CITY OF GOLDEN
PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD
****REGULAR MEETING****
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2012 - 7:00 P.M.

GOLDEN COMMUNITY CENTER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of September 18, 2012 Minutes
4. Public Comment
5. Bachman Property/South Neighborhood Park Discussion
6. Jeffco Local Grant Cycle Discussion
7. Clear Creek Corridor Discussion
8. Beverly Height Park Discussion
9. Director’s Report
10. Board Members’ Comments
11. Adjourn
City of Golden
Memorandum

To: Parks and Recreation Advisory Board

From: Steve Glueck, Director of Community and Economic Development

Date: October 2, 2012

Re: James and Gwendolyn Bachman Property at 18300 W Fourth Avenue

Purpose of Discussion: In recent communications with the City, Mr. and Mrs. James Bachman have indicated their desire to discuss a possible acquisition of their 2.8 acre property (and house) at 18300 W. Fourth Avenue by the City. Their proposal is that the City should acquire their property to expand the open space and future neighborhood park site adjacent to the south. In the past, there have never been any serious discussions of this specific parcel by the City based largely on the substantial difference of opinion about value between the seller and City’s appraisals.

In order to determine whether or not to enter into such discussions, staff requests that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board discuss the property and forward a recommendation to City Council. The recommendation would be whether or not to start discussions, and would not be a definitive position on a purchase, unless the discussions lead to that point. Based upon your schedule, staff requests that this discussion occur at your October 30, 2012 meeting.

Background: The 14 acres to the south and west were acquired by the City (funded 75% by the City and 25% by JeffCo) in 2010. That purchase was from four separate Bachman families and was priced at about $94,000 per acre. The land was all vacant, and did include a portion of flood plain and Lena Gulch, which tended to lower the value. Family members indicate that they agreed to what they considered to be a very low price due to family dynamics that pushed them to agree to disposing the land. At the time, the 18300 W. Fourth Avenue parcel was valued by Mr. James Bachman in excess of $1,000,000 but the City’s estimate of value was closer to $600,000, which amount the City did not readily have. As a result, there were no serious discussions about purchase. The big unknown for the City or another buyer is the house. While the house does provide a substantial part of the property value on paper, the City does not need (or benefit greatly from owning) another structure. If an acquisition were pursued, the house complicates the determination of value.

Current Status: City staff’s understanding is consistent with the statement in the letter from neighborhood representatives that the owner’s indication is that they want to resolve the future status, but would welcome the opportunity for a lease back or life estate arrangement that would affect cash flow. Staff’s experience, however, is that sellers often want to focus on terms related to cash flow, when the City’s inclination is to focus on the actual price, in determining whether to support an acquisition. Based upon all of the above, it appears that the status can be characterized as follows:

- The City currently has $251,000 remaining for open space purchases in the Sales and Use Tax Fund from the 2001 bond issue. Any funds for acquisition beyond that would need to come from further City Council commitment in the SUT fund, or the Open Space Fund and
Conservation Trust Fund. None of these funds have substantial discretionary funds to transfer to a purchase.

- The main other neighborhood park acquisition in the Master Plan in the Central Neighborhoods is not progressing, as the owner indicates no short term desire to sell.

- The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board has identified many millions of dollars of projects in the community, for which insufficient funds are available. The addition of an attempt to purchase this land only increases the funding gap.

- There is no question that the neighbors are correct that the neighborhood park development would be easier and perhaps more pleasant with this top of the hill parcel.

- It is uncertain how much change will occur in the coming decades in this part of Golden, but it will very likely be substantial.

