

## **SECTION 5**

### **IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**



## **Section 5**

### **IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section of the report identifies a six year strategy for funding park acquisition and facility improvements. This strategy identifies specific actions along with neighborhood input that should occur as well as potential sources of funding. The summary of this planning process is shown in two alternative six-year Capital Improvement Plans identified in Tables 13 and 15. Each of the alternatives is based on a different level of funding and commitment by the City. Some of these funding sources are new to the City whereas others have been utilized in the past.

*Objective: Maximize the effectiveness of existing funding sources.*

Policy 23. A 5-year Capital Improvement Program should be used as the means of coordinating the acquisition, improvement and rehabilitation of park facilities.

Policy 24. New parks should be developed and existing parks should be expanded only after a financing plan for the park providing for the improvements and the on-going operating and maintenance costs is approved.

Policy 25. There should be continued General Fund support (using 90/91 FY as a base, adding inflationary supplements tied to CPI) for operation, maintenance and development of park and recreation facilities.

Policy 26. Maximize the use of any federal and/or state grants, foundation funding sources, private donations, cooperative ventures, volunteer labor, or any other innovative means for land acquisition, development and maintenance of park and recreation facilities.

Policy 27. Implement, wherever appropriate, the collection of user fees and concession fees for facility improvements.

*Objective: Maximize the use of community funding mechanisms.*

Policy 28. Continue to seek out, develop and expand partnerships with other public/private and non-profit agencies through appropriate cost sharing mechanisms.

*Objective: Identify and consider new revenue sources.*

Policy 29. Consider the establishment of a land and easement acquisition reserve fund to purchase areas of high recreation potential in parks of the community now lacking adequate park facilities.

*Objective: Evaluate funding opportunities for all projects.*

Policy 30. A feasibility study should be funded to explore and evaluate the use of new funding mechanisms for acquisition, development and maintenance of new park and recreation facilities which could include landowner incentives, general obligation bonds or user fees. Any such new funding mechanism should be evaluated on the basis of whether all existing regulations for implementation can be met.

## 5.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

The following guidelines are recommended for implementing projects in the Capital Improvement Program. All parks projects, no matter how small, should be included in this program. The program should be continuously updated and reviewed/adopted by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board annually. The following guidelines are recommended for implementing projects in the park improvement program.

1. An assured portion of the General Fund needs to be allocated to the Parks Department at \$4,500 per acre (stated average).
2. Elevate maintenance of existing parks as the number one priority.
3. To accomplish #2, increase staffing, maintenance, and funding for the park system.
4. Before #2 and #3 can become a reality, hold neighborhood meetings allowing for specific input, concerns and improvements for individual park sites.
5. Staff processes public comments and suggestions.
6. Develop existing individual park site plans and estimate costs. (add and upgrade playground equipment, add additional parking and restrooms at Moore Park, etc.)
7. Explore cooperative operating agreements with other agencies (i.e. Kiger Stadium, Ella Redkey Municipal Pool, Wiard Park District, Conger Park, etc.)
8. Establish a Recreation District to include the urban area.
9. Seek approval of a serial levy for funding acquisition and development of park facilities.
10. Seek approval of a serial levy to pay for park and recreation facility renovations and improvements.
11. Acquisition of parkland.
12. Development of new park sites (i.e. Stewart-Lenox, Southside and Basin View)
13. Acquire and develop an indoor recreation center (joint effort with other agencies).
14. Phase in recreation programs (programs must be self-supporting)
15. Beautification projects.
16. Development of trails.
17. Preservation of open space.

## 5.3 CAPITAL PROJECT RATING CRITERIA

In an effort to evaluate project priorities, each project will be evaluated on a scale of 0-5 (with 5 being high) for its ability to fulfill the criteria identified below. Those projects that receive the highest score should have the highest priority for implementation. Listed below are recommended for prioritizing projects in the capital improvement program.

