

“Twenty years from now you will be more disappointed by the things you didn’t do than by the ones you did do. So throw off the bowlines. Sail away from the safe harbor...Explore. Dream. Discover.”

– Mark Twain (1835-1910)



IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARY

2012 PARKS, RECREATION, TRAILS & OPEN SPACE
VISIONING MASTER PLAN

7.1

INTRODUCTION

This Master Plan is intended to provide a broad vision and course of implementation for the future of Cedar Hill’s parks, recreation, open space, trails, streetscapes, and image. Action plans and cost estimates are provided for recommended future actions for Parks & Open Space, Indoor Facilities & Aquatics, Trails & Bikeways, and Streetscapes. These actions are based on analyses of existing conditions, needs assessments, and community outreach. For a better understanding of the implementation items contained in Section 7.2 of this chapter, refer to the implementation sections of Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Purpose

This chapter summarizes the recommendations and implementation items contained within the Master Plan. It also provides a summary of funding sources. An emphasis has been placed on utilizing outside sources for funding park acquisition and development as much as possible. Outside sources include grants, partnerships with public agencies, and partnerships with private entities. Partnerships with private entities include working with residential developers as needed to provide neighborhood and community parks for their developments at a level consistent with current values. This plan provides a recommended methodology for revising Cedar Hill’s Park Land Dedication Ordinance, engaging participation by residential developers at a level that reflects the true costs of land and park development. Calculations have also been provided allowing for developer participation at a level consistent with the City Water, Wastewater, and Roadway Impact Fees (see Table 7.13). Finally, information regarding compliance with the TPWD requirements for park master plans is included.

Coordinated Implementation

Maintaining the City of Cedar Hill’s effective interdepartmental coordination is an important consideration for the successful and efficient implementation of projects identified in this Master Plan. This is especially true for the provision of parks, trails, and bikeways; protection of open space; and streetscape improvements. Coordinating these actions with projects from other departments (such as street construction/reconstruction, major water or wastewater projects, right-of-way acquisition, drainage improvement, and flood management projects) will reduce overall capital costs to the City and speed up the implementation of this Master Plan.

There is a strong, symbiotic relationship between quality parks, accessible trails, protected open space, beautiful streetscapes and healthy economic development. High-quality, well-maintained recreation facilities

that are distributed across the City and are highly visible indicate high quality of life and economic prosperity. This plays a large role in attracting new businesses. On the other hand, funding for parks and recreation is dependent on sales and property tax revenues, which increase with sustainable economic development. In order to further capitalize on this natural symbiosis, it is recommended that the coordination between PARD and the Cedar Hill Community Development Corporation continue and that funding levels for parks, recreation, and streetscapes be maintained or increased in the future.

Business Plan / Capital Improvement Plan

As a method of maintaining the relevance of the Master Plan and implementing the recommendations contained herein, the City of Cedar Hill should prepare and maintain a business plan or capital improvement plan (CIP) specifically for parks, recreation, open space, and trail projects. Bikeway and streetscape projects may be best suited to inclusion in a roadway CIP. The parks, recreation, open space, and trails business plan or CIP should be developed as a refinement of the recommendations and actions contained in this Master Plan and based on available funding. It should identify and prioritize specific projects to be funded each year based on City Council, Park Board, and CHCDC input. Finally, it should be flexible to respond to changing needs and to account for implemented actions.

Plan Updates

It is recommended that City Staff conduct periodic reviews of this Master Plan. Regarding the plan's recreation-oriented components, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department requires master plans to be updated every five years (see pages 7-16 to 7-18 for additional information).

Updates regarding bikeways and streetscapes should be performed on an as-needed basis when infrastructure is built and/or new development occurs. These updates should be in coordination with the updates of other City documents, including the Comprehensive Plan, the Thoroughfare Plan, and the Public Works CIP.

Plan updates can be published in short report format and attached to this Master Plan for easy use.