**Policy Question:** If the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board’s discussion leads to a level of consensus, the board’s direction may take one of the following directions:

1. Regardless of price, the City has too many other parks and recreation needs to consider acquisition of more property in this area. There is sufficient land to accommodate both open space and the neighborhood park on the existing City parcel. The board recognizes that at some point, someone will likely develop the property according to uses approved in a rezoning. OR

2. Although the board needs to be very cautious about any expenditure, the addition of this 2.8 acre parcel for a future South Neighborhoods Park could be a very positive outcome, if the overall purchase value is close to the City’s prior estimates. OR

3. The case for adding this parcel as additional park and open space land in the South Neighborhoods is compelling. City Council should direct staff to negotiate the best mutually acceptable agreement and Council should give it consideration. OR

4. If the board has other direction, please advise.

**Attachment:** Vicinity Map
Vicinity Map

Case No.: PC11-10
Location: 18300 W. 4th Avenue
Applicant: James Bachman
Action: Annexation
October 2, 2012

Mr. Jerry Hoçgden, Chair
Golden Parks & Recreation Advisory Board
1470 10th Street
Golden, CO 80401

Re: South Neighborhoods Community Park

Dear Jerry,

In recent weeks, we have had conversations with Mr. Jim Bachman who has shown a flexibility and frankness in being a willing seller of his two parcels of property located on 4th Avenue near Heritage Road. The hope is that a transaction can occur to acquire the property as part of a multi-neighborhood, multi-access, active recreational park in the South Neighborhoods area. An acquisition of Mr. Bachman's property would facilitate easier development of a three- to five-acre community/neighborhood park with better access off of 4th Avenue and much less land disturbance than if built on the adjacent open space property. It would be an excellent location for a park pavilion and an outdoor kid-friendly play area.

The property is located in the southern portion of the South Neighborhoods 2030 Plan, which identifies areas of stability and areas of change in the South Neighborhoods. Within the immediate vicinity of Jim Bachman's property are major areas of potentially significant change, all of which would increase population density in the South Neighborhoods area and the need for parkland.

One area of change is on the West Colfax corridor from Zeta Street to the C470 overpass. This corridor is identified as potential future multi-story, mixed-use buildings. On the west side of Zeta Street is the city-owned property which includes land for a trail along Lena Gulch on US 40/West Colfax. On the southwest side of the C470 overpass, discussions have raised the possibility that beyond the 2030 Plan, this could be the potential site for future mountain rail. Immediately to the northeast of Mr. Bachman's property and extending on to West Colfax and to C470 are three mobile home parks owned by Equity Lifestyle Properties, Inc. (Chicago). These properties are seen as another potential area of change over the next 18 years of the 2030 Plan. Additionally, another unknown in the immediate vicinity is the type of changes which may occur with Heritage Square.
Besides the well-documented enhancement of local residential and commercial property values, the buildout of a future park would establish an area of stability. This is important. Parks establish a sense of place for residents, as demonstrated by neighborhoods surrounding Lyons, Parfit, and Norman D. Parks, and provide residents a gathering place that reinforces a community spirit. A South Neighborhoods park would also provide a unified sense of place in this south area of Golden. Such a park would be in fulfillment of the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

In the South Neighborhoods area, there is no other land in this southern portion of Golden that has the potential for expanding into a three- to five-acre park. Further, there is no land to incorporate into the city for a neighborhood/community park to serve present and future residents. A successful transaction with Jim Bachman would be an investment in the city's long-term green infrastructure in the South Neighborhoods area of Golden and in the southern gateway into Golden.

The historic, economic, recreational, and economic characteristics of this property also make for an attractive acquisition effort. From 1937, the Bachman family lived the history of this area, and a historical education plaque on the knoll could relate history from the original federal survey map of 1865 that plainly identifies the land in question. Some of the history of this area is summarized in the South Neighborhoods Plan (Section 2.2). Additionally, the proposed park is embedded in a mesh of existing and future pedestrian/bike trails that link to both city and regional trails.

The neighborhood understands this is a generational effort and that any capital expense for a South Neighborhoods park is at least a decade away. Mr. and Mrs. Jim Bachman are open to a transaction that would allow them to live on the property until their death or they vacate to a nursing home. This scenario would fit the long-term financial requirements of the city. In a life estate arrangement, there would be no immediate requirement for the Parks & Recreation Department to commit funds for property maintenance or park facilities, making it a sustainable and economically sound acquisition.

