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Fort Lupton Parks and Trails Master Plan

INTRODUCTION

In 2016, the City of Fort Lupton initiated an update to their 2005 Parks and Trails Plan, understanding that many of the recommendations and concepts from the previous plan remain applicable today. The process aimed to develop an updated plan that is responsive to changes since adoption of the previous plan, while incorporating modern planning practices and new ideas where applicable. In addition, the Parks and Trails Plan update is part of the City’s larger planning process to develop a new Comprehensive Plan. As such, the plan update reflects policy and direction from the new Comprehensive Plan, coordinating parks and trails improvements with the City’s broader goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>A pocket park is a small park, usually less than 1 acre, developed with passive elements such as sidewalks, fountains, gazebos, benches, and landscaping.</td>
<td>1/4 mile</td>
<td>0.25-0.50 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Playground, benches, walking path, etc.</td>
<td>Cannery Park, Lancaster Park, Smokey Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Provides recreational opportunities within a neighborhood, intended for all ages. Neighborhood parks should be stand-alone facilities; however, they may be located adjacent to elementary schools or linear parks.</td>
<td>1/2 mile radius, free of major barriers such as highways or waterways.</td>
<td>2-5 acres per 1,000 people</td>
<td>Play apparatus for all ages of children, multi-use paved surfaces, picnic areas</td>
<td>Heritage Park, Koshio Park, Lone Pine Park (future), Hidden Pond Park (future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>Provides recreational facilities for the entire community. Facilities should be provided for people of all ages. Should be located on arterial streets and accessible by pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1/2 to 3 miles or some uses community-wide.</td>
<td>5-8 acres per 1,000 people</td>
<td>Swimming pools, lighted athletic fields and tennis courts, pedestrian and exercise trails, large picnic areas with shelters, landscaped areas to buffer developments, areas of natural value and water areas.</td>
<td>Community Center Park, Pearson Park, Railroad Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Vacant and undeveloped land, maintained by Parks Department, preserved for natural amenity or infrastructure reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>Lone Pine Park, Vincent Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Park</td>
<td>Parks or recreational facilities oriented towards single-purpose use.</td>
<td>Community-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coyote Creek Golf Course, Road Side Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLASSIFICATION

The park system in Fort Lupton is classified using standards set by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA). However, the resulting classification has been slightly revised from that utilized in the 2005 plan to better describe the park system in Fort Lupton. The regional park category has been removed in favor of a “Special Use” classification. In addition, some Neighborhood Parks have been reclassified as Pocket/Mini Parks based on their size and the amenities they provide, and two parks that solely function as detention ponds were reclassified as Open Space.

SUPPLY EVALUATION

Through community outreach, residents indicated that not all neighborhoods are served by parks facilities within reasonable walking distances. Given this concern, several analyses using industry-wide standards were conducted to examine the location of park land and park service areas. In total, Fort Lupton contains 280 acres of parkland; however, Special Use and Open Space park land constitute just under 180 acres. Given the nature of these classification, that acreage was not included for the Level of Service and Service Area analyses.

LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service describes the acreage of parkland available per 1,000 residents, and is intended to measure the amount of parkland to which residents have access. NRPA provides population-based criteria for allocating park land for Mini, Neighborhood, and Community Parks. As shown in the accompanying table, the NRPA recommends a Level of Service between 6.25 to 10.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Fort Lupton provides 13.05 acres per 1,000 residents, indicating the City has more than adequate parkland to serve its current population. However, the analysis does not account for geographical barriers or municipal boundaries, which have created long arms extending outward from the urban core that are challenging to serve.

With regards to specific classifications, Community Parks are responsible for surplus parkland within Fort Lupton. While Community Parks exceed NRPA standards by 57 acres, the City falls short by roughly 4.5 acres for Neighborhood Parks and just 0.5 acres for Mini Parks. In addition, while Community Parks exceed standards, a large portion of this land is comprised of passive open space within Pearson Park.

SERVICE AREA

A service area analysis uses projected distances to identify the surrounding areas each park facility serves. Standards were set at 0.25 miles for Mini Parks, 0.5 miles for Neighborhood Parks, and between 0.5 and 3 miles for Community Parks. These distances are projected using a geographic information system to identify service areas.

Analysis demonstrated that Community Parks provide coverage for most of the City except the recently incorporated area to the north and industrial and agricultural areas near the southern boundary. Mini and Neighborhood Parks, however, leave certain neighborhoods without easily-accessible park facilities. Both Community Center Park and Railroad Park help to address these underserved areas by providing neighborhood-parks-level facilities. Neighborhoods east and south of Lone Pine Park are particularly underserved, with no parks featuring recreation amenities within a 0.5 mile radius. As such, the City should prioritize development of Neighborhood parkland and recreational amenities in this area. Overall, the City should explore opportunities to increase access for all underserved areas, particularly as development occurs on the periphery of Fort Lupton.

