

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS



Item Descriptions

The follow is a brief description of the primary goal of each item:

- Mission Statement Compatibility - Does the proposed project comply with the goals and objectives of the County's Mission Statement?
- Cost & Funding Expense for a New Facility - After a funding source for the proposed project has been identified, does it create a net capital expense to the County (on a sliding scale of impact), or, after the funding source is identified and any offsetting income is included, would there be no net capital cost to the County?
- Potential Environmental Impact to the natural, designed and built environment- Does the proposed project present a potential negative environmental impact (judged on a sliding scale), or would there be no impact?
- Demographic and Trends Compatibility - Is the proposed project supported by the County Planning Department's 1996 Recreational Users Survey findings, the County's demographic trends and any recreational trends identified in Chapter IV?
- Current County System Adequacy - Is the County presently adequately served by the recreation type proposed or is there a lack of facilities for this activity?
- Potential Costs for Operations and Maintenance - Will there be a net increase of O & M costs to the County with this proposed project and on a sliding scale, what are those cost implications?
- Compatibility With Existing Park Character - For proposed project intended for existing facilities (e.g.: expansions, additions etc.), would they be compatible with the existing character of the park or would it be inconsistent and perceived as a misplaced intrusion?
- Financial Projections and Revenue Stream - Would the proposed project be self supporting, require a subsidy to operate or would it not only pay for itself but also generate excess revenue that could be used for other park's expenses?
- New Acquisition / New Area Requirements - Would the County need to acquire any new property to accommodate the proposed project and how much would be necessary, or can it be accommodated on existing park land?

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS



- Affect on Existing Facility Operating Efficiency - Would the proposed project improve the operations of the existing facility in which it is sited or have no affect?
- Affect on Total County Recreation User Capacity - Would the project add available County recreational capacity for the activity proposed, would it decrease total available capacity or have no affect?
- Affect on Total County Recreation User Frequency - Would the project create or promote additional County recreational user frequency for the activity proposed, would it decrease total frequency or have no affect?
- Affect on Safety and Security - Would the proposed project cause an increase in, a decrease of or have no affect on the safety and security of the facility?
- Potential Staffing Requirements - Would the proposed project require the new funding of any full or part-time employee positions (amount noted on a sliding scale) or would the net staffing requirements be zero as they could be paid for either through new revenues generated by the project? Could additional staffing requirements be accommodated by sharing existing staff with other facilities, or would no new staff be needed?
- Equipment Requirements for Operations and Maintenance - Would the proposed project require the new funding of any new equipment (amount noted on a sliding scale) or would the net equipment requirements be zero as it could be paid for either through new revenues or savings generated by the project? Could additional equipment be accommodated by sharing existing equipment with other facilities, or would no new equipment be needed?
- Physical Access to Facility - Would the proposed project increase, decrease or have no affect on the physical access to the facility?
- Will a New Facility be Required - Does the proposed project require the construction of any new facilities or can it be accomplished with current facilities?
- Proposed Facility's Landscape Type - Is the proposed project predominantly a built/hardscape type facility or a natural/softscape type?

Softscape - Is the proposed softscape predominately composed of high maintenance (i.e. dollar, chemical or irrigation dependant), non-native plant material and turf grass or is it a more ecologically conservative type that utilizes more native species reliant on the natural processes?

Hardscape - Is the proposed hardscape composed of high maintenance facilities (i.e. buildings,

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS



pools etc.) or are they energy efficient and low maintenance?

- Facility Potential User Availability - What portion of a year would the proposed project be available for use? Are there potential 'off-season' supplemental uses for the facility?
- Facility Potential New User Capacity - What is the potential total daily capacity for new users of the proposed project?