1. Will the project improve health/safety conditions? Score: 0=no impact on health/safety; 3= provides moderate public health benefits or improved public safety; 5=project is legally mandated
2. How effectively does this project impact existing park and recreation service levels? Score: 0=no change to existing service program; 3=adds moderate enhancement to service levels; 5=necessary to maintain current service levels
3. How effectively does this project meet community recreation needs? Score: 0=no impact on community recreation; 3= provides moderate reduction of unmet recreation needs; 5=provides significant reduction of unmet needs
4. Are there additional resources available to aid in the implementation of this project (i.e. grants, inter-agency or public/private cooperation)? Score: 0=only City Park funds/resources available for project; 3=Partnership/contributions available for approximately 60% of project costs; 5=Most project costs borne by others
5. What is the project's impact on the City Park's operating or staff costs? Score: 0=project significantly increases operating/staff costs; 3=project has no impact of operating costs; 5=project will significantly reduce ongoing expenses
6. Does this project meet identified, unmet needs consistent with the Park Master Plan, Community Development Ordinance or Comprehensive Plan? Score: 0=not identified in current plan or policy; 5=identified in current plan or policy
7. Is this project consistent with the balanced use of the various available City Park Development Funds (i.e. SDC's, General Fund allocations, etc.)? Score: 0=project does not provide for balanced use of funds; 5= project provides balanced use of funds
8. Will this project generate revenue? Score: 0=will not contribute to any additional revenues; 3=project costs will be recovered within 20 years; 5=project costs will be recovered within 5 years
9. Is this project required to make a committed project operational? Score: 0=has no impact on other projects/facilities; 3=complements a larger project improving level of service to public; 5=project is required to make existing project/facility functional

## 5.4 FUNDING SOURCES

The following are possible sources of revenue for acquiring, developing and maintaining parks and other recreational facilities.

### 1. City General Fund

This source comes from the City's annual operating budget. Generally, little is budgeted for capital projects from this fund. See *Capital Facilities Fund* below.

### 2. Capital Facilities Fund

This is part of the City's General Fund, but each year the City develops a capital facilities budget for financing major improvements. This year about \$225,000 was budgeted for park improvements. Many cities prepare a 5-6 year Capital Facilities Fund which allows for more long-term planning.

**3. Capital Serial Levy**

This is a property tax assessed for the acquisition and/or construction of park facilities. This type of levy is established for a given rate for 1-5 years and requires a simple majority of voter approval. The advantage of this type of levy is that there are no interest charges. This type of levy (versus a Special Serial Levy for maintenance) does not affect the \$10 tax limitation of all taxing agencies in the area.

**4. General Obligation Bond**

These are voter approved bonds with the assessment placed on real property. The money can only be used for capital improvements and not maintenance. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 20-30 years). Passage requires a majority approval by the voters. This type of property tax does not affect the overall tax limitation as described in a special serial levy. One disadvantage of this type of levy is the interest costs.

**5. Revenue Bonds**

These bonds are sold and paid from the revenue produced from the operation of a facility. This approach does not require voter approval unless a majority of citizens request it.

**6. HUD Block Grants**

Grants from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development are available for a wide variety of projects. Most are distributed in the lower income areas of the community. Grants can be up to a 100%. Approximately \$8.5 million has been distributed to the City annually through this program. In the past it has been used for neighborhood improvements such as sidewalk and street repairs and for a wood stove exchange program. No park projects have been funded with this program.

**7. System Development Charges**

System Development Charges (SDC's) are fees imposed on new development because of the impacts their project has on the City's infrastructure. For parks, the current fees for single family housing is \$600 and will increase by \$100 each year for the next two years. The City Parks program receives approximately \$30,000 annually from this source.

**8. State Bicycle Funds**

At least 1% of the State Highway Funds that the City receives must be spent for bicycle/pedestrian improvements and maintenance within existing street rights-of-ways. The State also has grants for other bicycle/pedestrian improvements. The amount distributed from the State is based on size. For Klamath Falls, the amount averages about \$8,500 annually.