### Fort Lupton Projected Population: 7723

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Classification</th>
<th>Existing Parks</th>
<th>NRPA Recommended Guideline</th>
<th>Shortfall/Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Lupton Park Land Acreage</td>
<td>Level of Service (acres per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>NRPA Recommended Minimum Acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>38.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Fort Lupton Recreation Department provides the community with active and passive recreational activities for all ages. This includes 12 parks and 280 acres of parkland and open space. This chapter of the Parks and Trails Plan identifies opportunities for creation of new parkland and recreational opportunities, and reviews existing facilities to identify improvement projects that will benefit the Fort Lupton community.

NEW PARKS

The City should seek the development of additional Neighborhood and Mini Parks in order to meet national standards and address underserved areas of the community. Based upon field reconnaissance, level of service and service area analyses, and recommendations from the 2005 plan, the City should explore development of the following new parks:
Lone Pine Park

Lone Pine Park is currently an open space land, east of US Highway 85, used as a water detention area for overflow from the South Platte River during flooding. As a result, the open space is occasionally inundated with water, creating wet soils and marshy conditions near the culvert, which has limited the area’s use as a park. There is another open space about 1 acre in area adjacent to the Lone Pine Park along Lone Pine Street. The area includes existing stormwater detention facility and an oil and gas structure. The oil and gas structure will potentially be abandoned in the future.

It is recommended to extend the boundary of existing Lone Pine park to include the Detention Pond Park site through a trail along Lone Pine Street and name the entire park as Lone Pine Park. This park will be classified as a Neighborhood Park. While the original area under Lone Pine Park would be more suited for trails and greenways without any other built facility, the other open space would be more suitable for providing programmable activities such as a park shelter, playgrounds, and basketball courts. There are two possible options for the development of this park.

1. Develop the park where the existing oil and gas facility exists and plan trails around the detention facility which further connects to the overall trail system of the park.

2. Convert the existing stormwater detention facility to a park and re-locate/distribute the detention facility along the existing property of Lone Pine Park by creating series of ponds along either sides of trail. This option will require further hydrology study for its feasibility.

Due to the wet conditions of the soil, the trail surfacing should be concrete. The area on the southern end of Lone Pine Park encounters a hill with relatively steep grades. The hill presents a good opportunity for an attractive feature such as overlook area and the trailhead signage. The slope of the trail going up the hill shouldn’t exceed 5%; therefore, the trail needs to traverse.

Attractive plantings should be used to screen the trail from the nearby residences, while adding an attractive visual element. Native grasses and additional coniferous tree clusters should be added in some areas to add privacy, noise abatement, and/or screening of undesirable views. Plantings should line the entire length of the trail running through this parcel.
Golden Pond Park

The City owns a large property of open space directly south of 14th Street, just east of Pacific Court, which could be developed as a park. This concept was first developed for the 2005 plan, named Golden Pond Park. Development as a park would activate this area, providing parkland access to adjacent residential that is underserved within the parks system. In addition, the proposed Fort Lupton Trail would move through this area, thus a park would create a unique point of interest along the route.

As the site supports stormwater management, the western portion should be left open for stormwater detention, with some modification to accommodate proposed on-site trails. In addition, site grading should be carefully managed to account for stormwater and potential flooding. For example, proposed picnic areas should be at higher grade while soccer fields, which can handle occasional flooding, should be sited on lower parts of the site. Centralized parking between 14th Street and the Lancaster Avenue spur will improve access and support activity at the park.

As calculated in the Level of Service analysis, there is a deficiency in the number of neighborhood parks and the amount of land dedicated for neighborhood parks, it is recommended to classify this park as a neighborhood park.
Proposed New Park

Per the recommendations for the Fort Lupton Industrial Center Subarea within the Comprehensive Plan, the new park will be developed across the street from the existing Cannery Park on Fulton Avenue. By developing the new park across Fulton Avenue to the north-west corner of the Industrial Center site, the City could increase the park’s size to function as a Neighborhood Park. This would result in a more centralized facility for the surrounding residential and support Downtown Fort Lupton with a nearby public space.

The new park should include a playground, small shelter, basketball court, and a small field with a backstop fence. The ballfield size should be for the age group 10 and under due to limited area. In addition, walkways, drinking water fountain, and dedicated on street parallel parking should be provided. This park is part of the long-term plan for the subarea and is tied to potential redevelopment of the Site. For more information, see the Fort Lupton Industrial Center Subarea within the Fort Lupton Comprehensive Plan.
**Future Parks Considerations**

In addition to the identified opportunities for new parks, the City should continue to seek new parkland development as necessary. In developing new parkland, the following considerations should be taken into account:

**Existing Park Service Area Shortfalls**

The City should take advantage of opportunities to address gaps in the existing park system, as identified by the level of service and service area analysis. Pursuing development of Lone Pine Park, Golden Pond Park, and the relocated Cannery Park should help to significantly decrease shortfalls within the system.

**New Residential Development**

As new development continues, the City should update subdivision and zoning regulations to mandate that developers provide the appropriate category park necessary to service future residential areas. This will help the City to allocate resources for the entire community and will not cause immediate stress on the existing Building and Grounds Department. In particular, the City should require an open space buffer between residential (existing and future) and the industrial areas.

**New Acquisition of Unincorporated Land**

As the City incorporates new areas that increase residential land uses, it is important to consider the demand upon Building and Grounds amenities to service those areas. As part of preparing or considering annexation, the City should review parks and recreation needs based upon level of service and service area analysis.

