated at $16.4 million.

Projected costs for developing the Broomfield trails system are shown in Exhibit 10.3 below. These include on- and off-street missing trail links that are part of the overall system. These costs do not include land acquisition or easements, design and engineering services, utility relocation or compliance with any regulatory or permitting requirements. Bike lanes would be constructed as new streets are built or as existing streets are upgraded. (The trail costs are based on 2004 estimates of $13.00 per lineal foot for crusher fines trail and $25.00 per lineal foot for concrete trail).

**Projected Open Space Maintenance Staffing**

Presently, Broomfield employs two full-time and one half-time staff member who are dedicated to open space and trails maintenance tasks on City/County owned properties totaling 2005 acres, for a current staffing ratio of one person for every 800 acres. Applying this ratio into the future suggests that Broomfield would need a total of approximately six full-time equivalent staff to maintain the 4,560 acres of open space acquired at buildout. Applying this ratio into the future suggests that Broomfield would need a total of approximately six full-time equivalent staff to maintain the 4,560 acres of open space acquired at buildout. Applying this ratio into the future suggests that Broomfield would need a total of approximately six full-time equivalent staff to maintain the 4,560 acres of open space acquired at buildout. Applying this ratio into the future suggests that Broomfield would need a total of approximately six full-time equivalent staff to maintain the 4,560 acres of open space acquired at buildout. Applying this ratio into the future suggests that Broomfield would need a total of approximately six full-time equivalent staff to maintain the 4,560 acres of open space acquired at buildout.

**Projected Operations and Maintenance Costs**

Acquisition and development of additional acres of parks and open space and miles of trail will have an impact on operations and maintenance costs, and these are considered below. It should be noted that the acres for open space and park used below to estimate future Broomfield maintenance staffing needs are an estimate of how the total open lands at build-out will be allocated between park and open space. It is also important to underscore that maintenance services could be contracted out to the private sector and/or Homeowners Associations may take on maintenance responsibilities while still providing for public access on parkland and open space. These two approaches would result in significantly less maintenance staff than described below.

**EXHIBIT 10.3: PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT COSTS FOR MISSING TRAIL LINKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Crusher Fines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trail Connections</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>$4,484,899</td>
<td>$2,332,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Community Loop</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>$487,173</td>
<td>$253,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>$1,304,409</td>
<td>$678,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Community Link</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>$741,982</td>
<td>$385,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Loop Trail</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>$355,148</td>
<td>$184,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Trail</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>$2,262,913</td>
<td>$1,176,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>72.99</td>
<td>$9,636,524</td>
<td>$5,010,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 This staffing level is based on the following total open space acres at buildout of 4,560 acre: CCOB owned open space = 2,955 acres; other
Front Range communities exhibit wide variability in open space maintenance staffing ratios, ranging from a high of 4,500 acres per staff member in Longmont, to 260 acres per staff member in Westminster. The average for the five communities studied (Ft. Collins, Lakewood, Westminster, Longmont, and Broomfield) was one staff member for each 350 acres of open space – the same figure adopted as a standard by Jefferson County’s Open Space program. Applying this guideline would imply that Broomfield would need up to 13 full-time equivalent maintenance staff dedicated to its open space program at buildout.

It should be kept in mind that the level of open space maintenance staffing will be influenced by the character of the property purchased and degree of public use associated with each property. An ongoing evaluation of appropriate maintenance staffing ratios and number of staff will be necessary from now on to ensure that the public’s expectations for proper maintenance are met.

Projected Parks Maintenance Staffing

Broomfield also employs 40 full-time equivalent staff members who maintain 690 acres of parkland plus 18 acres of other open lands, including detention areas for a total of 708 acres. This provides a staffing ratio of one person for approximately every 18 acres of parkland. Maintaining this staffing ratio would suggest that approximately 28 additional full-time equivalent staff would be needed to maintain the 1,214 acres of parkland at buildout.

As trails are constructed and open space areas are improved for public enjoyment, the level of use is expected to increase and code enforcement issues are expected to be more prevalent. This topic has arisen at community open houses, with residents who abut open space or trails mentioning such issues as off-leash dogs running loose on private property, trails users trespassing or tossing trash on private property, and other similar infractions. Presently, such complaints are referred to the Broomfield Police Department, but over the longer term a code enforcement strategy tailored to the specific needs of parks, open space, and trails will likely be needed.

Elements of this strategy should include signage, as described in Chapter 6, and possibly the use of volunteer rangers. Other communities, including Denver, have established volunteer ranger programs to help with the management of trails and open space areas, educate users, and issue warnings to those violating use regulations. The OSPRT plan recommends studying volunteer programs in other communities to determine their applicability to Broomfield, and if such a program is initiated, targeting resources to neighborhoods and areas where use of trails and open space has markedly increased or where there are multiple, potentially conflicting uses (e.g. trails that might receive significant bicycle and hiker use and possibly equestrian use).

---

24 City of Thornton Staffing Benchmark Analysis, Open Space and Parks Division, January 2003.

25 This staffing level is based on the following total park acres at buildout of 1,214 acres: CCOB owned park = 921 acres; joint school park = 202 acres; park acquired by partnership or other means = 91 acres.
As Broomfield makes more open space available for public use, additional paid staff may also need to be hired to provide code enforcement. Needs for additional code enforcement staff should be evaluated as additional open space areas are made available for public use, and the most suitable assignments for those staff (within the Open Space and Trails Division, Recreation Division, Parks, Open Space and Maintenance Division of Public Works, Building Division with Community Development or the Broomfield Police Department) discussed. The concept of granting enforcement authority to Parks, Open Space and Trails Maintenance staff for the enforcement of Chapter 12-28 of the Broomfield Municipal Code (similar to what the Building Division’s powers are for the enforcement of the building code) should also be considered.

IMPLEMENTATION AND FINANCE STRATEGIES

This section discusses implementation and finance strategies that should be considered in achieving the open lands goal. Where possible, the acres yielded by each strategy have been estimated, and results are shown in Exhibit 10.4. Supporting statistical data and mapping are found in Appendix A.

Modifications to the Public Land Dedication Requirement

Broomfield’s current public land dedication requirement is contained in the subdivision regulations (Section 16-28-120) of the municipal code. The percentage of public land dedicated varies as a percentage of gross density and applies only to residential development. This single standard collectively captures all types of public lands that may be required because of the development, including land for parks, schools, libraries, public safety facilities, and other public uses.