**9. Land and Water Conservation Fund**

This is a federal grant program for the acquisition and development of parks and open space. At one time this was a significant funding source but over the years the amount has been significantly reduced. This program requires a 50% local match. Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation administers this program. This program is not currently funded at the federal level.

**10. Certificates of Participation**

This is a lease-purchase approach in which the City sells Certificates of Participation (COP's) to a lending institution. The City then pays the loan off from revenue produced by the facility or from its general operating budget. The lending institution holds title to the property until the COP's are repaid. This procedure does not require a vote of the public.

**11. Donations**

The donations of labor, land or cash by service agencies, private groups or individuals is a popular way to raise small amounts of money for specific projects. Such service agencies as the Kiwanis, Rotary, etc. often fund playground equipment improvements.

**12. Public Land Trusts**

Private land trusts such as the Oregon Parks Foundation Inc. and the Nature Conservancy of Oregon acquire will purchase land for eventual acquisition by a public agency.

**13. Lifetime Estates**

This is an agreement between a land owner and the City that gives the owner the right to live on the site after it is sold.

**14. Exchange of Property**

An exchange of property is between a private land owner and the city. For example, the City could exchange an unneeded water reservoir site for a potential park site currently under private ownership.

**15. Joint Public/Private Partnership**

This concept is relatively new to park and recreation agencies. The basic approach is for a public agency to enter into a working agreement with a private corporation to help fund, build and/or operate a public facility. Generally, the three primary incentives that a public agency can offer are 1) free land to place a facility (usually a park or other piece of public land) 2) certain tax advantages and 3) access to the facility. While the public agency may have to give up certain responsibilities or control, it is one way of obtaining public facilities at low or no cost to the taxpayer.

**16. Private Grants and Foundations**

Private grants and foundations provide money for a wide range of projects. They are sometimes difficult to find and equally difficult to secure because of the open competition. They usually fund unique projects or ones of extreme need.

**17. Urban Forestry Grants**

There are several funding grant programs that provide money for urban forestry projects. One is funded by the U.S. Small Business Administration and provides grants to purchase and plant trees. Urban street tree planting programs are sometimes funded by this program.

**18. Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21)  
Formerly the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)**

Over the years, Oregon has received considerable revenue for trail related projects. Originally called The *Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act* (ISTEA), it funded a wide variety of transportation related projects. In 1998 this program was modified some what and is now referred to as TEA-21. For 1998, Oregon was allotted \$488,723. This program is administered by the Oregon Department of Transportation. The money can be used for both maintenance and capital construction.

**19. Marine Board**

Grants are available for the development and operation of marine related facilities. Such items include restrooms, docks, boat ramps, parking areas, etc. are eligible. Money is also available for education, safety training and maintenance of facilities. Grants up to 100% are available. The City receives approximately \$11,000 annually from this source.

**20. Volunteer Efforts**

Volunteers can be quite effective in terms of contributing cash, materials and labor. This has worked well with groups such as Friends of Moore Park.

**21. Work Release Program**

An alternative to jail time is for offenders to provide community services such as working on a park maintenance crew or providing other recreation services. In addition, utilization of incarcerated work crews is an option, although this requires stronger supervision and more organization and planning.

**22. User Fees**

Cities and special service districts can charge a fee for the use of facilities or participating in programs. They are often an entrance fee or registration fee. A certain level of service or development may be required to access the park.

**23. Land and Easement Acquisition Reserve Fund**

Establish a City land and easement reserve fund which would be used to purchase areas of high recreation potential in parks of the community now lacking adequate park facilities. In-lieu fees, user fees and other minor revenues would be placed in the fund.

**24. Dedication/development as a mitigation measure for environmental issues**

Any projects that require mitigation measures, such as protection or establishment of riparian habitat or the replacement of trees, could consider off-site mitigation areas located in City parks or open space property. This would aid in reducing the City cost of planting or enhancement programs.