Evaluation Analysis

Some selected sample projects were evaluated using the Evaluation Screen Matrix and their point values were computed to demonstrate how the process works. After running through a number of examples, three issues were raised:

- 1) Proposed Capital Projects of the "New Facility" type will generally score higher than typical "Infrastructure/Rehabilitation" type projects, and two different threshold scores must be established to fairly judge "apples and apples".
- 2) The matrix is better used to evaluate "bricks and mortar" type efforts. Programs that are more people and/or policy oriented need a slightly different set of criteria for evaluation purposes.
- 3) Potential projects to be evaluated cannot be too general but rather they should have as much detail as possible so that the category questions can be answered with a context in mind. For example, it's more worthwhile to suggest "new swimming pool at Glen Island" than "New Swimming Pool in South County."

Two examples developed in the matrix show the benefit of evaluating the same project using two different funding mechanisms. The "New Parking Deck at the County Center" project that would be funded by the County scored rather poorly (36 pts.). The same project, funded by outside sources having not only no net cost to the County but also the potential for excess revenues, scored much better (56 pts.). Other projects were evaluated to test the scoring potential of projects that have already been done and are deemed to be successful. The highly successful "Do Bike Sundays on the Bronx River Parkway" project scored quite well with a total of 89 points thus confirming the methodology of the matrix.

It appears that after running a number of selected projects through the matrix, a desirable minimum score for new work type projects should be about 60± points. For infrastructure/rehabilitation type projects, the minimum value should be about 40± points.

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS



pools etc.) or are they energy efficient and low maintenance?

- Facility Potential User Availability - What portion of a year would the proposed project be available for use? Are there potential 'off-season' supplemental uses for the facility?
- Facility Potential New User Capacity - What is the potential total daily capacity for new users of the proposed project?

Evaluation Analysis

Some selected sample projects were evaluated using the Evaluation Screen Matrix and their point values were computed to demonstrate how the process works. After running through a number of examples, three issues were raised:

- 1) Proposed Capital Projects of the "New Facility" type will generally score higher than typical "Infrastructure/Rehabilitation" type projects, and two different threshold scores must be established to fairly judge "apples and apples".
- 2) The matrix is better used to evaluate "bricks and mortar" type efforts. Programs that are more people and/or policy oriented need a slightly different set of criteria for evaluation purposes.
- 3) Potential projects to be evaluated cannot be too general but rather they should have as much detail as possible so that the category questions can be answered with a context in mind. For example, it's more worthwhile to suggest "new swimming pool at Glen Island" than "New Swimming Pool in South County."

Two examples developed in the matrix show the benefit of evaluating the same project using two different funding mechanisms. The "New Parking Deck at the County Center" project that would be funded by the County scored rather poorly (36 pts.). The same project, funded by outside sources having not only no net cost to the County but also the potential for excess revenues, scored much better (56 pts.). Other projects were evaluated to test the scoring potential of projects that have already been done and are deemed to be successful. The highly successful "Do Bike Sundays on the Bronx River Parkway" project scored quite well with a total of 89 points thus confirming the methodology of the matrix.

It appears that after running a number of selected projects through the matrix, a desirable minimum score for new work type projects should be about $60 \pm$ points. For infrastructure/rehabilitation type projects, the minimum value should be about $40 \pm$ points.

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

E. Capital Projects Analysis

The list of Capital Projects that follows was derived from the WCPRC's 1996 Capital Projects Request Forms list and has been categorized to identify what priority level the project warrants:

- 'A'- Essential
- 'B'- Needed but not essential
- 'C'- New or expanded

If a proposed project or program is an essential improvement involving health, safety or welfare issues, there should be no question that it is important and a high priority item and therefore not subjected to the master plan other than to point out that it's on a short term list. The staff of WCPRC expressed concern as to how to rank the items on the 'A' list as not all of them can be funded in the year that they're requested. The other categories 'B' and 'C' would then be subject to the screen matrix discussed previously in Section D of this chapter.