**Landscape and Screening**

A well-designed and a thoughtful landscape plan significantly improves the appearance of parks. Native plants with xeriscaping techniques should be used to provide accent landscaping and utilities screening. Trees should be planted in open spaces in groupings of 3 or more, and standalone trees should be discouraged.

**EXISTING PARKS IMPROVEMENTS**

In addition to the recommended new parks, necessary improvements and potential projects for existing parks have been developed. These are based on an inventory of existing conditions, community outreach, as well as the 2005 Plan.

**Inventory of Existing Conditions**

In order to guide recommendations within the Plan, a complete reconnaissance and inventory of each park facility were conducted in June 2017. A key finding was that all City parks contain playground amenities. Areas that support programmable activities are limited to Community Center Park and Pearson Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
<th>Trail</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Horseride</th>
<th>Restroom</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Water Fountain</th>
<th>Picnic Table</th>
<th>Park Shelter</th>
<th>Skate Park</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Golf</th>
<th>Scent Overlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannery Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote Creek Golf Course</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koshio Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Pine Park</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>73.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Side Park</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Park</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANNERY PARK

Cannery Park is a Mini Park that serves the surrounding neighborhood with access to a small playground and open space. In addition, the park includes tree art, a trash container and a water pump station enclosed building.

A The playground has a semi-permanent edging and seems to have an ADA-accessible ramp, but there is no walkway that connects the playground to the sidewalk. The City should install more permanent edging and surfacing for the playground as well as a walkway connecting to the sidewalk.

B At the north and west sides of the park there is a chain-link fence that should be screened with vegetation.

C The sanitary sewer manhole should be screened with vegetation or a screened fence.

COYOTE CREEK GOLF COURSE

Coyote Creek Golf Course is a well maintained municipal golf course in good condition. This facility should continue to operate as a golf course in the future, and the City should regularly review maintenance needs to ensure maintained quality of the facility.

A Coyote Creek Golf Course is a well maintained municipal golf course in good condition. This facility should continue to operate as a golf course in the future, and the City should regularly review maintenance needs to ensure maintained quality of the facility.
COMMUNITY CENTER PARK

Community Center Park is the City’s premier park amenity and facility for recreation. The park features Fort Lupton’s state-of-the-art Community Center Complex as well as a skate park, playground, park shelter, soccer fields, parking, and trails, which will be an important connection as part of the Fort Lupton Trail.

A While the park’s playground is by far the best in Fort Lupton, the current semi-permanent edging should be replaced with more permanent edging.

B The skate park is a high-quality amenity but it is not clearly defined, lacking any kind of edging or fencing. The City should install a fence with signage and appropriate safety warnings to better formalize the skate park, as well as an access walkway that connects to the parking lot.

C The service access drive for the Community Center should be paved with a vertical curb on each side to formalize this roadway and reduce gravel runoff.

D The layout of trails within Community Center Park seems ambiguous and does not align with desired pedestrian circulation patterns. Several sidewalk connections abruptly end or the connections do not align. For example, there is no direct connection from the trailhead near the railroad crossing to the community center. It is highly recommended that the City analyze pedestrian movement and realign trails and sidewalk within the park to appropriately connect to each park amenity.

E The absence of a visual screen or buffer between the park and the railroad has a negative aesthetic impact on the park. The City should install a landscape buffer along the fence line. The buffer need not be continuous, but it should have a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees.

F The City should screen the utilities structures around the community center that are currently unscreened or insufficiently screened.

G As a long-term project, the City should explore opportunities for a grade-separated pedestrian crossing, such as a tunnel or bridge, connecting from Community Center Park to the west side of the railroad tracks. One concept would be to extend Dexter Street as a pedestrian route with a grade-separated crossing connecting to the Park. This improvement would be a great asset to improve connectivity to Community Center Park from the community living west of the railroad tracks.
**HERITAGE PARK**

Heritage Park consists of a meandering greenway walking path behind the backyard fences of homes between Aspen Street and Northrup Avenue. This includes a small playground area towards the east end of the park.

A. While the east side of the park has a more permanent and maintained entrance, the west side entrance is poorly marked and has some drainage issues where the trail meets the roadway.

B. The City should improve the walkway with a more permanent edging to prevent gravel from spreading and general deterioration. In addition, potholes and cracks in the walkway should be repaired.

C. Adjacent property owners treat the park like a rear alleyway, and many have deteriorated backyard fences. The City should work with property owners to maintain or replace these decaying fences.

D. There are few utilities structures in the park that should be screened, either by landscaping or a fence.

E. A porta potty has been placed in the park directly over turf near the eastern entrance. If this is intended as a permanent amenity, a dedicated permanent restroom facility should be constructed or, at a minimum, the porta potty should be placed on a concrete pad.

**KOSHIO PARK**

This park consists of playgrounds, a shelter, restrooms, picnic tables, a gazebo, walkway, and a public artwork installation of decorative painted trees called “Blue Spring Thing.” The improvements are generally in good condition.

A. Towards the north-west and south-west corner, landscape screening should be provided to reduce views of adjacent residential uses.

