

Parks Development and Improvements Report 2012-2015



Martin Luther King Park, Spring Valley Community Park, Wetlands Park, Willows Park, Exploration Peak Park.

November 2012



Prepared by the Departments of Comprehensive Planning, Finance, Parks and Recreation,
and Real Property Management

Executive Summary

The Board of County Commissioners directed staff to develop an effective, efficient, and quantitative process for prioritizing new parks and park renovations in the Las Vegas Valley. Staff from Comprehensive Planning, Finance, Parks and Recreation, and Real Property Management have worked together to meet this direction.

This report describes a new “Parks CIP Process” that will allow Clark County to improve its overall parks location and development program. The report provides recommendations for development of new parks and for existing park renovations. Recommendations were formulated by using information from the Parks Element of the Comprehensive Plan, County land use plans, County population forecasts, park master plans, and capital requests. Development of the recommended parks and renovation projects will address adopted Level of Service and health and safety needs through 2015. The top recommendations based on the analysis are shown below in Table 1:

**Table 1
Recommendations – New Parks, Additions, and Renovations**

Priority	New Parks and Additions by Park Type			Renovations**
	Neighborhood Parks	Community Parks*	Regional Parks*	
1	Durango & Blue Diamond Wash (Riley & Ford) (25 ac.)	Robindale and Arville (40 ac.)	Southwest Sports Park (65 ac.)	Desert Breeze Park
2	Unidentified Park D East Side #4 (10 ac.)		Mountain's Edge Park (95 ac.)	Alexander Villas Park
3	Torrey Pines and Wigwam (14.5 ac.)		Desert Breeze Park (95 ac.)	Laurelwood Park
4				Sunrise Park
5	41 Acres Needed by 2015***	22 Acres Needed by 2015***	241 Acres Needed by 2015***	Desert Inn Park
6				Mountain Crest Park
7				Silver Bowl Regional Park (Area C)
8				Sunset Regional Park
9				Sunset Regional Park
10				Sunset Regional Park

Note: Special Use Facilities at 315 acres meet LOS needs through 2015 and are not included.

* Phases as appropriate for customer service and funding availability

** For details of renovations see Appendix D

*** See Table 3 for level of service and acreage details.

Process and Methodology

The new process deals with new parks and renovations as separate components. For new parks, the main goals are to locate facilities throughout the community so the greatest number of residents are served at the lowest cost, and to minimize duplication of services. For renovations, the overall goals are to ensure public safety, replace worn out facilities, and improve service delivery.

Park Types

For new parks, the analysis follows the adopted classifications in the Parks Element of the Comprehensive Plan:

Neighborhood Parks - smaller day use facility, optimally 10 acres in size, which serves family and small group activities such as picnics, exercise, and general play. This type of park should be found within one mile of all residents.

Community Parks - medium sized facility, optimally 30 acres in size, which may house a small day/night sports complex, small recreation center, outdoor play pool, and host small to medium sized community events. This type of facility also meets the neighborhood park need and should be located within 2.5 miles of every resident.

Regional Parks- large day/evening facility, optimally 250 acres in size, with a large recreation center (over 20,000 sq. ft.), large day/night sports complex (more than 4 fields), aquatic complex with indoor and outdoor pools, and can host large regional events for more than 1,000 people. Amenities found in a regional park will also meet the neighborhood park and community park needs of those living within one mile and 2.5 miles respectively. Regional parks should be located within 5 miles of every resident.

Level of Service

The adopted level of service from the Park Element is 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents by the year 2035. In order to reach that goal, staff has prepared a set of five-year acreage and level of service milestones by park type as shown in Table 2. Table 3 (next page) shows the park acres needed by 2015.

**Table 2
Projected Level of Service and Acreage Needs to 2035**

Year	2011 (existing)	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
Projected Population*	820,505	887,040	993,300	1,055,040	1,133,580	1,196,160
Level of Service (LOS)**	2.05	2.10	2.20	2.30	2.40	2.50
Acres by Park Type:						
Neighborhood	505	559	656	728	816	897
Community	179	279	328	364	408	449
Regional	460	745	874	971	1088	1196

* Assumes that the Unincorporated Las Vegas Valley remains at 42% of County Population Total.

** Level of Service standards adopted November 2009. Overall LOS Goal is 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents by 2035.

Sources: Clark County Comprehensive Planning; CBER--Population Forecasts, Long Term Projections for Clark County, Nevada 2012-2050

**Table 3
Parks Acres Needed by 2015**

	Actual LOS and Acres as of 2011	Desired LOS and Acres by 2015	Additional Acres Needed by 2015	Park Acres already funded or in-process to be completed by 2015**	Acres Needed
Level of Service (LOS)*	2.05	2.10			
Acres by Park Type:					
Neighborhood	505	559	54	13	41
Community	179	279	100	78	22
Regional	460	745	285	44	241

* Level of Service standards adopted November 2009. Overall LOS goal is 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents by 2035.

** See Appendix B and Table 2 for Level of Service

Sources: Clark County Comprehensive Planning; CBER--Population Forecasts, Long Term Projections for Clark County, Nevada 2012-2050

County Land Use Plans and Population Forecasts

Staff used adopted County land use plans and the SNRPC most recent land use forecasts to determine the existing residential development/population through the year 2015. This information was used for the residential population analysis and mapping in this report. If this new “Parks CIP Process” is accepted, the future land use time frame should be used for the mid-term as follows:

CIP Year	Future Land Use Target Date
2011	2015
2013	2020
2015	2020
2017	2020
2019	2025
2021	2025

Parks Master Plans

Park master plans were used to identify and refine the phasing for future capital improvements. They were also used to develop project scopes and cost information used in this report.