Finally, including the Jim Bachmann property in an Urban Renewal Authority (URA) District that encompassed the commercial properties along West Colfax Avenue, as shown in the South Neighborhoods Plan, may be worth considering. The URA could be responsible for the property and future demolition of the structures and could work in collaboration with the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board on joint projects during the interim, such as the Lena Gulch trail and a bike lane along Heritage Road. This would be in keeping with the South Neighborhood 2030 Plan and in support of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan to serve current and future residents of the South Neighborhoods on the east side of Heritage Road, as well as the greater Golden community.

The effort to acquire this land has been ongoing since 2008 when it was threatened by major development. We would like to pursue future discussions with Mr. Bachman to complete our vision for the park and are open to suggestions and guidance by members of the Golden Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.
Sincerely,

Matthew Myers  
267 Kimball Ave.  
Golden, CO 80401

Tracy Evanko  
301 Allen Street  
Golden, CO 80401

Julie Morales  
18651 4th Street  
Golden, CO 80401

Preston Driggers  
209 Berthoud Way  
Golden, CO 80401

cc: Mr. Rod Tarullo, Director of Parks & Recreation
LOCAL PARK & RECREATION GRANTS
2013 GRANT APPLICATION

The JCOS Local Park & Recreation Grants Program provides supplemental funding to assist cities and park districts to implement their priority land acquisition or capital projects. Local Grants are budgeted on an annual basis and there is no guarantee of funds under this program in either the current year or future years.

One priority project may be submitted by each entity. JCOS will consider funding up to 25% for cities and up to 35% for districts. Entities must provide a cash match for the remainder of project funding (see attached Local Grant Criteria). Additional funding may be considered, see page 2, Enhanced Funding Criteria.

All Local Grant Applications must be received in the Open Space Office, 700 Jefferson County Parkway, Suite 100, Golden, Colorado 80401, by Friday, November 2, 2012, 5:00 p.m. If Applications are not received by this date, consideration will not be given to the request.

Agency Name: City of Golden

Project Name: Regional Trail Bridge Improvements

Project Category: Land Acquisition ☐ Capital Development ☑

Is the land acquisition or capital development project serving Local ☐ or Regional ☑ need?

Grant Size Request: Up to $100K ☑ Up to $400K ☐

Supplemental Grant Amount Request: $45,290 = 25%
(Cities up to 25%, Districts up to 35%)

☑ Enhanced Funding Request (optional): $__________

Total Grant Fund Request: $45,290 = 25%
(Maximum grant award not to exceed 50% of total project cost)

Applicant Match: $135,870 = 75%
(Including partnership funds)

TOTAL PROJECT COST: $181,160

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Please describe project priority scope, timeline and need per this grant request. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)

Golden has seven Continental pedestrian bridges throughout the community with Douglas Fir planks. The planks were last replaced in 2008 and with extensive use and exposure to the
Colorado weather, are once again in need of replacement. Over time the wood has shrunk and split, knot holes have fallen out and the ends have split and no longer hold a nail or bolt. This cumulative deterioration is preventing staff from effectively repairing and maintaining the bridge decking. Golden would like to replace the planks with IPE wood which has little to no maintenance other than oiling. It is extremely durable and weather resistant. IPE Wood is the material used by other communities with great success including the City of Wheat Ridge along their portion of Clear Creek Trail.

The bridges are used by both local and regional pedestrians and cyclists. They are critical for access to Jefferson County Open Space Apex Park, North Table Mountain and South Table Mountain.

Itemize all costs to be included in the land acquisition or capital development phase of the project. INCLUDE: Applicable land acquisition costs and services, capital development costs including design fees, construction costs, public improvements, landscaping, equipment and materials, signage, water taps, and others.