**25. Concessions**

Concessions provide income and a desirable visitor service within parks at no cost to the City. When consistent with individual master plan development goals, concessions should be approved. A concessionaire is given a long-term lease and/or other consideration to operate the business within a City park.

**26. Joint Powers Agreement**

Partnerships and collaborative agreements allow the City to effectively and creatively expand its services to address a wide range of community needs. The Joint Powers Agreement represent efforts at combining both the resources and manpower of the city and the partnering agency (e, school districts, state parks, Wiard park district, etc.) in the interest of meeting critical community needs, especially those related to open space and facility resources.

**5.5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

The City is currently paying approximately \$2,300 per acre for maintained parks. When compared to other communities, this amount is very low. The average is about \$4,500 with some cities as high as \$8,000 per acre. The parks in Klamath Falls appear to be maintained below an acceptable level as compared to other communities. However, the City Parks staff has done an exceptional job of maintaining the facilities given their limited funding and resources. Slowly, maintenance is falling farther behind and as a result, the existing park system could fall into disrepair. In addition, the lack of preventative maintenance is now becoming apparent. The City will find that where facilities are not properly maintained, they will soon be beyond a point where they can be salvaged.

To change this downhill slide, three major actions must occur. First, a new approach to park maintenance must occur. This includes using more seasonal employees and prioritizing park maintenance levels for each park. The second action needed is to reserve money for preventative maintenance. Otherwise, existing facilities will continue to disintegrate to the point where they can no longer be salvaged. Third, facilities must be added to existing parks to provide a well-rounded recreation program. To achieve this objective, a new outside source of money must be provided.

One recommendation is made for funding maintenance operations:

- **City General Fund:** The City should budget out of its General Fund, adequate money to maintain the park system. A budget of \$4,500 per maintained acre should be the target amount. As new parks are developed, this ratio should be maintained. Separate funds outside of the park budget, should be allocated for city beautification projects.

**5.6 FINANCING STRATEGY**

The cost to implement all of the improvements identified in the previous section could easily exceed \$10-15 million, not to mention the additional cost of operation and maintenance.

Table 12 below provides a range of costs for typical park facilities. The actual cost for development of specific parks will vary, sometimes significantly, from these averages depending on site and soil characteristics, water availability, topography, etc. These are reasonable costs for the year 2000 and may be used to develop broad order of magnitude costs. The estimates do not reflect any costs associated with design, inflation, environmental mitigation, etc.

**Table 12**  
**Typical Development Costs**  
**City of Klamath Falls**

Facility	Typical Development Cost (2000 \$)
Turf (five acres)	\$250,000
Ball Field	\$100,000-\$150,000
Tennis Court	\$30,000-\$40,000
Paved Trail (1 mile)	\$100,000-\$125,000
Unpaved Trail (1 mile)	\$10,000
Pool (outdoor)	\$750,000-1.5 million
Pool (indoor)	\$3-5 million
Parking (20 vehicles)	\$30,000-\$40,000
Basketball Court	\$30,000-\$40,000
Play Equipment	\$35,000-\$50,000
Restrooms	\$75,000-\$125,000
Group Picnic Area	\$30,000-\$125,000
Recreation Center	\$1-3 million
Land Acquisition (1 acre)	\$30,000

The City of Klamath Falls could not financially afford to implement a program of this magnitude. Furthermore, many improvements, particularly some of the neighborhood parks and trails, will not be needed for at least 5-10 years or until the City is fully developed. With this in mind, a short-term financing strategy is proposed for implementing facilities and programs of immediate need. As each park site plan becomes a reality, staff will look at each individual site plan and will phase-in work and implementation.