Proposed Revisions: Individual Dedication Requirements for Parks, Open Space and Schools

To ensure that parkland and open space land dedications (including cash-in-lieu) are adequate and meet the community’s needs as identified in the OSPRT Plan, the plan recommends revising the current public land dedication requirement to identify separately: (1) a parkland dedication requirement; (2) an open space land dedication requirement; and (3) a requirement for schools and other public facilities such as fire stations, library, public works buildings, as appropriate.

To ensure that all these dedication requirements do not consume a disproportionate percentage of gross land area within individual developments, the plan proposes that Broomfield establish a cash-in-lieu of land dedication option for developments where the total land dedications for parks and open space would consume more than 25 percent of the development’s gross land area, based on population build out projections.
1) Parkland Dedication: 16 acres of developed/improved land per 1,000 persons, including up to five acres of joint school park facilities;  
2) Open Space Land Dedication: eight acres of land per 1,000 persons;  
3) School Land Dedication for elementary schools, per school district requirements; and  
4) Public land dedication cap of 25% gross land area generating the open lands requirement for the sum of items 1 through 3 above. If population-based dedications for park, open space, and elementary school park lands would otherwise exceed this cap, cash-in-lieu, land, or other amenities may be used to meet the remaining dedication requirement. Cash-in-lieu values are based on improved park or open space land.

Specific criteria will be developed as part of the code amendment to identify the type of contribution that may be appropriate given the unique features of the developer’s project.

All other public uses, including public roads, would not fall within the 25% cap.

### Proposed Revisions: Explicit Parkland Dedication Standards

When the Broomfield County Commons facilities are completed, Broomfield will be providing 16 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons. The OSPRT Plan has recommended that this be adopted as the level of service standard. Doing so would ensure that the current level of service is maintained into the future. It also would contribute to achieving the overall 40 percent open lands goal established in the OSPRT and 1995 Master Plans.

Just as important as achieving overall parkland acreage goals, the mix and distribution of parkland and types of parks should accomplish the objectives of the OSPRT Plan. Specific service standards and dedication requirements have therefore been proposed for each park type to ensure that the mix of park types reflects the community’s needs and expressed values.

### Proposed Revisions: Explicit Open Space Dedication Standards

The previous chapter outlined proposals for revising the municipal code to specify those natural resources and features that should be protected during the site or development plan review process. To preserve core resources without rendering a site undevelopable, the OSPRT Master Plan recommends establishing a specific dedication requirement for open space in proposed residential developments. Where significant natural resources and features exist, the requirement would most likely be completely met through dedication of the actual, physical features. Where no features are present, cash-in-lieu could be obtained at the City/County’s discretion. Obtaining cash-in-lieu would allow the City/County to pool its resources to acquire other significant high-value open space parcels for communitywide benefit.

The justification for the open space land dedication standard based on population is supported by the following points:

- The standard ensures that all future developments contribute a proportionate amount of open space lands (or cash) to help achieve Broomfield’s policy goal adopted in the
OSPRT Plan of 40 percent open lands citywide. As demonstrated in the 2002 Community Needs Assessment Survey, residents value open space as a community amenity similar to parks, and development creates a demand for open space.

- Contribution of land and/or cash-in-lieu for open space provides benefits that the entire community enjoys. The open lands system serves the community as a whole and is not mutually exclusive to particular neighborhoods or geographic areas.

The minimum standard of eight acres per 1,000 persons was derived from extensive analysis of adjacent municipalities’ requirements, as well as simulation of the effects of alternative dedication standards (e.g. greater or lesser than eight acres) on the amount of gross land area that would need to be dedicated.

Exhibit 10.4 shows that these revised public land dedication requirements would yield 363 acres of open lands: 109 acres of open space, 218 acres of parkland, and an estimated 36 acres of joint school/park land. A more detailed discussion of the proposed public land dedication formula is found in Chapter 11.

Open Space and Parks Sales Tax

Between 1996 and 2002, Broomfield has realized approximately $13.2 million in open space sales tax revenue, ranging from a low of $1.2 million to a high of $2.6 million per year. To anticipate the future yield from the sales tax, projections were made of revenues and expenses through 2020, including debt service. Results are shown in Exhibit 10.4. This analysis assumes a $40,000 initial per-acre acquisition cost in 2004, incremented by 5% each year through 2020. The incremental cost in the year of the debt issuance was used to derive acreage that might be purchased. For the debt issuances, it was assumed that borrowing occurs for 20 years at 5% with semi-annual payments. Based on this analysis, it is estimated that approximately 766 acres of open space and 46 acres of parkland could be acquired.

While additional sales tax revenues may be projected beyond 2020, many desirable properties could be lost to development by that time. Because acquisition of many properties is expected to be time-sensitive, two strategies should be considered that would permit more timely modification and use of sales tax monies to strategically acquire desirable properties before they are lost to development.

26 Open space tax yield analysis completed by OSTAC Chair Pat Quinn, Quinn, Stevens, Veta and Associates, PC, Spring 2003 and City and County of Broomfield Finance Department. Parks sales tax yield estimated by Recreation Services staff and City and County of Broomfield Finance Department. Supplementary analysis completed for Open Space Business Plan dated June 17, 2004.
EXHIBIT 10.4: DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OPEN LANDS AT BUILDOUT
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Temporary Increase in Open Space Sales Tax Rate for Specific Projects

Recommendation: Where specific, high-value property acquisitions may be identified, Broomfield should consider a request to the voters to temporarily increase the sales tax rate to fund these specific projects. Examples may include a very large acquisition of a signature property that preserves significant natural features, that provides a key “missing link” in the existing system, and that may also provide opportunities for parkland.

Temporary Earmarking of a Portion of the General Sales Tax

A related strategy that may also be explored, again to fund specific projects, is a temporary earmarking of a portion of the county’s general sales tax revenues, for the acquisition of open lands. This strategy may be explored, for example, to use sales tax dollars from commercial development to purchase valued open space adjacent to that property. It may also be applicable in cases such as described above, where specific properties are identified and funds are needed more quickly than can be attained through the open space/parks sales tax alone.

Recommendation: Where appropriate, Broomfield should consider temporarily earmarking a portion of the county’s general sales tax revenues for open space or parks purchases.