7.2 ACTION PLANS & COST ESTIMATES

The four components of this Master Plan—Parks & Open Space, Aquatics & Indoor Recreation, Trails & Bikeways, and Streetscapes—each include lists of actions for implementation. To aid in the implementation and coordination of projects, as well as with near-term and long-term budgeting, this section includes summaries of the Action Plans from each of the four components and provides cost estimates.

Parks & Open Space

Neighborhood Parks

The Action Plan for neighborhood parks primarily includes the development of 14 new neighborhood parks and recommends the acquisition or reallocation of 105 acres of land. Four of the 14 new parks will be located on land already owned by the City.

Table 7.1 – Neighborhood Park Action Items & Cost Estimates

Action	Acres	Estimate of Probable Cost	Main Source of Funding	Additional Funding Sources
Acquire Land for New Neighborhood Parks* – Acquire land for 10 new neighborhood parks (average of 10 acres).	100	\$6,000,000	CIP, Park Land Dedication	
Reallocate Land for a New Neighborhood Park – Reallocate the 5 acres of City-owned land at the former YMCA site for neighborhood park use	5	--		
10 New Neighborhood Parks on Dedicated Land - Develop 10 neighborhood parks at an average of \$1,200,000 per park as development occurs.		\$12,000,000	CIP, Park Improvement Fee	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Develop Neighborhood Park Amenities in Four Undeveloped Parks - Develop neighborhood park amenities on existing park land at an average of \$1,200,000 per park (City-owned land at the former YMCA site, David Rush Park, Bear Creek Park, unnamed park near Plummer Elementary)		\$4,800,000	CIP, Park Improvement Fee	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Neighborhood Park Improvement - See recommendations as per the park reviews on pages 3-14 to 3-22 (one park per year at an average of \$225,000 per park).		\$2,925,000	CIP	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Redevelop & Repurpose Dot Thomas Park - Redevelop Dot Thomas Park as a neighborhood park with a trail head and passive open space.		\$1,000,000	CIP	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
	105	\$26,725,000		

*Assumed cost of land = \$60,000 per acre. The cost of land can vary considerably depending on whether it is urban or rural, the size of the parcel, frontage access along a major roadway, and whether it is in the Escarpment or the prairie. \$60,000 is chosen for purposes of budgeting with the intent to secure land at fair market value and to account for instances of high-value land.

Community Parks

The primary action for community parks is land acquisition and development of one or two new community parks. Determining whether to develop one park versus two will depend on the size of land available for acquisition and the need for specific athletic facilities (see page 3-44). In addition, the development of a tennis center is included in this action plan.

Table 7.2 – Community Park Action Items & Cost Estimates

Action	Acres	Estimate of Probable Cost	Main Source of Funding	Additional Funding Sources
Parkerville Park - Resolve contested land ownership issue.	--			
Land for New Community Parks* - Acquire land for two future community parks (one active community park and one passive community).	350	\$21,000,000	CIP, Park Land Dedication	
New Community Park Development – Develop two future community parks (\$8,000,000 for an active park and \$2,000,000 for a passive park) or one combined community park. Include facilities to replace those removed from Dot Thomas Park, Crawford Park, and Community Center Park (see Table 3.3).		\$10,000,000	CIP, Park Land Dedication	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Community Park Improvement – See recommendations as per the park reviews on pages 3-38 to 3-41.		\$5,105,000	CIP	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Tennis Center Development – Develop an eight-court tennis center. (Alternatively, develop four tennis courts for a lower cost).		\$1,200,000	CIP	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
	350	\$37,305,000		

*Assumed cost of land = \$60,000 per acre. The cost of land can vary considerably depending on whether it is urban or rural, the size of the parcel, frontage access along a major roadway, and whether it is in the Escarpment or the prairie. \$60,000 is chosen for purposes of budgeting with the intent to secure land at fair market value and to account for instances of high-value land.

Other Parks

The largest expenditures listed in the Other Parks action plan is land acquisition for open space protection and special purpose park needs. In addition to acquiring land, the development of special purpose facilities—water spray parks, a skate park, and a dog park—are included.