B. The City should consider flattening the raised bed towards the southern half of the park, which could be used to provide either a basketball or volleyball court.
LANCASTER PARK

Lancaster Park is a Mini Park that serves the surrounding neighborhood with access to basic recreational amenities. This includes a small playground, picnic tables, and a partial basketball court.

A. The City should increase the size of the walkway providing access to the park to at least 6’ wide.

B. The existing basketball practice hoop is sited on a concrete pad, approximately 10’ by 15’. Provided that there is enough available space in the park, the City should widen the concrete pad to a half-size court at minimum.

C. The City should explore installation of a more permanent rubberized surfacing for the playground, as budget allows, to reduce maintenance required by the current wood mulch surfacing.

D. The City should paint the site furnishings.

E. The bike racks should be reinstalled on a concrete pad to reduce deterioration of the grass and related pot holes.

PEARSON PARK

Pearson Park is Fort Lupton’s largest park and consists of ball fields, a playground, parking, trails, a pedestrian bridge over the South Platte River, and a scenic overlook.

A. The City recently added a dog park, located north of the ballfields behind a wooded area; however, this amenity is not directly accessible and should be improved with connections to the trail and parking lot.

B. The parking configuration at the south-west corner is not clearly defined and creates redundant pavement. The configuration should be improved by creating angled parking with a central landscaped island. The parking lot located at the north-east corner should be edged with curb and improved with a central landscaped island.

C. The Pearson trail that runs north from Pearson Park is in the development stage. This trail should be paved to provide comfortable access to cyclists and pedestrians.

D. The access at the south-east corner of the Park, via the pedestrian bridge, is relatively new and a great asset to improve connectivity. However, the City should add Pearson Park signage and pedestrian lighting to improve and more clearly mark the park’s entrance.

E. The existing playground is not well defined and is sited without any consideration given to the pedestrian connectivity with other park amenities. The City should consider expanding and improving the existing playground along with sidewalk connectivity with other park features.
**RAILROAD PARK**

Railroad Park runs adjacent to the railroad right-of-way on the east from 1st street to 9th street, resulting in a very long but narrow park. 4th Street bisects the park, cutting the park into a northern and southern segment. The Park hosts many amenities, including a soccer field, park shelter, playground, volleyball court, horseshoe court, parking, baseball backstop, basketball court, and walkways.

- **A** Currently, on-site walkways are limited to the southern half, ending at 4th street. The City should extend walkways to the northern half, per the recommendations of the 2005 plan.
- **B** The gravel surface surrounding the horseshoe court should be replaced with turf.
- **C** The gravel parking lot north of 4th street should be permanently paved with asphalt or concrete.
- **D** Since this park is spread across several blocks and is divided by the City roads, it is vital to have a well-defined crosswalk at each intersection with regulatory signage for vehicular traffic to provide safer pedestrian movement across the park.
- **E** Park signage at the corner of 9th Street and Pacific Avenue, which is adjacent to a fire hydrant, should be relocated and improved with foundation landscaping.
- **F** The City should explore opportunities to develop a permanent restroom facility within Railroad Park.

**ROAD SIDE PARK**

Road Side Park is accessible only from the Highway 85, and serves as a recreational rest stop for drivers. Although Factory Drive is adjacent to the park, access to the park is restricted to Highway 85 alone.

- **A** The ingress and egress drives from Highway 85 are very short, which may be unsafe for vehicles exiting and entering the roadway. The City should close the direct access of this park from Highway 85.
- **B** Potential reconfiguration of the 14th Street interchange with Highway 85 recommends Factory Drive be used as a southbound entrance ramp for the highway, blocking entrance to the park. As such, the City should relocate primary access to Road Side Park to Factory Drive, supporting adjacent industrial users with passive recreation. For more information regarding the interchange and redevelopment of the park, see the Northern Industrial Subarea within the Fort Lupton Comprehensive Plan.
**SMOKEY PARK**

Smokey Park consists of open space, a playground, and a picnic table and is generally in good condition.

A  The playground has a semi-permanent edging and seems to have an ADA-accessible ramp, but there is no walkway connecting the playground to the sidewalk. The City should install more permanent edging and surfacing for the playground as well as a walkway connecting to the sidewalk.

B  The picnic table’s location at the corner of the park is unusual. The table should be moved closer to the playground and be accessible by a walkway.

C  As budget allows, consider expanding the playground with new play equipment.

D  At the south-east corner of the park there is a chain-link fence that does not provide any use. The fence should be removed or screened with vegetation.