Broomfield’s General Fund

A third source of funding for open space and parks acquisition is the General Fund. Historically, funding amounts for open lands have varied a great deal based on project opportunities and because the Fund supports many essential municipal services. Given the many important services the Fund addresses, it is not possible for the City and County to earmark a consistent funding amount for open lands purchases from year to year. As a matter of policy, however, the OSPRT Master Plan recommends that the City direct some level of General Fund monies each year toward the achievement of the open lands goal. This could come in the form of the existing Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds, or from other accounts.

Recommendation: Dedicate some portion of the General Fund toward acquiring community open lands each year, and report utilization of funds and progress toward the goal to OSTAC, PRAC, Council, and the public on an annual basis.
Revolving Loan Fund for Land Banking

To enhance Broomfield’s ability to make timely and strategic acquisitions, the OSPRT plan recommends the use of the existing General Fund to establish a revolving loan fund for land banking. This fund could be called upon to purchase a specific and valuable parcel in cases where existing funding streams were not adequate or sufficiently timely to support the purchase. In effect the City would make itself a loan from the General Fund, to be repaid by future revenue streams.

Unless new revenue sources were identified to support this revolving loan fund, this recommendation would primarily address the need for an expedited source of funding to support acquisitions which required more cash than had been accumulated by the open space sales tax at the time. Unless new revenue sources are found to sustain the revolving loan fund, it would not yield more acres than would otherwise be obtained by the open space sales tax.

Broomfield’s Property Tax: Temporary Mill Levy Increase

Another potential source of funding could be a specific temporary mill levy increase in Broomfield’s property tax that would be dedicated for open space/park acquisition and improvements. In order to implement this option, the proposal would need to be passed by the citizens of Broomfield in an election.

Recommendation: Where appropriate, Broomfield should consider the option to propose a temporary increase in the mill levy to provide revenues for open space or parks purchases and improvements.

Establish a Foundation and Encourage Donations of Land or Easements

Form a Foundation to Assist with Purchase and Conservation of Open Space, Parks, or Trails

Broomfield currently obtains open space via public land dedication, direct acquisition or conservation easement/donation. As a municipal entity, however, the City does not engage in independent fundraising to supplement these sources.
Recommendation: Encourage interested residents to proceed with a plan to create a foundation, or a partnership with an existing foundation. This could focus on the preservation of open lands, or on a specific issue, such as completion of the community and regional trail network. Encourage the foundation to pursue grant writing and public-private partnerships to leverage resources. The Foundation Board should report foundation activities and contribution towards the open lands goal to Council and the public on an annual basis.

Citizen-initiated “Friends of...” parks, recreation, and open space organizations are common throughout the United States, especially in large municipalities. San Francisco and Chicago, for example, have had such advocacy programs in place for decades. Literature searches and web sites also indicate that these organizations are becoming more common in smaller locales. For example the Friends of West Windsor (New Jersey) Open Space (FOWWOS) was founded in 1996. San Luis Obispo citizens started a group ten years ago. These organizations typically serve the following functions:

1. Promote conservation of open space.
2. Assist local governments with their education, resource management, and acquisition programs.
3. Raise funds for purchasing properties.
4. Promote resource study and conservation.
5. Engage in other charitable and educational activities related to open space conservation or parks.

Jefferson County Open Space Foundation is a citizen-initiated organization that works with the county to foster protection, enhancement, and enjoyment of the natural resources throughout the county. This organization is a 501(c) 3 tax-exempt organization that accepts donations of land, equipment, real property, and historical artifacts, as well as appreciated assets. In addition, the foundation administers fundraising programs and supports educational programs. Adams County has a similar foundation to support preservation of open lands.

Some of the larger municipal programs, including San Francisco and Chicago, have Neighborhood Park Grants Programs, which provide matching funds and technical assistance to neighborhood groups undertaking improvements to their local parks. For example, small grants of up to $1,000 annually go to park advisory councils and Adopt-A-Park groups can greatly assist local groups wanting to engage in projects. Broomfield currently has a neighborhood small grants program and an adopt-a-trail/open space/park program, and there are opportunities to build on this effort.

Accept Land and Conservation Easement Donations

To lower the cost of acquiring properties and increase partnerships with local landowners, active solicitation of property donations may be one means of acquiring desired properties, while providing a tax benefit to the donor.
Recommendation: Develop a marketing strategy to encourage landowners to work with Broomfield to donate land and easements that meet the intent of the OSPRT plan. Broomfield may need a resolution to authorize acceptance of donated conservation easements and trail easements, when such rare opportunities arise and should also ensure that the community does not have policies that are barriers to accepting donations of land.

Landowners donate property as open lands for a variety of reasons, including a desire to conserve the property for future generations or to reduce both income and estate taxes. Tax advantages can be substantial for landowners in a growth pressure market such as Broomfield’s because the appraised value of the land for development is so much higher than the value of the land for conservation. Thus, landowners can reap great tax benefits from donations. Landowners can donate their properties through the following means:

- Charitable donations,
- Bargain sales,
- Lease options, and
- Donation with reserved life estate.

The advantage of easements is that they lower Broomfield’s cost of acquiring land and easements in a market where land costs are high. Donated properties tend to be smaller, and still have some costs associated with them such as fencing, signing, resource management, and maintenance, and may have property-owner imposed restrictions such as no public access. Broomfield may want to only accept lands that meet OSPRT selection criteria. On the other hand if an offer for donated land has little conservation value or does not meet the objectives of the OSPRT plan, Broomfield could accept it with the understanding by the landowner that Broomfield may sell it, with development restrictions if appropriate, to help support its parks, recreation, open space, and trails program.

Expand the Role of Partnerships with Neighboring Jurisdictions and Within the Community

Broomfield has already begun to establish partnerships with some neighboring jurisdictions and has begun to identify organizations that may be able to assist with planning, acquisition of parcels, restoration projects, and maintenance and stewardship. Other governmental agencies—federal, state, and local, as well as conservation trusts, state wildlife and natural resource agencies and private partners often provide technical or financial assistance.

Recommendation: Broomfield should continue to identify organizations that may be interested in partnering to implement OSPRT plan objectives and common goals, as well as meeting with and taking into account input from local grass roots organizations with interests in open space and trails issues.