The recommendations for park and facility improvements found in the Section IV of this document can be divided into two basic categories: 1) those that are regional in nature and 2) those that mostly benefit City residents. Facilities affected by these two categories are as follows:

**Regional Facilities**

- Moore Park & Old Fort Park
- Indoor Recreation Center
- Regional Sport Facilities
- Recreation Programs
- Trails and Connectors

**Local Facilities**

- Park Land Acquisition
- Park Development
- Park Upgrade/Improvements
- Trails

It is concluded and recommended that local facilities should be funded by City residents whereas regional facilities should also be funded by everyone living within the urban area of Klamath Falls. The major funding sources for these regional and local facilities should be as follows:

- **Special Service District:** Form a County service district to fund the acquisition and development of regional recreational facilities: A general obligation bond would pay for the capital development and its service area would include the urban area of Klamath Falls. A separate operating serial levy would pay for the cost of programs and maintenance.

- **Three Year Serial Levy:** Initiate a three year serial levy is proposed for City residents to pay for park and recreation facility renovation: (Option B only)
- **System Development Charges:** Increase the SDC rate: Currently, approximately \$30,000 per year is realized from this source for City only local projects. This program could also be available to areas located outside the City limits if the County would adopt this program.
- **Capital Facilities Fund:** Dedicate funds annually to the City's Capital Facilities Fund.
- **Other Sources:** Seek grants and other funding sources: It is assumed that HUD Block Grants could be used to upgrade and develop parks in the lower incomes areas of the City. TEA-21 funds should be used for trail development.
- **Recreation Programs:** Develop recreation programs that are self-sustaining.

Based on these funding sources, two optional park improvement programs are proposed. Option A meets most of the immediate park and facility needs. Option B assumes that County residents would not participate in the funding program and no funding would occur for regional facilities. The monetary values used are rough estimates and are used as **examples only**. Each project will have specific cost estimates prepared before any financing can be determined. Each of these options are described below.

**Option A:**

- **Regional General Obligation Bond:** **\$3,405,000**
  1. Upgrade of Moore Park
  2. Construction of an indoor recreation center
  3. Construction of the infrastructure for the Sports Complex
  4. Development of Old Fort Park
  
- **City General Obligation Bond:** **\$5,000,000**
  1. Upgrade 14 existing park and special use sites
  2. Develop 5 miles of trail
  3. Acquire 6 new park sites
  4. Acquire 2 open space sites
  5. Develop 5 new parks

**Table 13**  
**Summary of Funding Sources**

Regional G.O. Bond	\$3,405,000
City G.O. Bond	\$5,000,000
System Development Charges (\$45,000 annually)	\$270,000
Capital Facilities Fund (\$200,000 annually)	\$1,200,000
Grants (\$150,000 annually)	\$900,000
Miscellaneous Sources	\$2,125,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12,900,500</b>

**Table 14**  
**Suggested Six Year Capital Improvement Plan**  
**Park, Open Space and Trail Development**  
**City of Klamath Falls**

Project	Cost (2000 \$)	Notes
<b>Regional Facilities</b>		
Moore Park Upgrade	\$405,000	
Proposed Old Fort Park	\$1,500,000	no land acquisition needed, development
Proposed Indoor Recreation Center	\$1,500,000	Allocation; excludes land acquisition
Proposed Youth Sports Complex	\$1,000,000	Infrastructure (grading, utilities, parking, etc.)
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,405,000</b>	
<b>Park and Special Use Area Acquisition</b>		
Proposed Balsam Park	\$210,000	7 Acres @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Basin View Mini-Parks	\$180,000	6 @ 1 Acre each @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Basin View Neighborhood Parks	\$630,000	3 @ 7 Acres each @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed East Klamath Park	\$210,000	7 Acres @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Lake Ewauna Access (Special Use)	\$300,000	20 Acres @ \$15,000/Ac.
Proposed Pine Valley Park	\$150,000	5 Acres @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Southside Park	\$150,000	5 Acres @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Southview Park	\$300,000	2 @ 5 Acres each @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed S. Stewart Lenox Park	\$90,000	3 Acres @ \$30,000/Ac.
Proposed Vet's Park Expansion (Special Use)	\$500,000	3 Acres @ \$166,000/Ac. (Per Appraisal)
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,720,000</b>	
<b>Park and Special Use Development</b>		
Proposed Balsam Park	\$525,000	7 Acres @ \$75,000/Ac.
Proposed Basin View Mini-Parks	\$450,000	6 @ 1 Acre each @ \$75,000/Ac.
Proposed Basin View Neighborhood Parks	\$1,575,000	3 @ 7 Acres each @ \$75,000/Ac.
Proposed East Klamath Park	\$525,000	7 Acres @ \$75,000
Proposed Lake Ewauna Access (Special Use)	\$300,000	20 Acres @ \$15,000/ Ac.
Proposed Pine Valley Park	\$375,000	5 Acres @ \$75,000/Ac.
Proposed South Side Park	\$375,000	5 Acres @ \$75,000/Ac.
Proposed Southview Park	\$750,000	2 @ 5 Acres each @ \$75,000
Proposed S. Stewart Lenox Park	\$225,000	3 Acres @ \$75,000
Proposed Vet's Park Expansion (Special Use)	Undetermined	Undetermined Acres @ \$75,000/Ac.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,100,000</b>	