**VINCENT PARK**

Vincent park is an open space primarily used as a detention pond. As the park does not provide any park amenities, it should not be categorized as a park. City should conduct a hydrology study to identify the high-water line for this space and subsequently a feasibility study for providing any future park amenities for this space. Until then, the park area should not be categorized or counted as a Fort Lupton parkland.
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**TRAILS MASTER PLAN**

Trails are pathways for people. A trail is a unique and distinctive feature in the open space landscape, which are purposefully created and maintained for public use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Material and Surfacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Fulton Ditch Trail</td>
<td>This trail runs north-south along Fulton Ditch on the eastern edge of Fort Lupton. South of Fort Lupton, this trail could potentially connect with the trail running north from City of Brighton at County Road 6. North of Fort Lupton, this trail could potentially connect to the trail running south from the Town of Platteville.</td>
<td>10'-12'</td>
<td>Concrete or asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lupton Trail</td>
<td>This trail serves the entire community, and is accessed through a series of connection and neighborhood routes. The trail is designed to get users to the main parks of the area. It should be able to support walking, jogging, biking and rollerblading. Other trails and improvements in the network feed off of this main trail. The Fort Lupton Trail will be connected to the Front Range Trail system.</td>
<td>8'-10'</td>
<td>Concrete, asphalt, or pavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector Trail</td>
<td>These trails provide connections from a major trail system to the pedestrian-friendly destinations of the city. Connector trails are important for bringing tourists and regional population to downtown or to the Fort Lupton Trail from the South Platte River Trail and Fulton Ditch Trail.</td>
<td>8'-10'</td>
<td>Concrete or asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Trail</td>
<td>These trails connect the community to the trail system. These routes are as simple as suitable sidewalks in the community.</td>
<td>5'-6'</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>The walkways are internal to the parks. The purpose of walkway is to highlight pedestrian circulation routes through a park and provide durable surface on which to walk these routes. Walkways provide connections for different amenities of the park and when they are in community parks they act as a crucial connecting link for the Fort Lupton Trail.</td>
<td>6'-8'</td>
<td>Concrete, crusher fine, pavers, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fort Lupton Parks and Trails Master Plan
TRAIL CLASSIFICATIONS:

Fort Lupton Trail:

The 2005 Parks and Trail Master Plan recommended the development of a trail system to connect the Fort Lupton Community with some of the major parks and destinations. Over the last 12 years, several portions of this trail have been built or under development. The Pearson Trail, west of the South Platte River, is part of Fort Lupton Trail currently under development. Given the importance and benefit of this trail, the City should continue development of the Fort Lupton Trail.

In addition to those trail alignments proposed within the 2005 Plan, new alignments have been identified that will greatly benefit the Fort Lupton trail system, including:

- Extension of the Fort Lupton Trail west on 14th Street toward the historic Fort and connecting with Pearson Trail.
- Extension of the Fort Lupton Trail along 9th Street to the west from the intersection with Pacific Avenue. The trail should extend over Highway 85 via a pedestrian overpass bridge and run south along the east bank of the South Platte River, eventually connecting to the existing trailhead near the existing pedestrian bridge to Pearson Park.
- Widening of the sidewalk along north side of 1st street at Highway 85 underpass to provide consistent width for the Fort Lupton Trail.

Existing open spaces will be a key to supporting these routes. Necessary open spaces should receive special attention related to obtaining the areas and setting codes that enable trail development.

Figures 1 to 5 provide cross-section concepts for unique situations where the Fort Lupton trail passes through different geographical features. The sections will help Building and Grounds Department to evaluate trail design concepts for consistency.

Connector Trail:

As development of the regional trails progresses, connector trails should be established to provide needed connections to Downtown Fort Lupton. These trails should include bike lanes to allow safe and comfortable facilities for regional cyclists and tourists. Proper signage to Downtown Fort Lupton and related destinations should be provided along connector trails to assist bikers with wayfinding.

The existing underpass at Lone Pine Park could be utilized to connect eastern and western areas split by Highway 85. This underpass is a critical element of the trail system, connecting two essential portions of the trail system. The South Platte River trail branches off of the Fort Lupton Trail in Lone Pine Park via the underpass, connecting Fort Lupton to the City of Brighton. Improvements should be made to the existing structure including adequate lighting, landscaping, repaving, and other detailing. One idea would be a mural completed by a local painter to improve the aesthetics through the underpass.
10' Vertical Clearance

12' Horizontal Clearance

Figure 4: Fort Lupton Trail / Connector Trail
Highway Underpass

Figure 5: Fort Lupton Trail / Connector Trail
Highway 85 & 1st Street
**Neighborhood Route:**

Neighborhood Routes provide informal connections between residents and designated trail routes. These are almost entirely accommodated by sidewalks within the community. Where sidewalks do not exist along designated routes, the City should fill these gaps as funding becomes available. In addition, existing sidewalks should be reviewed and improved as necessary. In terms of implementation, these routes are lower in priority level, but the easiest in terms of establishing connections. Since bike traffic will also feed off the main trails onto these routes, bike lanes are recommended if space exists.

**Walkways**

Heritage Park, Koshio Park, Pearson Park, Community Center Park, and Railroad Park have internal walkways. Community Center Park and Railroad Park walkways also form a connecting link for the Fort Lupton Trail and must be given special attention for their periodic upgrades and maintenance. For any future neighborhood and community parks, the internal trail width should not be less than 6' and the material should be either asphalt or concrete as shown in Figure 6.