(Attach additional sheets if needed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMIZED PROJECT COSTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Attachment A: Itemized Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$181,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhanced Funding Criteria: Local priority projects may be eligible for additional JCOS matching funds if one or more of the following criteria are met, as determined by JCOS. The maximum grant award is 50% of the total project cost.

A. Land acquisitions for parks, trails, open space and recreation facilities: Please include any JCOS related acquisition values and/or conservation tools applicable to the project, such as easements or partnerships with other land conservation organizations. Please list key elements of this project.

B. Partnerships with other public, non-profit or business organizations: Please list any funding received and/or requested from additional sources for cost-sharing this project. Note: Entity in-house labor, in-kind and volunteer services are not eligible as matching funds. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)
C. Regionally significant outdoor recreation: Please describe the benefits of this project. The project provides safer, more sustainable pedestrian bridges on several trails within Golden that also connect to Jefferson County Open Space Parks and the surrounding region such as Apex Park. Trails encourage alternative means of transportation throughout town, healthy lifestyles and time spent outdoors. This project is ready to be implemented.

D. Conservation education for indoor and outdoor facilities: Please describe the type of facility and programs and who it will benefit.

Does the project fill a current need in the area of Outdoor Recreation? Yes ☒ No ☐

Project Timeline to Complete:

Estimated time needed to complete the project:

Within 1 year ☒ Between 1 and 2 years ☐

(If the project is not completed within 2 years of funding approval, future grant eligibility may be suspended until they are completed.)

(Capital Projects Only)

Does the entity own or lease the land for which a Capital Development project is proposed? Owned ☒ Leased ☐

If leased, please provide the following regarding the Lease:

Name of Lessor ____________________________________________

Years remaining on Lease __________________________________

Is the proposed development permitted under the terms of the Lease? _________

Per Capita Funding:
Entity’s Lottery Population: 18,000

Provide the following information for past grants received from Jefferson County within the last five years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT % COMPLETED</th>
<th>PER CAPITA FUNDING (Based on Lottery Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Splash Aquatic Park Improvements</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Splash Aquatic Park Splash Pad</td>
<td>$5,825</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Vanover Park Tree Memorial</td>
<td>$60,900</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Universally Accessible Playground</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Clear Creek Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>$79,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Clear Creek Whitewater Improvements</td>
<td>$27,127</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>S. Side Extension of Clear Creek Trail</td>
<td>$97,326</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Golden High Turf Field</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$16.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total funded to date: $845,034
Total completed to date: $436,808

(Cities Only)
What amount and percent of the total attributable share received has been spent on operations and/or maintenance vs. capital improvements during the past 5 years?

a) Operations & Maintenance: Amount _________ Percent _________

b) Capital Improvements: Amount $436,808 Percent 100

GENERAL GRANT REQUIREMENTS:

1. SIGNAGE: Open Space Policies and Procedures Part 6, Chapter 4, Section 2, 3.c requires that all properties acquired and/or developed with Open Space funds be appropriately signed. Recognition signage to specify, "Jefferson County Open Space funds used at this site." Open Space recognition may be integrated into an agency's sign program or signs may be obtained directly from Open Space.

2. All local grant funds not expended according to the approved proposal are non-transferable.

3. Include a location map of this project with the application.

See Attachment B

4. Attach an appropriate resolution from your elected officials authorizing this application.

See Attachment C

5. ADDITIONAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:
a. Please provide (1) unstapled copy of your application packet, 3-hole punched.

b. Please provide (14) stapled copies of your application packet, 3-hole punched.

c. Maps or attachments should be no larger than 11" X 17".
Rod Tarullo
Contact Person (Please print)

303 384 8120
Phone

rtarullo@cityofgolden.net
Email

1470 10th Street
Address (Street, P.O. Box, Suite No.)