Recommendation: Initiate formal and informal (project-specific) partnerships with surrounding municipalities, surrounding counties, and with community residents, to leverage acquisition of desired properties. Report progress towards the open lands goal to Council and the public on an annual basis.
Private land trusts have played an increasingly important role in land conservation and sensitive lands protection in recent years. Land trusts are typically non-profit organizations that hold land and other property rights for the benefit of the public. Because most are private, land trusts have significant flexibility in the way they can acquire property and can often react quickly to buy land or acquire an easement before the land is developed and their private status is often more appealing to landowners that would be reluctant to negotiate with a government agency. Where public planning objectives coincide with private land trust objectives, local planning jurisdictions can benefit by coordinating efforts with these organizations. Land trusts can assist local jurisdictions in a number of ways, including:

- Assist with pre-acquisition negotiations;
- Accept donations of property through a transaction that qualifies the landowner for substantial tax benefits;
- Help inform property owners and the public about conservation strategies; and
- Purchase and hold a property for future government acquisition if local budget is insufficient to acquire a critical property at a certain time.

Broomfield may want to consider partnering with organizations such as Great Outdoors Colorado Trust Fund (GOCO), The State Land and Water Conservation Trust Fund, the Colorado Coalition of Land Trusts (CCLT), The Conservation Trust Fund (DOLA), The Trust for Public Land, and the Nature Conservancy.

**Expand Formal Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) as well as Project-Specific Affiliations for Joint Acquisition and Management**

Broomfield currently has Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) with some adjacent communities to develop open lands buffers between communities and to plan for orderly growth. In addition, successful affiliations with other communities have been made on a less-formal, project-specific basis.

Recommendation: Broomfield should continue to coordinate on a formal and informal basis with surrounding jurisdictions to acquire and protect mutually beneficial open lands and to establish the “green edge” around the community.

Local governments may work cooperatively together or with state and federal governments to jointly purchase land, develop master plans, and manage land near city/county boundaries. Intergovernmental cooperation is also necessary to establish various programs. Such efforts may result in the joint purchase of open lands by the city/county, or in the purchase of lands for protection by one municipality. Broomfield may also work with its neighbors to develop intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) for master plans of future land uses in areas near the participating municipalities. An IGA may have an open space preservation component, or it may simply identify where annexation and urban development will occur during the term of the agreement (usually 15-20 years) and which lands will remain unincorporated.
Promote Partnerships with the Community through Stewardship Programs and Volunteer Initiatives

Additional outreach and collaboration with Broomfield residents can be valuable in implementing the OSPRT Master Plan. Through educational programs and volunteer initiatives, the goals and recommendations of the plan can be communicated to Broomfield residents and their collaboration enlisted in promoting its implementation.

Recommendation: Broomfield should work with existing environmental education programs such as the volunteer-based Broomfield Nature Program to develop brochures, programs, and educational programs (classes, tours) to promote stewardship of open space lands and compliance with established rules and conservation design guidelines. Broomfield should adopt a leadership position in promoting volunteer activities that benefit open space, trails and parks. The existing web site should highlight these volunteer opportunities. The City should support and strengthen existing programs in the community to build a network of volunteers to help maintain and manage its open space, parks, and trails system.

Additional volunteer programs might include trail building and maintenance, naturalists for interpretive hikes/programs, fence building, trash removal, trail building, and tree planting programs. The existing “adopt-an-open-space or park”, “adopt a trail” could be more well publicized. The Volunteer Coordinator position within the Human Resources Department should be utilized as a way to increase the visibility of these efforts and promote coordination. Broomfield should help provide classes as well as sponsor volunteer programs when financially feasible.
Other Strategies

Fee Simple Acquisition of Park Land and Open Space Parcels

Broomfield is actively acquiring properties for park land and open space to ensure that the community will be able to meet its long term open lands goals as it continues to experience development pressure. Acquisition of land in fee simple gives the purchaser full title to and possession of all rights associated with the purchased property, subject only to the constraints imposed by nuisance laws and public regulations.

Recommendation: To accomplish the goals of the OSPRT Master Plan, Broomfield should acquire high priority lands using local dedicated funding sources. Broomfield should follow the procedures for evaluating and acquiring properties set forth in this plan, work with partners to acquire and maintain lands, and leverage local funds whenever possible. Ways of leveraging funds include using outside sources of funding such as grants or working with property owners that are willing to negotiate at less than fair market value or donate portions of property.

Acquiring fee simple ownership of land will provide Broomfield the most effective means to control land uses and activities on desirable open space and parks properties, and it is an approach to work with landowners that is non-regulatory. For that reason, it is usually a publicly supported and non-controversial tool.

Moreover, ownership of land provides control of the full bundle of rights associated with it, including development, preservation, and public access. Once Broomfield assumes fee simple ownership, it possesses a broad range of options: the government may re-convey selected interests in the land, restrict future development of the land for uses other than open space or parks, lease the land, or otherwise manage activities in accordance with the management objectives established by this OSPRT plan or by area management plans. While fee simple ownership of property has the benefits cited above; the drawback is that it is one of the most expensive conservation tools both in terms of up front purchase expenses and the long-term maintenance costs. Broomfield will need to leverage dedicated local funding sources with other state and federal sources to the extent possible.

Purchase Conservation Easements

Purchasing conservation easements can be a slightly less expensive conservation tool than outright acquisition, but in a community with high development pressures like Broomfield, the costs of acquiring easements are not much lower than fee simple acquisition. Broomfield has already purchased conservation easements (or development rights) for open space conservation on properties on the west side of the community.

Recommendation: Broomfield should continue to use conservation easements as a tool to conserve open lands and stretch open space dollars, under the right set of conditions. Conservation easement acquisitions are most appropriate to accomplish the following objectives:

- Protect natural resources on the property;
Maintain viable agricultural operations; and
Share management responsibilities with other entities to offset long-term costs for Broomfield.
Certain incentives to promote landowner interest in this vehicle, such as retaining naming rights on the property, should be considered to enhance its attractiveness.

Purchasing conservation easements or development rights is an option used to protect natural areas and open space lands from development. A conservation easement is a restriction placed on a piece of property to protect resources associated with the parcel. The easement is either voluntarily sold or donated by a landowner, and it constitutes a legally binding agreement that prohibits certain types of development from taking place on the land. Because the easement is a recorded restriction in the property deed, it runs with the property and applies to all subsequent owners. A conservation easement is a flexible instrument that can limit development as much as the landowner desires; however to be eligible for tax advantages, federal criteria do apply.

Conservation easements and purchase of development rights are not appropriate where public access is an important objective for a property as typically the private land owner retains the right to control access to the property.

The purchase of development rights tool is almost identical to conservation easements. Under a PDR program, a landowner voluntarily sells his or her rights to develop a parcel of land to a public agency or charitable organization. The landowner retains all other ownership rights, and a conservation easement is placed on the land and recorded in the title.