Trailheads are another amenity that offer users an easily accessible place to begin and end a walk or bike ride. Clear signage is important in these areas, as well as the entire trail system. High quality signage will make the experience of the trail more enjoyable, safe, and efficient. In addition to signage, trailheads should have other improvements and amenities, specifically trash receptacles and dog waste bags.
**Main Fulton Ditch Trail:**
The Main Fulton Ditch Trail alignment was proposed in the 2005 Plan but has not been built thus far. The community has shown a continued desire for this trail, therefore, it is recommended the City continue to pursue the development of this trail. With proper marketing, signage, and trail amenities, the Main Fulton Ditch Trail should be connected to Downtown Fort Lupton and historical landmarks to cater to long-distance bicyclists and joggers. Standards for this trail should be coordinated with all towns involved to promote a feeling of continuity. Refer to Figure 7.
TRAIL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS:
The design of trails is essential to safety along designated routes and the creation of quality trail amenities for Fort Lupton. The City should review and apply the following considerations to serve as guidelines for the planning and designing of trails and related facilities.

ADA Compliance:
All trails should meet ADA regulations. The longitudinal grade should not exceed five percent (5%). The cross slope should not exceed two percent (2%). If a departure from the maximum 5% and 2% standards is proposed, Department staff should be consulted early in the design of the trail to determine whether an exception is warranted. In areas not conducive to accommodating these longitudinal grade and cross slope requirements, the City will decide if departure from these criteria is warranted based on the most current version of the Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas prepared by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board). These guidelines acknowledge that under certain circumstances exceptions to the ADA regulations should be granted, thereby allowing steeper trails and deviations from other trail design standards.

Floodplain
Trails should be above the 100-year floodplain. They may be within the 100-year floodplain in limited cases, as approved by City staff, requiring additional protection using buried rip-rap, walls, or other means of stabilization.

Clear Zone
All trails should have a minimum of two-foot (2’) wide shoulder, or as shown in the trails section, clear zones on both sides of the trail to allow for recovery from accidents or passing. The clear zone should be at the same grade as the trail (with maximum 2% cross slope) and be free of obstructions.

Street Crossings/Grade Separation
The Fort Lupton Trail should always have a grade separated intersection at US 85. Where the Fulton Ditch Trail, Fulton Trail, and Connector trails intersect with an arterial or collector streets, a grade-separated crossing is preferred. If a grade-separated crossing is not feasible, a signal-controlled at-grade crossing should be provided, either designed as a midblock crossing or co-located with the crosswalk of a T-intersection or 4-legged intersection for streets. When these trails cross any local streets, regulatory stop sign or other appropriate traffic control device should be provided.

Hard Surface
Hard surface trails should be a minimum five-inch (5”) depth concrete with fiber mesh reinforcement. Where the trail also serves as a maintenance access road for another City department, the trail should be a minimum of six-inch (6”) depth concrete with fiber mesh reinforcement. Where the trail is within a fire lane, the pavement design should meet the requirements of the Fire Department.

Soft Surface
Soft surface (crusher fines or recycled concrete passing a similar sieve size) trails should be a minimum six inches (6”) depth over weed barrier fabric. Soft surface trail may be used for neighborhood connections or less significant trail connections, but may not be used for school access routes. They may not be within the 10-year floodplain or used in locations that require snow removal, such as fire access lanes. If the grade exceeds five percent (5%), soft surface trails should not be an option.
The Parks and Trail Master Plan sets forth an agreed-upon “road map” for future recreation facility development and open space acquisition for the City of Fort Lupton. The recommendations contained within the Master Plan address parks and trails for both existing and future residents. The Master Plan’s recommendations reflect a 10-15 year time period, a realistic expectation of when the community will achieve its ultimate build-out population.

This section highlights several next steps that should be undertaken to begin the process of plan implementation. These include:

- Prepare Annual Goals;
- Utilize the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP);
- Enhance Public Communication;
- Regularly Update the Master Plan;
- Cost Opinions for Major Improvements; and
- Potential Funding Sources.

The Master Plan should serve as a resourceful inventory of all parks and facilities and become Fort Lupton’s official guide for parks and trails improvements. It is essential that the Plan be adopted by the City, used by Building and Grounds staff, and the recommendations be incorporated into the City’s annual budgets.

PREPARE ANNUAL GOALS

The City should develop annual goals as part of the implementation for this Master Plan. Each of the Master Plan’s recommendations should be recognized and addressed as part of the City’s annual update to the Master Plan.

Parks

- Make improvements to existing parkland that will help activate these properties as recreational assets and address underserved areas of the community.
- Seek development of additional neighborhood parkland, particularly at Lone Pine Park and the parcel east of Pacific Court and 14th Street intersection.
- Explore pedestrian and bicycle connectivity improvements to Pearson Park that will help activate open space and allow greater access from central Fort Lupton across Highway 85 and the South Platte River.
- Consider parkland needs and service areas as part of the review process for future residential development as well as annexation and outward growth.
**Trails**

- Seek development of the Fort Lupton Trail to provide a dedicated circulator within the community that supports access to key destinations and enables appropriate recreation.
- Seek development of the Main Fulton Ditch Trail to provide future connections to the adjacent communities.
- Seek development of additional trails that will provide necessary connections to Fort Lupton’s park and trail system and contribute to a thorough and extensive trail network.
- Construct trailheads and other amenities that will support trail access and utilization.

**Utilize the Capital Improvement Plan**

The strongest tool for implementing the Master Plan is a Capital Improvement Plan. It establishes schedules and priorities for all park improvements and land acquisition within a five-year period. The City first prepares a list of all capital improvements that will be required in the next five to ten years, then annually, all projects are reviewed, priorities assigned, cost estimates prepared, and potential funding sources identified.