The Capital Improvements categories are as follows:

1. Infrastructure/Rehabilitation –Improvements that are essential to park operations, access, utilities, maintaining essential facilities, etc. Included in this category are Capital Improvements numbered: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44 and 48.
2. Facilities Rehabilitation – Improvements to park and recreation user facilities which are important to quality, efficiency and user experience but not imperative. Included in this category are Capital Improvements numbered: 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 23, 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 43, 46, 47 and 49.
3. New and/or Expansion – Facilities that are appropriate to add and/or expand but not essential or significant to the quality, efficiency or user experience. Included in this category are Capital Improvements numbered: 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, 36, 41, and 45.

The use of the screening techniques will assist the WCPRC staff in determining how items get on the list and how WCDPRC decides priorities.

The following items are drawn directly from the current WCPRC Capital Project Request Forms. This list is constantly being revised as new projects are added and others are funded.

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Blue Mountain. - Sportsmen's Center Rehab. Gen. Improve., safety, lead contamination	\$4,650,000
2. Bronx River Rev. Riverbank Stabilization Env. engin. solutions for erosion	\$1,100,000
3. Bronx River Rev. Pond Rehabilitation Maint. & rehab. of sediment basins	\$1,675,000
4. County Center - Modification Ceilings, elevator, HVAC	\$1,125,000
5. County Center - Floor Replacement Full wood floor replacement	\$1,780,000
6. County Center - Parking Structure 1500 car parking deck behind CC	\$18,200,000
7. Croton Point Redevelopment - Infrastructure General utilities improvements	\$3,675,000
8. Croton Point Day Uses & Picnic Area Pk lot paving, planting, bathhouse rehab, boat/bike rentals, new shelters/comfort stat., minigolf, pk lot expan.	\$2,860,000
9. Croton Point Camping RV hookups, boat ramp/pk lot, bath rms, cabin reloc.	\$2,850,000
10. Croton Point - Site Improvements Tellers Pt. Nature trail, wine cellar restore, interp centr., archeol study, concess cafe, storg bldg.	\$2,450,000
11. Croton Ballfields II 2 new ballflds, lighting, comf stat.,	\$ 880,000
12. Davids Island Improvements Park construction after acquisition	\$8,500,000
13. Maple Moor GC Clubhouse Reconstr. Club house, new maint. bldg.	\$2,000,000
14. Mohansic GC - Expansion New 18, new 9, new cart bldg, renov clubhouse, tee/green/fairway renov, irrig improve,	\$10,000,000
15. Maple Moor GC 1st Hole Reconstruction Relocate tee, carpath, irrig, fairway regrade	\$ 500,000
16. 4 Course Golf Tee & Green Rehabilitation Rebuild tee&greens@ MM, SL, SW & Dun	\$4,300,000
17. Sprain Lake GC Clubhouse Renovation Roof, structural, siding, flooring	\$ 200,000

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

18. Dunwoodie GC Parking Improvements	\$1,220,000
Realign & repave, lighting, cartpath, elec system improve	
19. Hudson Hills GC Development	\$5,400,000
All site and building work for new course	
20. Georges Island Hudson River Overlook	\$ 450,000
Development of reserved picnic area	
21. Glen Island Redevelopment - Infrastructure	\$2,500,000
Sanitary, water, elec, lighting, pumps, pavements	
22. Glen Island Bridge Repair	\$6,500,000
Rehab to continue functioning	
23. Glen Island Picnic Areas	\$1,400,000
New comfort stat, rehab pavilion, picnic site work	
24. Glen Island Sea walls	\$1,800,000
Repair, rehab, rip rap, jetty, access walks	
25. Glen Island - Castle Improvements	\$ 350,000
Stabilize & repair stone structures	
26. General Infrastructure - ADA	\$ 800,000
ADA Access @ MMoor, SWoods, Dun & Mohansic	
27. Gen. Infrastructure for All Parks Active Rec. Areas	\$3,600,000
Site improve/amenities not included in other specific requests	
28. Gen Infrastructure - Bridge & Dam Inspection	\$5,100,000
Inventory & catagorize condition of all bridge & dams	
29. Gen Infrastructure - Paving & Resurfacing	\$1,000,000
Asphalt repaving @ various parks	
30. Kensico Dam Plaza Water Improvements	\$ 500,000
Potable water, cascade waterproof, restore 3 fountains	
31. Lasdon Infrastructure	\$1,950,000
New pk lot, elec upgrade, maint facil reloc, irrig syst,	
main house roof, pump house roof,	
32. Lasdon Park & Arboretum	\$1,400,000
Etab/improve arboretum, new greenhse for floral production	
33. V.E. Macy Infrastructure Woodlands Lake/Dam	\$1,010,000
Reconstruct Woodlands Lake Bridge/Dam, rehab lake,	
picnic area improve, new \$storage garage	
34. V.E. Macy Ballfield Improvements	\$ 900,000
Regrade/rehab ballfields, 2 new ballflds, new soccer field	
sports lighting, pk lot	
35. Marshlands Site Development Work	\$1,500,000
New entrance, pk lots, pathways, picnic areas, plantings	