Table 7.3– Other Parks Action Items & Cost Estimates

Action	Acres	Estimate of Probable Cost	Main Source of Funding	Additional Funding Sources
Special Purpose Parks* - Acquire land for special purpose parks including trail heads, trail gateways, a dog park, a skate park, and other as yet unforeseen special purpose use.	20	\$1,200,000	CIP, Grant Funding	Park Land Dedication, Private Donations, Land Trusts
Open Space Acquisition and Protection (Floodplain) - Acquisition of land along creek corridors (100' wide corridors along ~15 miles of floodplain or the 100-year floodline at build-out conditions, whichever is greater; assumed \$30,000 per acre).	180	\$5,400,000	CIP, Grant Funding	Park Land Dedication, Private Donations, Land Trusts
Open Space Acquisition and Protection (out of Floodplain)* - Acquisition or non-acquisition protection programs of other important Open Space land not within the floodplain.	230	\$6,900,000**	CIP, Grant Funding	Park Land Dedication, Private Donations, Land Trusts
Support Facility Development – Develop playgrounds, pavilions, loop trails, and open play areas with new park development.		(included in park development)	CIP, Park Improvement Fee	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Water Spray Parks – Develop three water spray parks at a cost of \$100,000 each.		\$300,000	CIP	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Skate Park – Develop a skate park as a joint-venture with surrounding cities.		\$500,000	CIP, Other Cities	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Dog Park – Develop a dog park as a joint-venture with surrounding cities.		\$500,000	CIP, Other Cities	TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
	430	\$14,800,000		

*Assumed cost of land = \$60,000 per acre. The cost of land can vary considerably depending on whether it is urban or rural, the size of the parcel, frontage access along a major roadway, and whether it is in the Escarpment or the prairie. \$60,000 is chosen for purposes of budgeting with the intent to secure land at fair market value and to account for instances of high-value land.

**Assumes half of the land will be purchased and half will be protected without acquisition. These proportions can vary significantly depending on future opportunities.

Estimate of Probable Cost for Parks & Recreation Facilities Maintenance

Maintenance cost for parks and recreation facilities may vary greatly depending on seasonal conditions, development intensity, quality of materials, level of improvement, etc. As a guide for budgeting purposes, an annual projected maintenance budget for parks and recreation facilities is 2 to 4% of the development cost, rounded to an average of 3% per year. The following table illustrates the probable cost to maintain parks and recreation facilities improvements as listed in Tables 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3. Actual costs for maintenance should be determined during the design phase of each project prior to construction.

Table 7.4 – Parks & Open Space Maintenance Costs*

Priority	Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost
14 New Neighborhood Parks**	\$504,000
2 New Community Parks	\$300,000
Tennis Center	\$36,000
Water Spray Parks	\$9,000
Skate Park	\$15,000
Dog Park	\$15,000
Total Annual Maintenance Cost	\$879,000

*Maintenance costs for improvements to existing parks are not included in this table as the maintenance of improvements will be part of the existing program for these facilities.

**Includes 10 new neighborhood parks on developed land and new neighborhood park development on four existing undeveloped properties.

Aquatics & Indoor Recreation

Expanding the Recreation Center to include indoor aquatics is the single largest expenditure recommended by this Master Plan. Also included in this list is the development of a new Outdoor Aquatic Center to replace the Crawford Park Pool—although at a more centralized location—and the expansion of the Senior Center to reflect recent and future population growth and expectations within the city.