The Capital Improvement Plan typically schedules the implementation of a range of specific projects related to parks and recreation. Soccer fields, ball fields, land acquisition, picnic shelters, shade shelters, playgrounds, and other facilities would all be included in the Capital Improvement Plan. The City should balance capital funds for infrastructure repair improvements with new athletic facilities and park needs.

The recommendations of the Plan vary greatly in financial considerations necessary to implement and develop the facilities and parkland. While many of the projects and improvements called for in the Master Plan can be implemented through the City’s annual budgeting process, several recommendations will require additional funding sources, such as bonds, grants, or special technical/financial assistance. The City should periodically consider funding large capital projects or land acquisition through referendum. In general, the City should continue to explore and consider the wide range of local, state, and federal resources and programs that may be available to assist in the implementation of the Master Plan’s recommendations.

**Regularly Update the Master Plan**

It is important to emphasize that the Master Plan is not a static document. If community attitudes change, a new trend in recreation develops, or new issues arise, that are beyond the scope of the current Master Plan, it should be revised and updated accordingly.

Although a proposal to amend the Master Plan can be brought forth by petition at any time, the City should regularly undertake a systematic review of the Master Plan. Annual “housekeeping” is desirable to ensure recreation inventories are current and new facility development is reflected. Ideally, this review should coincide with the preparation of the annual goals and budget and CIP. In this manner, recommendations or changes relating to capital improvements or other programs can be considered as part of the upcoming commitments for the fiscal year.

In addition to regular upkeep, the City should initiate a review and update of the Master Plan every five to ten years. Routine examination and periodic updates of the Master Plan will help ensure that the planning program remains relevant to community needs and aspirations.

**Enhance Public Communication**

The City should continue to make the Master Plan available to the community through the City’s website and at the local library. It is important that all residents, affiliates, property owners, and other organizations be familiar with the Master Plan’s major recommendations and its vision for the future.

The City should also consider additional techniques for responding quickly to public questions and concerns regarding planning and development. For example, the City might consider a dedicated column in the quarterly program guide or web page features that focus on frequently raised questions and concerns regarding planning and development within Fort Lupton.
**COST OPINIONS OF MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS**

The following table is a tool the City of Fort Lupton may use to initially evaluate and budget for new improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Feature</th>
<th>Capital Improvement Cost*</th>
<th>Estimated Life (years)</th>
<th>Annual Operation and Maintenance Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails and Pavement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 10’ (Asphalt)</td>
<td>$95/LF</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>$5,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 10’ (Concrete)</td>
<td>$100/LF</td>
<td>20 - 50</td>
<td>$5,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 8’ (Asphalt)</td>
<td>$80/LF</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>$4,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 8’ (Concrete)</td>
<td>$85/LF</td>
<td>20 - 50</td>
<td>$4,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 6’ (Asphalt)</td>
<td>$65/LF</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>$3,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails: 6’ (Concrete)</td>
<td>$70/LF</td>
<td>20 - 50</td>
<td>$3,500 Per Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots (Asphalt)</td>
<td>$3,000-$3,200/Stall</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>$20-$25 Per Stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14’ Wide Pedestrian Bridge over Creek</td>
<td>$200,000 - $300,000</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>$3,000 - $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Separation at Road</td>
<td>$1.5 Mil - $4.0 Mil</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>$5000 - $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>$100,000 - $300,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3,800/Bldg./Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts (Concrete)</td>
<td>$35,000/Court</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$400/Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts (Asphalt)</td>
<td>$25,000/Court</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$600/Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>$50,000 - $300,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,500/Site/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Playground</td>
<td>$200,000 - $600,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,000/Site/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Play Areas</td>
<td>$50,000-$250,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,000/Site/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park Improvement Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 $400 shade trees; 2- $2,000 benches with concrete pad, 2- $1,000 waste receptacles</td>
<td>$16,000 to $25,000/park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,000/Site/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park Improvement Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50- $400 shade trees; 8-12- $1,200 6 ft. picnic tables 8-12- $2,000 benches with concrete pad, 2- $2,000 bike racks with concrete pad</td>
<td>$45,000 to $75,000/park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,000/Site/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Field Irrigated: Includes lining, mowing, trimming, fertilizing, weed control, aerating, irrigation &amp; overseeding</td>
<td>$65,000/Field with Sod $30,000/Field with Seed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$4,200/Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Field Non-Irrigated: Includes lining, mowing, trimming, fertilizing, weed control, aerating, irrigation &amp; overseeding</td>
<td>$37,500/Field with Sod $2,250/Field with Seed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,000/Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Lighting (Rectangular)</td>
<td>$250,000/field</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>$7,000/field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All costs are planning-level estimates. Actual costs may vary.
**POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

**Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)**
Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants are available to cities, counties and school districts to be used for outdoor recreation projects. Projects require a 50 percent match. All funded projects are taken under perpetuity by the National Park Service and must only be used for outdoor recreational purposes. Development and renovation projects must be maintained for a period of 25 years or the life of the manufactured goods.