Conservation easements and development rights are appraised and valued as follows:

\[
\text{Appraised Value of Development Rights} = \text{Appraised Value for Agriculture or Conservation} - \text{Appraised Value of Development Rights}
\]

So if, for example, the market value to develop the property is $40,000 per acre, and the value of agricultural production is $5,000 per acre, an easement or development rights will still cost $35,000 per acre, or almost 90 percent of fair market value of the property.

For this reason, conservation easements are most effective and best administered when development pressures are not so strong as to inflate the values of development rights, such as in rural agricultural areas. They can be valuable in more developed urban areas, if landowners are willing to donate easements, as addressed in the next section.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Broomfield would like to find alternative ways to conserve open lands to stretch local funding sources. A Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program is a government authorized program that allows property owners to transfer development rights from one parcel of land to a different parcel of land. As with the tools described above, this tool severs rights to develop land from other property rights. TDR programs can be an effective land conservation tool, particularly for
conserving agricultural lands, natural areas, and scenic lands identified through the OSPRT plan. TDRs are also one of the most complex and difficult to implement of all the possible tools, and can require a number of years to tailor to fit a community.

**Recommendation:** The 1995 Master Plan Update Committee should analyze the viability of using a Transfer of Development Rights program to conserve open lands in Broomfield as an alternative to acquiring properties.

Local governments have used TDRs for several decades. A TDR is a device by which the development potential of a site is severed from its title and made available for transfer to another parcel. As in purchase of development rights, landowners receive compensation for the development value of the land through a TDR program. However, once the TDR program is established, the system relies on the free market transfer of development rights from undeveloped areas to development areas.

To implement the TDR program, many communities designate “sending” and “receiving” areas. The “sending” areas are the lands that are to be protected and the development rights from those areas can be sold to developers in identified “receiving” areas. The owner of a parcel within a “receiving” area may purchase the transferred development rights, which allows the “receiving” area site to be developed at a higher density—essentially a bonus. If the transfer is approved, the local government is granted a conservation easement in perpetuity on the sending site.

TDR programs have been effective in many counties and states around the country. The success of any TDR program most often depends on the condition of the local market to provide demand for higher density areas. TDR programs must also have the following elements to be successful:

- A designated conservation zone, or sending area(s);
- A designed growth area, or receiving area(s);
- Development rights that are legally severable from the land;
- A procedure to transfer rights from one owner to another. Two common approaches are: (1) direct sale from a property owner to a developer, and (2) establishment of a TDR Bank, that could be managed by Broomfield or a separate quasi-governmental entity;
- Incentives (i.e., a density bonus); and
- Managed growth with tight zoning ordinances.

TDR programs can be mandatory or regulatory. Many TDR programs that have more quickly achieved their land conservation objectives are mandatory programs. For example:

- Montgomery County, MD has protected over 40,000 acres,
- New Jersey Pinelands has protected almost 20,000 acres,
- Boulder County, CO has protected 4,500 acres.

These programs ensure all parcels in a zoned sending area will transfer development rights. However, regulatory TDR programs, as with any zoning requirements or changes, may encounter resistance from property owners who would be required to sell their property rights.
through the program. A voluntary program, which means that transactions are contractual, would preclude challenges by property owners. The voluntary programs tend to be easier to adopt. However, voluntary programs are still time-consuming to administer and typically result in fewer acres conserved and a checkerboard pattern of open lands conservation. For example, Howard County, MD, with a voluntary program, has protected almost 900 acres of farmland. Douglas County, Colorado adopted an ordinance in 1996 and did not do any transfers in the first few years because baseline zoning did not provide incentives for developers to increase density. Boulder County, Colorado began a TDR program in 1995 and has conserved about 4,500 acres that are now secured in conservation easements.

The greatest challenge for Broomfield in establishing a TDR program, as with most communities, would likely be to identify appropriate “receiving” zones where density and building capacity could be increased. The Front Range development market does not yet support much higher densities than what are currently being built because people tend to have negative perceptions of density, even though it can be attractive and provide for more efficient development. Because most of Broomfield is zoned in a manner that allows for flexibility as far as density of units, it may be difficult to establish a real incentive to buy TDR credits on receiving sites when developers and landowners already have the option to add units without changing zoning as long as they meet standards that ensure a quality project.

**Develop an Annual Reporting System to Track Acquisition Progress**

Finally, to measure and track year-to-year progress in meeting the open lands goal, the OSPRT plan recommends the creation of an annual reporting system that would track acquisitions or lands protected and the methods or strategies used (public land dedication, sales tax, grant, etc.).

**Recommendation:** Report the parks and open space acquired through public land dedications and sales tax receipts to OSTAC, PRAC, Council, and the public on an annual basis. This annual report should provide a descriptive summary of progress toward goals and funds expended.
Chapter 11

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PUBLIC LAND DEDICATION REQUIREMENT

THE EXISTING PUBLIC LAND DEDICATION FORMULA - SECTIONS 16-28-120 TO 16-28-170 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE

Broomfield’s current public land dedication requirement is contained in the subdivision regulations (Section 16-28-120) of the municipal code. The percentage of public land dedicated varies as a percentage of gross density and applies only to residential development. This single standard collectively captures all types of public lands that may be required because of the development, including land for parks, schools, libraries, public safety facilities, and other public uses. The requirement also specifies that the applicant dedicate drainage channels, as shown on the 1995 Broomfield Master Plan map. It also limits credit for the following features: detention ponds and drainage channels (50 percent), lakes, ponds, and reservoirs (25 percent), school sites (50 percent; not to exceed five acres per school).

The existing public land dedication requirement should be improved in several areas. First, the formula does not include specific, individual requirements for parkland, open space, and other public lands, such as schools. As a result, in some development projects the existing formula has yielded less land of a specific type (e.g., useable neighborhood parkland), than has been deemed necessary, given anticipated population and the space required for certain recreational activities. Second, the existing formula results in an extremely high dedication for medium and higher density residential projects.

Proposed Revisions: Individual Dedication Requirements for Parks, Open Space and Schools; Dedication Based on Population Rather than Density

To ensure that parkland and open space land dedications (including cash-in-lieu) are adequate and meet the community’s needs as identified in the OSPRT Plan, the plan recommends revising the current public land dedication requirement to separate it into three distinct components to include: (1) a parkland dedication requirement; (2) an open space land dedication requirement; and (3) a requirement for schools and other public facilities such as fire stations, library, public works buildings, as appropriate.