Table 7.5 – Indoor Recreation & Aquatics Action Items & Cost Estimates

Action	Estimate of Probable Cost	Main Source of Funding	Additional and Other Potential Funding Sources
Recreation Center Expansion & Indoor Aquatics	\$13,340,000	CIP	4B Sales Tax, Revenue Bonds, General Obligation Bonds, TPWD Indoor Grant, Private Donations
Outdoor Aquatic Center	\$5,200,000	CIP	4B Sales Tax, Revenue Bonds, General Obligation Bonds, TPWD Outdoor Grant, Private Donations
Senior Center Expansion	\$980,000	CIP	4B Sales Tax, Revenue Bonds, General Obligation Bonds, TPWD Indoor Grant, Private Donations
Convert Crawford Park Pool to a Water Spray Park	\$500,000	CIP	4B Sales Tax, Revenue Bonds, General Obligation Bonds, TPWD Indoor Grant, Private Donations
Total	\$20,020,000		

Estimate of Probable Cost for Aquatics & Indoor Recreation Maintenance

Maintenance cost for aquatic and indoor recreation facilities may vary greatly depending on seasonal conditions, development intensity, quality of materials, level of improvement, etc. As a guide for budgeting purposes, an annual projected maintenance budget for parks and recreation facilities is 2 to 4% of the development cost, rounded to an average of 3% per year. The following table illustrates the probable cost to maintain the improvements listed in Table 7.5. Actual costs for maintenance should be determined during the design phase of each project prior to construction.

Table 7.6 – Aquatics & Indoor Recreation Maintenance Costs

Priority	Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost
Recreation Center Expansion & Indoor Aquatics	\$400,200
Outdoor Aquatic Center	\$156,000
Senior Center Expansion	\$29,400
Convert Crawford Park Pool to a Water Spray Park	--*
Total Annual Maintenance Cost	\$879,000

*Action would result in maintenance cost savings compared to current Crawford Park Pool maintenance costs.

Trails & Bikeways

Trails

The Trails Master Plan includes a total of 120.2 miles of trails, including 23.2 miles of existing and programmed trails (trails that will be completed in the next few years). In addition, it includes 97.0 miles of new trails to be implemented in the long-term future.

Table 7.7 – Trail Master Plan Cost Estimates

Type	Miles/Units	Typical Cost*	Total Cost
Existing & Programmed Trails	23.2	--	--
Planned Trails (all types)	97.0	\$750,000	\$73,725,000
Trailheads	17	\$350,000	\$5,950,000
Overlooks/Viewing Points	4	\$150,000	\$600,000
Total	120.2 Miles		\$80,275,000

*Estimated costs include design, administration, and miscellaneous costs. The cost for the Core & Loop Trail segments, as reflected in Table 5.4 on page 5-23, are included in the totals shown on this table.

Core Trails

Of the 120.2 miles of existing, programmed, and planned trails, 48 miles are considered Core Trails, which will serve as the backbone of Cedar Hill’s trail system (see page 5-18). The top priority Core Trail segments are as follows:

- Cedar Hill State Park from FM-1382 to Mansfield Road
- Belt Line Road from Mansfield Road to Cedar Hill Road
- Cedar Hill Road from FM-1382 to Belt Line Road
- Houston/Main/Cooper Streets from Belt Line Road to US-67
- Longhorn Boulevard from US-67 to Virginia Weaver Park and Parkerville Road
- FM-1382 from northern city limits to New Clark Road

These six trail segments are estimated to cost approximately \$7.3 million in total. See Table 5.5 and Figure 5.4 for more information.

Bikeways

A number of facility types constitute the Action Plan for bikeways, which will exist on or adjacent to roadways (depending on type). Due to the highly varied nature of roadways and the many elements that must be considered—overhead and underground utilities, stormwater drainage, driveway curb cuts, right-of-way constraints, traffic operations, etc.—specific estimates of probable costs cannot accurately be developed without in-depth, case-by-case conceptual engineering. Typical costs per mile are shown in Table 7.8. Table 7.9 lists priority bikeway projects.

Table 7.8 – Bikeways Master Plan Cost Estimates*

Type	Miles	Typical Cost per Mile (retrofit)	Typical Cost per Mile (new construction)
Shared Lanes	19.0	\$10,000	\$50,000
Bike Lanes	25.7	\$20,000	\$100,000
Buffered Bike Lanes / Cycle Tracks	9.7	\$30,000	\$150,000 / \$600,000
Side Paths	24.6	\$750,000	\$750,000
Further Study Needed	6.4		
Total	85.4 Miles		

*See Table 5.6 on page 5-36 for additional information. Bikeway projects will most likely be implemented as part of future roadway projects. Therefore, probable costs cannot accurately be estimated without in-depth, case-by-case conceptual engineering.