CITY OF KLAMATH FALLS PARKS MASTER PLAN

<b>Trail Development</b>		
'A' Canal Trail Southern Extension	\$250,000	2 miles @ \$125,000/mile
East Link River Trail	\$15,000	1.5 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Foothills Creek Trail	\$35,000	3.5 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Hogback Ridgeline Trail	\$100,000	10 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Kit Carson and 'A' Canal Trail Connector	\$41,250	0.33 miles @ \$125,000/mile
Lake Ewauna Trails (East and West)	\$40,000	4.0 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Northern Connector Trail	\$10,000	1.0 mile @ \$10,000/mile
OC&E Woodsline Trail Northern Extensions	\$187,500	1.5 miles @ \$125,000/mile
Pine Valley Trails	\$50,000	5 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Southview Trails	\$50,000	5 miles @ \$10,000/mile
Stewart-Lenox Extension	\$93,750	0.75 mile @ \$125,000/mile
Upper Klamath Lake Dyke Trail	\$10,000	1.0 mile @ \$10,000/mile
Misc. Connectors	\$300,000	Allowance
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,182,500</b>	
<b>Park and Special Use Area Upgrades</b>		
Eldorado Park	\$60,000	Allowance
Fairview Park	\$110,000	Allowance
Henderson Park	\$59,500	Allowance
Kit Carson Park	\$200,000	Allowance
Krause Park	\$30,000	Allowance
Mills Little League (Special Use)	\$60,000	Allowance
Mills-Kiwanis Park	\$35,000	Allowance
Moore Park Marinas (Special Use)	\$120,000	Allowance
Pacific Terrace Park	\$57,500	Allowance
Putnam's Point (Special Use)	\$60,000	Allowance
Richmond Park	\$57,500	Allowance
Stukel Park	\$8,500	Allowance
Veterans Memorial Park (Special Use)	\$110,000	Allowance
Misc. Improvements	\$25,000	Allowance
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$993,000</b>	
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST</b>	<b>\$12,900,500</b>	

**Option B:**

- **City Three Year Serial Levy:** **\$1,000,000**
  1. Renovate 14 existing park sites

The annual cost to the tax payer would be about \$0.45 per \$1,000 assessed valuation for three years.

City Serial Levy	\$1,000,000
Capital Facilities Fund (\$50,000 annually)	\$300,000
Grants and Other Sources	\$98,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,398,000</b>

**Table 16  
Suggested Six Year Capital Improvement Plan  
Park, Open Space and Trail Development  
City of Klamath Falls**

Project	Cost (\$2000)	Notes
<b>Park Upgrade</b>		
Eldorado Park	\$60,000	Allowance
Fairview Park	\$110,000	Allowance
Henderson Park	\$59,500	Allowance
Kit Carson Park	\$200,000	Allowance
Krause Park	\$30,000	Allowance
Mills-Kiwanis Park	\$35,000	Allowance
Mills Little League (Special Use)	\$60,000	Allowance
Moore Park (Regional)	\$405,000	Allowance
Moore Park Marina (Special Use)	\$120,000	Allowance
Pacific Terrace Park	\$57,500	Allowance
Putnam's Point (Special Use)	\$60,000	Allowance
Richmond Park	\$57,500	Allowance
Stukel Park	\$8,500	Allowance
Veterans Memorial Park (Special Use)	\$110,000	Allowance
Misc. Improvements	\$25,000	Allowance
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST</b>	<b>\$1,398,000</b>	