To ensure that all these dedication requirements do not consume a disproportionate percentage of gross land area within individual developments, the plan proposes that Broomfield establish a cash-in-lieu of land dedication option for developments where the total land dedications for parks and open space would consume more than 25 percent of the development’s gross land area, based on population build out projections. Typically,
a general rule of thumb is that a developer will allocate approximately 20 percent for parks and open space and another 20 percent for road and other public improvements. These percentages vary among the different public uses but the total dedications for specific projects commonly do not exceed 40 percent. The 25 percent figure for open space and parks falls within the range of 20 percent to 40 percent of gross land dedicated for public uses. The recommended distribution by component is shown below.

1) Parkland Dedication: 16 acres of developed/improved land per 1,000 persons, including up to five acres of joint school park facilities;
2) Open Space Land Dedication: eight acres per 1,000 persons;
3) School Land Dedication for elementary schools, per school district requirements; and
4) Public land dedication cap of 25% gross land area generating the open lands requirement for the sum of items 1 through 3 above. If population-based dedications for park, open space, and elementary school park lands would otherwise exceed this cap, cash-in-lieu, land, or other amenities may be used to meet the remaining dedication requirement. Cash-in-lieu values are based on improved park or open space land.

Specific criteria will be developed as part of the code amendment to identify the type of contribution that may be appropriate given the unique features of the developer’s project.

All other public uses, including public roads, would not fall within the 25% cap.

Second, the plan proposes revising the basis for dedication, tying standards to population rather than density. Standards requiring a certain number of acres based on population rather than density make the dedication more proportional to the impact of new development, with a side benefit of being simpler to administer.

Simulations that compared the proposed public land dedication requirements above with the current formula were conducted for subdivisions of varying density. For projects of two to five dwelling units per acre, the new proposal provided on average 10% to 20% more open lands than the existing formula. For projects with extremely low density – such as single homes on one acre or more – the proposed public land dedication formula results in slightly less open space and park acres than the current formula’s total public land dedication acres. However, the proposed formula results in acres that are specifically designated for open space and park uses, while the current formula allocates the dedicated acres to a variety of public purposes. As a result, the proposed formula seems to provide adequately for the open space and parks needs of very low-density subdivisions.

Coordination with the 1995 Master Plan Update will be necessary to refine the
A plan for the heart and soul of Broomfield

Proposed Public Land Dedication
Recommendations for implementation.

Develop Specific Parkland Dedication Formula for Residential Development that Helps to Achieve the Park Level of Service Goals of the OSPRT Plan

The 1995 Broomfield Master Plan recommends providing 10.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons. The OSPRT Plan has recommended that the 16 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons be adopted as the level of service standard. Doing so would ensure that the current level of service is maintained or exceeded. It also would contribute to achieving the overall 40 percent open lands goal established in the OSPRT and 1995 Master Plans.

Recommendation: Amend Section 16-28-120 in the Subdivision Regulations to specify a minimum public parkland dedication standard, based on a formula of 16 acres of improved parkland per 1,000 persons. The City would retain the discretion to allow a cash-in-lieu of land option when recommended by staff and approved by Council. The cash-in-lieu is based on the value of improved parkland. Developers may also propose the cash-in-lieu option, subject to City approval. The parkland dedication requirements will be applied to individual developments based upon an individualized and discretionary review for compliance by each development with the requirements.

Provide Explicit Level of Service Standards and Corresponding Dedication Requirements for Specific Types of Parks Facilities

Just as important as achieving overall parkland acreage goals, the mix and distribution of parkland and types of parks should accomplish the objectives of the OSPRT Plan. The current land dedication requirement does not specify the types of parks to be provided by private developments. It has resulted in a well-distributed system of neighborhood parks, but not enough large community parks and in certain cases, too many small pocket parks with limited public recreational use.

Recommendation: Adopt level of service standards and corresponding dedication requirements for each type of park facility.

Exhibit 11.1 identifies level of service standards to be achieved for each type of park facility, and the acres to be obtained through dedication. The sum of the specific parkland dedications equals the overall parkland dedication standard of 16 acres per 1,000 population. The intent of the service standards is to ensure that the mix of park types reflects the community’s needs and expressed values. The expectation is that larger community and citywide parks will be acquired through accumulation of cash-in-lieu since few developments are expected to be of a size that would yield a true community park. Parkland dedication requirements, including requirements for cash-in-lieu, however, will be determined on an individual basis by Broomfield in applying the standards of the code to the particular development.
A typical 350-unit subdivision, consisting of single family homes and with approximately three persons per home, would increase Broomfield’s population by just over 1,000 persons and would require the dedication of 16 acres of parkland or equivalent cash-in-lieu. Requirements would include one acre of pocket park, four acres of neighborhood park, four acres of joint school park, five acres of community park and two acres of city/countywide park. Because community parks are required to be a minimum of 21 acres and City/Countywide Park

### EXHIBIT 11.1: LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS AND DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIFIC PARK FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Park</th>
<th>Size Standards</th>
<th>Level of Service Standard (acres per 1,000 population)</th>
<th>Proposed Parkland Dedication Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/Countywide Park</td>
<td>81-150 ac.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Cash-in-lieu equal to the fair market value of improved park land of 2.0 AC/1,000, if this type of facility is shown as needed within the targeted geographic area, by the OSPRT Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>21 to 80 ac.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Cash-in-lieu equal to the fair market value of improved park land of 5.0AC/1,000, if this type of facility is shown as needed within the targeted geographic area, by the OSPRT Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Park</td>
<td>Size depends on school: 5 to 8 ac. for elem.; 8 to 12 ac. for mid. school; 12 to 15 ac. for high school</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0 AC/1,000 (or cash-in-lieu at city’s option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>3 to 20 ac.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0 AC/1,000 (or cash-in-lieu at city’s option) if this type of facility is shown as needed within the targeted geographic area, by the OSPRT Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>5 to 2.5 ac.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0 AC/1,000 (or cash-in-lieu at city’s option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16 AC/1,000 people (or cash-in-lieu at city’s option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Greens</td>
<td>.25 to 1 ac.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Apply formula to population base (e.g., TOD project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Mixed Use Areas:

- Village Greens
- .25 to 1 ac.
- Level of Service Standard (acres per 1,000 population)
- 1.5
- Proposed Parkland Dedication Requirement
- Apply formula to population base (e.g., TOD project)
Countywide parks have a minimum size of 81 acres, Broomfield may wish to require cash-in-lieu to satisfy the community and city/countywide parks dedication requirements.