Table 7.9 – Priority Bikeway Projects*

Upcoming Roadway Projects			
Project	Planned Facility Type	Miles	
Mansfield Road from City Limit to Belt Line Road	Bike Lanes & 12' Sidepath	3.9	
Lake Ridge Parkway from Mansfield Road to US-67	Bike Lanes & 12' Sidepath	3.6	
Pleasant Run Road from Joe Wilson Road to Duncanville Road	Bike Lanes & 12' Sidepath	1.0	
FM-1382 from New Clark Road to Strauss Road	Bike Lanes & 12' Sidepath	0.8	
South Clark Road from Belt Line Road to Parkerville Road	Buffered Bike Lane or Cycle Track	1.0	

*This table only illustrates upcoming roadway projects in which bikeway facilities are to be included. Table 5.7 on page 5-37 includes additional recommended projects.

Estimate of Probable Cost for Trail Maintenance

Maintenance cost for trails is calculated on a per-mile basis. Costs vary based on facility design, location, and frequency of use. The following table illustrates the probable cost to maintain the planned trails identified in this Master Plan.

Bikeway maintenance will be part of the general roadway maintenance program and is estimated to have a relatively minor impact on maintenance costs.

Table 7.10 – Trail Maintenance Costs

Type	Miles	Typical Estimated Maintenance Cost per Mile	Total Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost
Core Trails*	48.0	\$6,000	\$288,000
Secondary Trails*	36.9	\$4,000	\$147,600
Park Loop Trails	12.1	\$1,000	\$12,100
Total Annual Maintenance Cost	97.0 Miles		\$447,700

*Includes existing, programmed, and planned trails.

Streetscapes & Gateways

Streetscape Projects

The selection of priority streetscape projects reflects the City’s upcoming roadway projects. Streetscape enhancements should be designed and constructed simultaneously with the design and construction of the roadways themselves. Such an approach can reduce the overall costs of the project and ensure consistency.

Table 7.11 – Priority Streetscape Projects Summary & Cost Estimates*

Location	Estimate of Probable Cost [†]
South Clark Road from US-67 to Parkerville Road	\$1,500,000
Mansfield Road from City Limits to Belt Line Road	\$4,000,000
FM-1382 from City Limits to Cedar Hill Road	\$3,400,000
US-67 from Northern City Limits to Belt Line Road**	\$1,100,000
Pleasant Run Road/Duncanville Road Intersection	\$50,000

*See Table 6.2 on page 6-57 for additional information.

**This project overlaps two of the gateways included in Table 7.12 (US-67 between Joe Wilson and Wintergreen Roads; US-67 from FM-1382 to Belt Line Road). However, the estimate of probable cost for this project does not include the cost for these two gateways.

[†]Cost estimates were prepared utilizing standard cost estimate practices and exclude “soft” costs such as design and administrative costs, financing costs, construction management, surveying, geotechnical investigations, and construction materials testing. Cost estimates exclude engineering associated components (e.g. road paving surfaces, curbs, ramps, typical sidewalks, light poles and fixtures, traffic signage, traffic lights, striping, etc.) and assume water and service taps are available and accessible.

Gateway Projects

The selection of priority gateway projects was made to prioritize the most visible of the gateway locations identified in Figure 6.1 on page 6-7. While gateway projects can be implemented independently, the development of gateways concurrent with other roadway and streetscape projects will provide the most cohesive design and is recommended.

Table 7.12 – Priority Gateway Projects Summary & Cost Estimates*

Location	Estimate of Probable Cost[†]
Belt Line Road/FM-1382	\$155,000
US-67 between Joe Wilson Road and Wintergreen Road	\$210,000
US-67 from FM-1382 to Belt Line Road	\$3,500,000
FM-1382 at City Limits	\$110,000
Mansfield Road at City Limits	\$110,000

*See Table 6.1 on page 6-56 for additional information.