**5.7 SUMMARY OF ALL RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS**

The policies in the previous chapters reflect the intention of the City of Klamath Falls to provide adequate park and recreation facilities for all residents and visitors. Although total costs, including land acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance, of the Plan’s proposals are uncertain until detailed plans for each facility have been developed, preliminary estimates of costs and potential revenues indicate the existing financing sources are inadequate to finance all of the facilities proposed. Development of all of these facilities will require the creative use of existing funds and personnel, together with the establishment of new funding sources.

Shown in Table 17 below is a list of all site recommendations found in the Plan. It is from this list that a short term capital improvement plan has been developed.

**Table 17**  
**Summary of all Recommended Improvements**  
**Klamath Falls Parks Master Plan**

Facility	New Facility	Action
<b>MINI PARKS</b>		
Proposed Basin View Parks (6)	X	Acquisition/Development
Eldorado Park		Upgrade
Henderson Park		Upgrade
Pacific Terrace Park		Upgrade
Richmond Park		Upgrade
Stukel Park		Upgrade
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</b>		
Proposed Balsam Park	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed Basin View Parks (3)	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed East Klamath Park	X	Acquisition/Development
Fairview Park		Upgrade
Kit Carson Park		Upgrade
Krause Park		Minor Improvements
Mills-Kiwanis Park		Upgrade
Proposed Pine Valley Park	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed Southside Park	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed Southview Parks (2)	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed South Stewart-Lenox Park	X	Acquisition/Development
<b>REGIONAL PARKS</b>		
Proposed Old Fort Park	X	Development
Moore Park		Upgrade

Table 17 (continued)

Facility	New Facility	Action
<b>SPECIAL USE PARKS</b>		
Conger Park		No Change
Ella Redkey Municipal Pool		No change
Kiger Stadium		No Change
Prop. Klamath Sports Complex	X	Acquisition/Development
Proposed Lake Ewauna Access	X	Acquisition/Development
Maple Park		No Change
Mills Little League Park		Upgrade
Moore Park Marina		Upgrade
Putnam's Point		Upgrade
Proposed Vet's Park Expansion	X	Acquisition/Development
Veterans Memorial Park		Upgrade
<b>NATURAL OPEN SPACE/GREENWAYS</b>		
Prop. Foothills Creek Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Hogback Mountain Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Kago Hill Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Lake Ewauna/Klamath River Shorelines	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Link River Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. McKinley Hill Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Miller Hill Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Moore Mountain. Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Moore Ridge Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Pine Valley Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Plum Hills Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
Prop. Upper Klamath Lake Dyke Open Space	X	Acquisition/Preservation
<b>RECREATION TRAILS</b>		
'A' Canal Trail Southern Extension		Extension of existing trail
East Link River Trail	X	Acquisition/Development
Foothills Creek Trail	X	Acquisition/Development
Hogback Ridgeline Trail		Formalization of existing trail
Kit Carson and 'A' Canal Trail Connector		Extension of existing trails
Lake Ewauna Trails	X	Acquisition/Development
Northern Connector Trail	X	Acquisition/Development
OC&E Woodsline Trail Northern Extension		Extension of existing trail
Southview and Pine Valley Trails		Formalization of existing trails
Stewart-Lenox Extension	X	Acquisition/Development
Upper Klamath Lake Dyke Trail	X	Acquisition/Development
<b>SPECIALIZED FACILITIES</b>		
Multi-Use Skate Park	X	Development
Indoor Recreation Center	X	Development
Klamath Youth Sports Complex	X	Development