Recreational facilities, amenities, and other improvements constructed in parks should comply with current recommendations of Broomfield’s OSPRT Plan and with all applicable city/county standards. Privately maintained recreation facilities and amenities that provide for the general public’s use may be counted towards the park dedication requirement subject to the City and County of Broomfield’s discretion.

**Develop Criteria for Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland**

The Broomfield Municipal Code currently has the option to require payment of cash for parkland instead of land dedication and has some general considerations to guide City Council in determining when to require cash-in-lieu versus land (Sections 16-28-140 and 16-28-150).

Recommendation: Expand the criteria in Section 16-28-150 of the Code to provide for the option of cash-in-lieu of land dedication if any of the following conditions exist.

- The area in which the subdivision is located does not meet level of service standards and sufficiently suitable lands to provide for public parks are not available within the project area; or
- The proposed subdivision contains no land that is suitable for parks (as determined by the OSPRT Plan park selection criteria); or
- The public parkland dedication required amount is less than the established size criteria, as listed under “park size” in Exhibit 11.1 above; or
- The subdivider requests the option of providing cash-in-lieu; or
- The total amount of land required for dedicated parks and open space, would consume more than 25 percent of the total development parcel and would substantially interfere with a reasonable, economic use of the parcel.

The expanded cash-in-lieu option enables Broomfield to collect funds to be placed in a “parkland” account to use exclusively for the acquisition and development of parks and related facilities that are consistent with the OSPRT Plan and that will serve the subdivision paying the cash-in-lieu. Section 16-28-140 provides for a process to determine how the cash-in-lieu amount should be calculated. The City and subdivider may negotiate a cash-in-lieu amount or if agreement is not reached, the value is fixed by a real estate appraisal completed by one or more qualified appraisers acceptable to both parties. The appraisal shall be for developed/improved parkland. The cost of the appraisal is paid for by the subdivider.
Use a Combination of Parkland and Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland

Recommendation: Continue to require a combination of land and cash-in-lieu of land to satisfy all its parkland needs. It is unlikely that most developments will be large enough to provide a community park but many will be large enough to provide pocket parks and a neighborhood park. Therefore, it would be advantageous for Broomfield to collect cash, rather than land, for the larger parks, but also require land for smaller parks to ensure that they are well distributed in new neighborhoods.

Require Dedication of Open Space as Part of the Public Land Dedication Requirement for Residential Development

Chapter 9 outlined proposals for revising the municipal code to specify those natural resources and features that should be protected during the site or development plan review process. Not all properties contain these significant or sensitive natural areas and features, while others are so rich in resources that the entire site would be undevelopable if these requirements were applied at face value.

To preserve core resources without rendering a site undevelopable, the OSPRT Master Plan recommends establishing a specific dedication requirement for open space in proposed residential developments. Where significant natural resources and features exist, the requirement would most likely be completely met through dedication of the actual, physical features. Where no features are present, cash-in-lieu based on the value of improved open space could be obtained at the City/County’s discretion. Obtaining cash-in-lieu would allow the City/County to pool its resources to acquire other significant high-value open space parcels for communitywide benefit. Additionally, land earmarked for trail corridors and shown on the OSPRT Master Plan map, would also be credited towards the open space dedication requirement, if the land is maintained or restored to a natural condition. Open space dedication requirements, including requirements for cash-in-lieu, however, will be determined on an individual basis by Broomfield in applying the standards of the code to the particular development.

Implementing a public land dedication requirement specifically for open space would accomplish two additional objectives. First, it would address and respond to community values and priorities for open space acquisition and preservation. As this has emerged as the top priority voiced by Broomfield residents, directly linking preservation of lands for public use to development would demonstrate (a) the community’s commitment to residents’ stated priorities and (b) that preservation for public use, and development, are not incompatible objectives. Second, implementation of a public land dedication
requirement for open space would help accomplish the community’s goal of preserving 40 percent of the planning area as open lands.

As is the case for parks, credit towards the open space dedication requirement would be provided where significant natural areas or features are preserved as private open space.

**Recommendation:** Amend Section 16-28-120 in the subdivision regulations to require a minimum open space land dedication formula of eight acres per 1,000 population in all new residential developments. Broomfield would retain the discretion to allow a cash-in-lieu of land option when recommended by staff or the subdivider, and approved by Council. The cash-in-lieu amount is based on the value of improved open space. Developers may also propose the cash-in-lieu option, subject to City approval. The parkland dedication requirements will be applied to individual developments based upon an individualized and discretionary review for compliance by each development with the requirements.

Amend Section 17-38-120 to read “open area” not “open space,” thus correcting a typographical error in the current code.

The following points support the justification for the open space land dedication standard based on population:

- **The standard ensures that all future developments contribute a proportionate amount of open space lands (or cash) to help achieve Broomfield’s policy goal adopted in the OSPRT Plan of 40 percent open lands citywide.** As demonstrated in the 2002 Community Needs Assessment Survey, residents value open space as a community amenity similar to parks, and development creates a demand for open space.

- **Contribution of land and/or cash-in-lieu for open space provides benefits that the entire community enjoys.** The open lands system serves the community as a whole and is not mutually exclusive to particular neighborhoods or geographic areas.

The minimum standard of eight acres per 1,000 persons was derived from extensive analysis of adjacent municipalities’ requirements. Communities within Colorado treat open space very differently depending on how they choose to define the public parkland dedication requirements and other open space requirements. (See Appendix I: “Comparison of Colorado Local Government Requirements for Parks, Trails, and Open Space,” for analysis of comparable dedication and open space conservation requirements.) The chart in Appendix I differentiates between requirements for a minimum open space public land dedication requirement and/or requirements for open space or open lands set asides in PUDs or through by-right zoning districts. In contrast to publicly dedicated open space, set asides are typically open areas that are privately or commonly owned and maintained and often include both parks and open space.

Brighton has a public land dedication requirement for parks and open space that is most similar to the recommendations for Broomfield, requiring six acres of parkland.
and 15 acres of open space (or 21 acres of open lands) per 1,000 residents. Brighton also elected to adopt policies to make all open areas accessible to the general public, rather than as private set-asides.  