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

36. Memorial Field Renovation	\$8,600,000
Acquire & improve outdoor multi sport athletic complex	
37. Muscoot Farm - Phase III	\$ 500,000
Connect w/ footbridge to Lasdon, restore stone walls	
38. Mt. Lakes Park Infrastructure	\$1,000,000
New potable water syst, lightning protection	
39. Gen Infrastructure - Pathways & Trails	\$1,845,000
2 mi. of connecting trails & pathways @ various sites	
40. Trail Mod. at Cranberry Lake & Read Sanctuary	\$1,500,000
Boardwalk / ADA trails in sensitive areas	
41. Ridge Road - Picnic Area	\$ 600,000
Addnl. group picnic area w/ comf stat, 200 pk lot, play equip,	
42. Saxon Woods - Pool Rehabilitation	\$3,000,000
Replace filtration system	
43. Saxon Woods Facility Improvements/New Bldgs.	\$1,200,000
With filter proj- demo old bldgs except filter bldg,	
new public service & staff bldgs, site work	
44. Sprain Ridge Park Bathhouse Improvements	\$ 860,000
New roof, siding, windows & site work	
45. Sprain Ridge Pool Modernization	\$4,000,000
Pool redesign and construction	
46. Tibbetts Brook Park Site Work	\$ 800,000
Renov tennis, pathways, picnic, ballfields, boat house,	
new bulkhead/dock, landscaping, playground	
47. Tibbetts Brook Park Infrastructure	\$ 250,000
New maint bldg, 8 pk lot, fences, landscaping, utilities	
48. Ward Pound Ridge Restor. Of Hist. Bldgs & Site Work	\$ 100,000
Restore maint garage & park office, repave pk. lot & ent. road	
49. Willson's Woods Pool Modernization	\$4,000,000
Pool redesign and construction, expand parking lot	

Playland

50. Ice Casino Improvements/Systems Rehabilitation	\$ 2,865,000
51. Auto Scooter - Ride Replacement	\$1,710,000
52. Maintenance Facility, Study & Construction	\$4,515,000
53. Breakwater Rehabilitation	\$ 800,000
54. Various Rides & Components/Repair & Restoration	\$ 4,000,000
55. Colonnade & Music Tower Rehabilitation	\$ 3,790,000
56. Bathhouse Masonry & Brickwork Rehabilitation	\$ 800,000

PHASE I - MASTER PLAN INITIAL FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS



57. Backflow Prevention Installation	\$ 500,000
58. Picnic Pavilions Rehabilitation	\$ 300,000
59. Music Tower Stage	\$ 500,000
60. Infrastructure Reconstruction	\$9,150,000
61. Boat Launch Ramp	\$ 100,000
62. Redevelopment of Outdoor Arena	\$ 100,000
63. Park Resurfacing - All Blacktop Areas	\$1,000,000
64. Security and Communication System	\$ 350,000