**Recreational Trails Program**
The federal “Recreational Trails Program” (RTP), was created through the National Recreational Trail Fund Act (NRTFA) as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and reauthorized by the MAP-21. This program provides funding assistance for acquisition, development, rehabilitation and maintenance of both motorized and nonmotorized recreation trails. By law, 30 percent of each State’s RTP funding must be earmarked for motorized trail projects, 30 percent for nonmotorized trail projects and the remaining 40 percent for multiusage (diversified) motorized and nonmotorized trails or a combination of either. The RTP program can provide up to 80 percent federal funding on approved projects and requires a minimum 20 percent non-federal funding match.

**Nonmotorized Trail Grants**
The mission of CPW’s Trails Program is to promote understanding and stewardship of Colorado’s outdoors by providing opportunities for the public use and support of Colorado’s diverse system of trails. The grant program is a partnership among Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO), the Colorado Lottery, the federal Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF).

**Fishing is Fun Program**
This program, funded by the Colorado Parks & Wildlife (CPW) Division of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources (CODNR) aims to improve angling opportunities in Colorado. The Division awards up to $400,000 in matching grants to local and county governments, parks and recreation departments, water districts, angling organizations and other related organizations annually. Potential uses of funds includes stream and river habitat improvements, access improvements, perpetual easements, pond and lake habitat improvements, fish retention structures, and new fishing ponds, as well as amenity updates including shelters, benches, and restrooms.

**Colorado Wildlife Habitat Program (CWHP)**
This state-wide program supports the private protection of important wildlife habitats and/or the provision of wildlife-related recreational access to the public. This program is voluntary for private landowners to utilize funds from a partnership between Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) and revenue generated by the sale of habitat stamps to create conservation easements, access easements, and fee title purchases.

**Habitat Partnership Program**
This program is funded by revenue from big game hunting licenses to reduce agricultural disruptions caused by deer, elk, pronghorn, and moose. It creates a partnership among private landowners, land managers, sportsmen, the public, and CPW. Actual money available from the program depends solely on sales revenue from big game licenses but currently it receives between $2.2 and $2.5 million each year.

**Off-Highway Vehicle Grant Program**
This program, administered by CPW, funds projects for the improvement and enhancement of safe OHV usage in the State of Colorado. Local, county, and state governments can apply for funds, combined from OHV registration and permit fees and the federal Recreation Trails Funds, on land open to the public.

**Shooting Range Grants**
This program provides matching grants to local and county governments, sportsmen and outdoor recreation programs, economic development agencies, and other organizations to establish, improve, or expand shooting ranges across the state. The program awards up to $250,000 each year for these programs.

**Snowmobile Grants Program**
The Snowmobile Grants program, funded by State snowmobile registration fees can be used by snowmobile trail operations organizations for trail grooming, maintenance and construction, signage, development of trailheads, parking construction, and map development. It also can be used by law enforcement to identify and return stolen vehicles, as well as encourage safe snowmobile use. Over $700,000 is available each year for this program.

**Wetlands Partnership**
State, county, and local governments can receive varying amounts of funding each year for the creation, restoration, and enhancement of wetlands and riparian corridors; wildlife and aquatic resource inventories; wetlands education and outreach; conservation easements and fee-title purchases; and project monitoring and evaluation. All projects are voluntary and promote cooperation among public, private, and nonprofit entities.

**Surface Transportation Block Grant Program**
This federally administered program provides flexible highway funding to states to improve state and local transportation systems currently or previously on a federal-aid highway system. Grants can be used to fund new recreational trails projects and pedestrian and bicycle programs, including modifications for compliance with ADA accessibility requirements.
Colorado Healthy Rivers Fund Grants
Administered by the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, this fund provides both project and planning grants. Project grants are intended for projects that promote the improvement and/or protection of the condition of the watershed. Planning grants are for the planning of successful watershed restoration or protection projects. Eligible applicants include locally-based watershed protection groups who are committed to a collaborative approach to the restoration and protection of lands and natural resources within Colorado’s watersheds.

Source Water Assessment & Protection Pilot Planning Project
The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment provides funds for source water protection entities that develop exemplary and comprehensive source water protection plans. Funding ranges between $25,000 and $50,000.

Protection Plan Development & Implementation Grants
This grant program provides funds for source water protection entities to develop and implement protection plan up to $5,000. It is administered by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

Public Private Partnership
The Parks and Recreation Department can partner with local non-profits and other community organizations to maintain existing parks or work to develop a new one as necessary. This partnership would formalize as the non-government entity providing funding to the Department to upkeep and improve specifically designated parks. It should strive to establish such partnerships to help improve the City’s parks and programs.

Payment In Lieu Of (PILO)
Payment in Lieu Of (PILO) is a tool that helps promote better development in the City. Municipalities can use PILO to help developers get a project proposal approved by adjusting the requirement for dedication of land. PILO allows developers to pay the present value of the land that is originally required to be set aside for dedication. In this instance, a developer is less constrained by land availability for the project and the municipality still receives compensation for the dedication that it is owed. Payments are typically made in the form of a fixed sum. Fort Lupton should periodically evaluate its PILO formula to ensure that new developments are appropriately compensating the City for land.