[†]Cost estimates were prepared utilizing standard cost estimate practices and exclude “soft” costs such as design and administrative costs, financing costs, construction management, surveying, geotechnical investigations, and construction materials testing. Cost estimates exclude engineering associated components (e.g. road paving surfaces, curbs, ramps, typical sidewalks, light poles and fixtures, traffic signage, traffic lights, striping, etc.) and assume water and service taps are available and accessible.

7.3 PARK LAND DEDICATION ORDINANCE REVISION

Acquiring land for parks and trails at the same pace as development and growth is one of the most critical tasks for the City. In order to acquire an adequate amount of land, it is important for the City to have a Park Land Dedication Ordinance that requires development to proportionately share the burden of meeting the needs of a growing community.

Recent research published by Dr. John L. Crompton of Texas A&M University¹ examines the constitutionality and viability of park land dedication ordinances across the State. Crompton suggests ordinances be calculated based on the true costs of land and park development. This approach ensures the specific requirements of an ordinance are proportionate to the impact of new development. The recommended method for revising Cedar Hill’s ordinance is based on this research and is detailed in Appendix F.

Table 7.13 compares the conveyance requirements and fees of the current Park Land Dedication Ordinance with an example calculation resulting from the proposed methodology (see Appendix F). This table also demonstrates the results if the same example calculation is discounted by 64% (resulting in 36% of the original calculated results). This discounted allowance is comparable to those established for Cedar Hill’s Water, Wastewater, and Roadway Impact Fees.

Although variables exist in this method, the calculation will always result in fees that are substantially greater than the current Park Land Dedication Ordinance fees. This is because these calculations result in fees based on the true cost to acquire land and develop new neighborhood and community parks to maintain current levels of service. Additional population growth requires the provision of additional park land. If fees are not increased to reflect the true cost of land and development, existing taxpayers will need to fund the majority of the costs associated with park development that is necessitated by new residents.

Historically, cities have established park dedication fees as an arbitrary value to prevent them from being challenged. This was a common practice when the economy was vibrant and growth was prevalent throughout many geographic areas. The downturn in the economy has allowed cities to realize the need for finding alternate methods of funding growth including revisiting existing park dedication fees. Table 7.14 describes the park dedication requirements of several cities in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex.

1 Crompton, John L. Parkland Dedication Ordinances in Texas: A Missed Opportunity? Rep. no. E-233. Texas A&M University: AgriLife Extension, 2010.

Table 7.13 – Comparison of Park Land Dedication Ordinance Calculations

	Existing	Example Calculation	36% of the Example Calculation
Conveyance of Land	1 acre/133 dwelling units*	1 acre/37.2 dwelling units	1 acre/37.2 dwelling units
Payment in Lieu of Land	\$250/dwelling unit	\$1,613/dwelling unit*	\$581/dwelling unit*
Park Development Fee	\$250/dwelling unit	\$4,468/dwelling unit**	\$1,608/dwelling unit**
Floodplain Dedication Ratio	1:1	1:2 [†]	1:2 [†]
Maximum Floodplain Dedication	Max. 50% of dedication may be in-floodplain; at least 5 acres must be out-of-floodplain	(no change)	(no change)
Minimum Dedication	5 acres	(no change)	(no change)

*Land costs can range from \$20,000 to over \$100,000 per acre. An average cost of \$60,000 per acre is used in these calculations.

**For single-family and multi-family development.

[†]2 in-floodplain acres equal 1 out-of-floodplain acre.