GIS

The GIS was used to locate, identify and map existing County parks services, city parks services, park development patterns, land ownership, and population density. The assessor parcel data was linked to the County’s land use plans and comprehensive plan elements to perform this analysis.

Capital and Operations and Maintenance Cost Data

Real Property Management generated cost estimates for projects while Parks and Recreation provided service delivery information for existing and future park projects. In addition, operations and maintenance cost information was provided by Real Property Management and Parks and Recreation.

Recommendations

Based on all of the inputs and analysis, staff has prepared a set of recommendations for new park development and park renovations through the year 2015 as noted below in Table 4. The recommendations are based on priority except where duplication of service would occur, or level of service ratios were exceeded for park types. Recommended new park development projects are shown on maps in appendix C. The full prioritized lists for new parks and renovations are shown in Appendix D.

**Table 4
Recommendations – New Parks, Additions, and Renovations**

Priority	New Parks and Additions by Park Type			Renovations**
	Neighborhood Parks	Community Parks*	Regional Parks*	
1	Durango & Blue Diamond Wash (Riley & Ford) (25 ac.)	Robindale and Arville (40 ac.)	Southwest Sports Park (65 ac.)	Desert Breeze Park
2	Unidentified Park D East Side #4 (10 ac.)		Mountain's Edge Park (95 ac.)	Alexander Villas Park
3	Torrey Pines and Wigwam (14.5 ac.)		Desert Breeze Park (95 ac.)	Laurelwood Park
4				Sunrise Park
5				Desert Inn Park
6				Mountain Crest Park
7				Silver Bowl Regional Park (Area C)
8				Sunset Regional Park
9				Sunset Regional Park
10				Sunset Regional Park

Note: Special Use Facilities at 315 acres meet LOS needs through 2015 and are not included.

* Phases as appropriate for customer service and funding availability

** For details of renovations see Appendix D

*** See Table 3 for level of service and acreage details.

APPENDIX A

Criteria and Weights

Table A – Example: New Neighborhood Park Criteria

New Development	Will it serve the Greatest Number of Future Residents By 2015?	Does it Duplicate Existing Service?	Land Cost?	O&M** Parks	O&M Recreation	Total
Grading Criteria	>12,000 = 4 9,500-12,000 = 3 6,800-9,500 = 2 0-6,800 = 1	0-2% = 4 2-16% = 3 16-30% = 2 >30% = 1	Owned = 4 Leased = 3 FMP* = 2 FMP & remediation= 1	0-1.08 FTE*** = 4 1.08-1.81 FTE = 3 1.81-2.54 FTE = 2 >2.54FTE = 1	0-1.89 FTE = 4 1.89-3.34 FTE = 3 3.34-4.79 FTE = 2 >4.79 FTE = 1	
Weighted Criteria	5	5	1	1	1	

* Fair Market Purchase, ** Operations and Maintenance, *** Full Time Equivalent

Table B – Example: Park Renovation Criteria

Renovations	Public Health and Safety	Service Delivery (Cost-benefit analysis)	Maintenance-Replacement	O&M Parks	Total
Grading Criteria	4- Urgent remedy to prevent major health/safety hazard. 3- Essential remedy to prevent health/safety hazard. 2- Potential to prevent health/safety hazard. 0- Not a health/safety concern.	4- Project creates revenues or identifiable savings in excess of the project cost. 3- Project significantly improves service delivery. 2- Project improves service delivery, with no impact on future operating costs. 1- Project improves service delivery, but increases future operating costs. 0- Project does not improve service delivery.	4- Urgent maintenance/replacement; facility, material or equipment has failed. 3- Life cycle maintenance/replacement; facility, material or equipment is at the end of its life cycle, repair costs are increasing to maintain asset. 2- Necessary maintenance/replacement; facility, material or equipment is not at the end of its life cycle, repair costs are increasing to maintain asset. 1- Necessary maintenance/replacement; facility, material or equipment is not at the end of its life cycle, deferral will not result in significant increase in repair cost. 0- Not a maintenance or replacement issue.	0-0.89 FTE = 4 0.89-2.10 FTE = 3 2.10-3.32 FTE =2 <3.32 FTE =1	

Notes: Overlapping services were evaluated into the matrix, and parks who's population exceeded beyond one mile for neighborhood parks, three miles behind community parks and five miles behind regional parks were capped and ranked at those mile distances. Developer built or future build sites were eliminated from the proposed recommendations.

APPENDIX B

Park projects in process or already funded for completion by 2015

Neighborhood Parks:

Nathaniel Jones Park	13 acres	completed in 2012
----------------------	----------	-------------------

Community Parks:

Charlie Frias Park	39 acres	completed in 2012
Walnut Park Expansion	5 acres	in-construction to be completed in 2013
So. Highlands Sports Park	10 acres	part of a development agreement
Summerlin Aquatics Park	24 acres	part of a development agreement

Regional Parks:

Hollywood Regional Park	5 acres	indoor/outdoor pool facility completed in 2012
Lone Mtn. Regional Park	21 acres	park expansion completed in 2012
Mtn's Edge Regional Park	18 acres	first phase in development, to be completed in 2014

APPENDIX C

MAPS

APPENDIX D

RESULTS MATRIX