Golden CO 80401
City State Zip
### City of Golden Bridge Replacement Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th># of planks</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Width (in)</th>
<th>IPE</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>Oil Stain</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden Glen Court and Garden</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$31,584</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$37,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Garden and East Street</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$13,888</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$19,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coors Porcelin</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$19,712</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$25,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanover over Tucker</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$15,232</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$20,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanover over CC</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$40,600</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>$652</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$46,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Run at Tripp</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$12,040</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$17,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney Run at Heritage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$10,752</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$15,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear Creek Corridor Meeting 10/9/12

Biggest Concerns:

Safety of persons enjoying the creek
Ordinance exists for mechanical and mining the banks

- The Ordinance covers the banks, anything under the water, for a distance of 5 miles past cities boundaries. Oriented towards watershed.

Trash and recycling separation
Lack of signage, visitors 80-92% out of county where signage might be more common
Clear message communicated?
Clarification of creek areas that are considered parks

- Where can we actually enforce?
- Whether floating or standing in the water PD will enforce

What are appropriate uses of the creek, who can use the creek?

- Are there uses of the creek that shouldn’t be allowed?
- Are there biases towards who is using the creek?

We need to be cognizant of the weather’s affect on the creek, lets plan but not overreact.

Chief Kilpatrick has authorization to close the creek, what are the rational criteria for such a closure?

- Boulder Creek has safety closures, flooding
- We had three swift water calls this year, potential was really high for injury
- Reasons for closure could also include water that is too low which stresses the aquatic health of the stream. We can possibly gain criteria from the Division of Wildlife.
- In the case of a spill, what criteria might close the creek?

Strategies that were Successful:

The realignment of the kayak lot and eventual fencing of the west end
Signage at the RV Park and new PW Building were beneficial
RV Park brought in staff to work the entrance to the park
Porta Potties at Billy Drew Bridge helped alleviate use of surrounding business restrooms
New Regulations put into place helped enforcement along the creek

- Should we allow consumption in a different format?
- One of the new regulations was not allowing alcohol whether opened or not
- We also prohibited glass, though did not have any tickets
- Zero tolerance on dogs off leash and fire ban
- 247 tickets were issued between July 4th and August 30th

Obama’s visit didn’t leave any trash in the park as most items were not allowed in the park
Electronic signage on 10th Street was a beneficial education piece
Officer presence in the corridor had a positive effect

**Strategies that Didn’t Work:**

Tape and orange fencing didn’t work, need something more permanent
Soft parking barricades didn’t work, they were moved
Was the closing of parking lots and traffic control the best method during events?
Are we adequately educating the public on rules and regulations?
Difficult to get consistent coverage on the PD side
  - Police required overtime Thursday through Saturday
  - Expensive, being short staffed there were times PD still couldn’t cover the creek

Fishing is limited with all the tubers

**Strategies that Could Work:**

Use of non-commissioned officers?
Goodwill ambassadors? Parking, reminder of rules, etc.

- More education provided by people who want to be involved
- Ambassadors can change the message to a positive one
- Reward people for good behavior, encourage self policing

Parking Plan:

- Consideration to those using the fields, park, etc.
- Education suggesting parking in the parking garages downtown
- Paid parking and permits for neighborhoods go hand in hand

Hard closures of social trails into the creek
No camping in the creek regulation
South side of the creek should be addressed at the same level as the north side.
South side trail will change the dynamics of the corridor when it is built

Alcohol: Is there a problem with alcohol across the board, or only a few abusing?

- Is the issue the trash and glass not the drinking?
• We need continuity amongst all the parks. Should one be able to drink in Lions but not along the creek?
• The biggest issue for parks is the glass and trash left after the event
• Make the regulations civil violations similar to a parking ticket

People Management Plan:

• Steamboat for example allows activities based on flows of the river
  • Highest is for boating, fishing as it comes down, then tubers, too low may close access
• How do we balance the many stakeholders?
• Permits issued for businesses to rent the tubes could also help educate users
• How do we address the potential for high flows next year