Table 7.14 – Park Land Dedication Ordinance Requirements of Other Metroplex Cities

	Conveyance of Land	Payment in Lieu of Land	Park Development Fee	Non-Residential Park Improvement Fee
Colleyville	1 acre/25 DU	\$1,802/DU	n/a	\$800 / acre
Flower Mound	1 acre/25 DU	Market value	\$790 / DU	\$1,000 / acre
Grapevine	1 acre/145 DU	\$1,416/DU	n/a	n/a
Highland Village	TBD	\$2,160/DU	\$1,025-\$1,447 / DU*	n/a
Lancaster	1 acre/50 DU	\$1,400/DU	n/a	n/a
Mansfield	1 acre/100 DU	\$500/DU	\$750 / DU	n/a
Rockwall	1 acre/72 DU	\$325/DU	\$202-831 / DU	
Southlake	1 acre/40 DU	Market value	n/a	n/a

*Based on level of service

7.4

TWPD MASTER PLAN COMPLIANCE

One of the primary purposes of this Master Plan is to serve as a parks, recreation, and open space master plan as defined by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD). Visioning, bikeways, and streetscapes are considered additional elements not required by TPWD, but in fact contribute tremendously to the comprehensiveness of this Master Plan.

TPWD Requirements

As of January 2008, TPWD stipulates that park master plans must cover at least a ten-year period. Plans must be updated every five years to remain eligible for grant funding (a completely new plan is required every ten years). At a minimum, updates should include a summary of accomplishments, new public input, most recent inventory data, updated needs assessment, priorities, new implementation plan, demographics, population projections, goals and objectives, standards, and maps. Priorities should be updated as implementation items are accomplished. A new resolution is not required when updating priorities; however if the City changes or revises its priorities, it must submit a new resolution adopting the new priorities.

High Priority Needs

Consistent with TPWD requirements, Table 7.15 lists the top priorities for parks, recreation, open space, and trails in Cedar Hill. These priorities have been determined based on community outreach, needs assessments, and City staff and City official input in order to provide an effective set of actions to enhance quality of life in the community for purposes of grant applications. The priorities are broken into two lists: one for outdoor facilities and one for indoor facilities.

Priorities for streetscape enhancements and on-street bikeways are excluded from this list since these types of projects are not eligible for TPWD recreational or other grants.

Table 7.15 – High Priority Parks & Recreation Needs

Outdoor Facilities		Indoor & Aquatic Facilities	
1	Develop a City-wide network of multi-use trails.	1	Upgrade the Recreation Center and construct indoor aquatic expansion.
2	Acquire and preserve open space and nature areas and make them publicly accessible.	2	Completely remodel and expand the Senior Center.
3	Develop currently undeveloped neighborhood parks with playgrounds, pavilions, loop trails, and open play areas.	3	Construct a new outdoor aquatic center in a central location.
4	Acquire land for new community parks in the southeastern portion of the City.	4	Replace Crawford Park Pool with a water spray park.
5	Acquire land for new neighborhood parks in under-served areas and areas of future development.		
6	Develop additional baseball and softball game fields.		

Plan Updates

This Master Plan is a guide to be used by the City to develop and expand the existing parks, recreation, trails, and open space system for future needs over the next five to ten years. Since recreation trends and needs change over time, it is necessary to consider this Master Plan as a living document that should be updated regularly. Potential factors that might bring about the need to revise this Master Plan include:

- The population may increase more or less rapidly than projected;
- The recreation needs, wants, and priorities of the community may change; and

The implementation of certain action items may stimulate and inspire other needs. Four key areas for focus of these periodic reviews are as follows:

- **Facility Inventory** - An inventory of new facilities should be recorded as well as any significant improvements of facilities provided by the Cedar Hill ISD whenever such facilities may become available for public use.
- **Facility Use** - Facility use is a key factor in determining the need for renovation or additional facilities. Updates on league participation of sports facilities should be prepared each season with data from each association. Changes in participation of those outside the City limits as well as the citizens of Cedar Hill should be recorded.

- **Public Involvement** - As mentioned previously, this Master Plan reflects the current population and attitudes as expressed by the citizens. However, those attitudes and interests may change over time as the City changes. Periodic surveys are recommended to provide a current account of the attitudes of the citizens and additional direction from the public on issues that may arise.

Maintaining a regularly-updated Master Plan will ensure that the needs of Cedar Hill's citizens continue to be met and that the vision and goals set forth in Chapter 1 can be achieved.