Other communities require comparatively lower quantities of open lands to be dedicated, but the OSPRT Master Plan, 2002 Community Needs Assessment Survey, and public comments all offer substantial support for a higher level of service standard for Broomfield. Residents overwhelmingly support preservation of additional open space and for maintaining a parks level of service that is roughly double what adjacent communities provide. This valuing of community open lands suggests that a total open lands dedication of 24 acres per 1,000 persons – 16 acres for parks and eight acres for open space – would not be out of line.

Simulations were also conducted on the impacts of different dedication standards on typical subdivisions, to identify the point at which dedications began to require a disproportionate percentage of gross land area and the 25 percent cap would begin to apply. Results are shown in Exhibit 11.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Open Lands Dedication 32 AC/1,000</th>
<th>Open Lands Dedication 28 AC/1,000</th>
<th>Open Lands Dedication 24 AC/1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Creek</td>
<td>2 DU/AC</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay Landing</td>
<td>3.7 DU/AC</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preble Creek (minus commercial acreage)</td>
<td>5.4 DU/AC</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Place</td>
<td>9.2 DU/AC</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 The City of Brighton requires 6 acres unimproved parkland per 1,000 residents and 15 acres open space per 1,000 residents. In addition, the city requires “neighborhood features” and private set-asides in multi-family developments (see Appendix I for more information).
1,000 residents would contribute to achieving the community’s open lands goals while generally staying within the 25 percent gross land area threshold for the moderate density development that has been characteristic of Broomfield. At higher densities, the 25 percent cap applies as warranted to limit the dedication.

Develop Criteria for Cash-in-Lieu of Open Space Land

Broomfield does not currently have explicit criteria to guide City Council when cash-in-lieu would be required specifically for open space land. Section 16-28-140 does provide for cash-in-lieu for recreation and open space but does not provide explicit guidelines for application of this option to open space acquisitions. Further, the current code does not stipulate that cash-in-lieu for open space cannot be used in another fund.

Recommendation: Add criteria in Section 16-28-140 of the Code to allow cash-in-lieu for the minimum amount of open space land dedication if the proposed residential subdivision or land does not contain the natural areas and features as defined in Chapter 9. Subdividers may also propose cash-in-lieu, subject to City/County approval. The City/County may also accept cash-in-lieu of land when the total amount of land dedication required for parks and open space is greater than 25 percent of the total gross land area of the residential or mixed-use residential development parcel and would substantially interfere with a reasonable, economic use of the parcel.

The cash-in-lieu option would also stipulate that monies collected would be placed in an “open space” account to use exclusively for the acquisition of open space and enhancement of open space or construction of trails that are consistent with the OSPRT Plan. The amount of cash-in-lieu would be determined by Section-28-140 and is based on improved open space.

Credits for Detention Areas, Reservoirs/Lakes and Golf Courses

Developers may receive partial credit against open space and parks dedication requirements for detention areas, lakes/reservoirs and golf courses, as described below.

- Developers may receive up to 50 percent credit towards parks or open space public land dedication requirement for the useable portions of detention areas that accomplish the following objectives:

  For Open Space: The 10-year storm storage capacity area is designed as a wetland amenity. The landscaping creates a natural wetland appearance by using plant materials such as native grasses, trees, and shrubs. Trail access and seating areas are provided for pedestrians where appropriate and above the 10-year storm area.

  For Parks: The benched area above the 10-year storm storage capacity is designed so that it is useable park area for activities such as playfields. The proposed park area is useable by the public a majority of the time.
Thus, if a developer proposed a 6-acre wetland, up to three acres could be credited against the public land dedication requirement for open space. In the case of an eight acre park located entirely within the area above the 10-year storm capacity, up to four acres of the eight acres could be credited against the public land dedication for parks.

- Developers may receive up to 25 percent credit towards the open space public land dedication requirement for providing a lake or reservoir. This existing requirement has remained intact in the OSPRT plan.

- Developers may receive up to 25 percent credit toward the parkland dedication requirement for providing a golf course open to the general public. Thus, if the parkland dedication requirement called for 80 acres of parkland to be provided, up to 20 acres of the public golf course could be credited against this requirement.

Credits for School Lands

If Broomfield amends the public land dedication requirement, it will need to specify land dedication requirements for schools and other facilities. Broomfield currently requires that developers dedicate land for elementary schools only. Fifty percent of the land proposed for a school site, not to exceed 5 acres per school, may be credited toward the park dedication requirement. Currently, the school districts purchase land for middle schools and high schools.

Recommendation: Work with the school districts to update these public land standards during the time of the 1995 Master Plan Update if both entities deem it is necessary.

Appeals Process

The OSPRT Master Plan recommends the creation and adoption of an appeals process, which would enable developers to obtain an expedited administrative hearing to address appeals related to the location or amount of land or cash-in-lieu requirements as applied, and to provide an opportunity to address the appeal issues in a manner that avoids future litigation.
Chapter 12
CONCLUSION

Exhibit 12.1 summarizes projected open lands anticipated by the OSPRT Plan when Broomfield is fully built out.

Forty percent of the community’s planning area, or 9,567 acres, would be preserved as open lands. Of this 9,567 acres, 72 percent is preserved as open space, 13 percent would be developed as parks, nine percent developed as golf courses, and about six percent preserved as other open lands, including a new reservoir.

In terms of level of service, this would provide 126 acres of open lands for every 1,000 persons, ensuring that future Broomfield residents would continue to enjoy proportionately the same level of amenities as current residents. This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT 12.1: TOTAL OPEN LANDS AT BUILDOUT</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Other OL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN LANDS ACRES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Owned Acres</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield/ Boulder Counties</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Potential Partnerships and/or IGAs</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks and facilities</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint School Parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA parks</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands Maintained by CCB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Lands not Elsewhere Classified</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,567</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broomfield County planning area including Intergovernmental Agreement - Broomfield/ Boulder County AC 23,917

OL as a percentage of total planning area acreage % 29% 5% 6% 40%

OPEN LANDS ACRES/ POPULATION
Estimated Buildout Population persons 75,668
Actual acres attained/ 1000 persons AC/ 1,000 91 16 20 126
equates to about 5,700 square feet of open lands for each resident - or roughly the size of an average single-family lot.

At buildout, Broomfield residents would also enjoy 243 miles of trails, 2 ½ times the trail mileage available today, thus greatly improving the opportunities for recreational and commuter trail use by bicyclists, pedestrians, equestrians, and other trail users.