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IRVING CONTEXT

The City of Irving is located in the heart of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex and is the fifth most populous city in the region. Irving serves as a major employment center and is also a unique, diverse community that offers a wide variety of park and recreation options. The community is expected to grow 20% in the next 20 years and the demographic composition of the city will continue to become more diverse. As Irving continues to grow and as areas begin to redevelop, the provision of quality parks, recreation, open space, and trails will be a crucial element to maintaining quality of life. City leaders recognize the importance of the parks system and initiated this master plan effort in 2018 to provide a blueprint for the future of parks and recreation in Irving.
PURPOSE OF PLAN

The purpose of this plan is to conduct a thorough assessment of and recommend improvements to parks, recreation facilities, and open space in Irving. This plan provides guidance for the continued development of the park system, including improvements and expansions to the existing system. Additionally, the plan provides a framework for future expenditures for parks and recreation. The updated plan should position the City in such a way that residents, commuters, and visitors alike see Irving as a quality recreation destination within the DFW Metroplex.

Major sections of the plan include:

1 Community Profile

Evaluation of past and current community trends, demographics, natural and cultural resources, the built environment, and past planning efforts to inform the recommendations made in this plan.

2 Plan Vision & Goals

Overview of the input strategies used and the key findings from public and stakeholder engagement, which guided the development of the overarching vision and goals of this plan.

3 Parks & Open Space Assessment and Recommendations

Assessment of the existing park system and the development of system-wide recommendations to enable the park system to meet the city’s current and future outdoor recreation demands.

4 Indoor Recreation & Aquatics Assessment and Recommendations

Review of the current recreation and aquatic facilities and recommendations for a series of approaches for improving, expanding, and programming spaces to meet user needs.

5 Operations & Maintenance Assessment and Recommendations

Discussion of existing conditions and issues, and recommended strategies for reducing inefficiencies to create a department better equipped to support the City’s aging park system.

6 Implementation Action Plan

Outline of the short, medium, and long-term action items with corresponding costs which provides guidance for future budgeting and implementation.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

KEY COMPONENTS ADDRESSED BY PLAN

Development of a Unified Vision
Communities typically adopt a parks and recreation master plan at least once every 10 years in order to reassess needs, trends, and priorities. In Irving, the last master plan was adopted in 2000, nearly 20 years ago. Thus, a primary component of this master plan effort is to develop a unified vision for the future of the parks and recreation system and serve as a “blueprint” for guiding expenditures in the future. This is much preferred to making improvements piecemeal without regard to the larger picture.

Meet Growing Needs
Since the last master plan was adopted in 2000, the population of Irving has grown 25%. While there have been several miles of trails constructed and existing parks improved during that time, no significant park acreage has been added. Therefore, the number of parks haven’t kept up with the growing population. Additionally, the 2017 Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan projected that an additional 61,000 people will live in Irving by the year 2040, which is approximately a 20% increase. Not only does this plan look at addressing the needs of the existing population, but it also projects needs as the population continues to grow.

Addressing Aging Facilities
Many parks and recreation facilities in Irving are showing their age and require increasing amounts of maintenance and repairs. For example, the last recreation center was built 16 years ago, and the oldest recreation center was built over 60 years ago. This leads to increasing strains on maintenance budgets and forces staff to respond to immediate issues instead of focusing on proactive care and maintenance. This master plan introduces a series of approaches to address aging parks and facilities to make the recreation offerings in Irving commensurate with other area communities.

Identifying Operations/Maintenance Gaps
Even though the population and therefore number of park users have increased significantly over the past two decades, the number of maintenance staff has decreased. Since budgets and staff have not kept up with major capital investments, there are continued strains on the department’s ability to maintain parks facilities. This master plan recommends strategies to improve the efficiencies of parks operation and maintenance related to staffing, outsourcing, and technology.

Guide Future Expenditures
A critical component of a parks and recreation master plan is the implementation action plan, which outlines specific short, mid, and long-term actions and policies. The recommendations in the short-term action plan correspond with years 1-5 of the plan; this directly relates to the department’s five-year plan in which they budget for specific projects. The implementation actions also provide guidance for future department requests for bond programs and capital improvement projects. Having a catalogue of system needs which is reviewed every 5-10 years as part of a park master plan process is an extremely helpful exercise when developing budgets and making investments in the park system.
PARKS & RECREATION SYSTEM SNAPSHOT

Neighborhood Parks
These parks are designed to be within walking distance to a neighborhood. Irving currently has 24 neighborhood parks.

Community Parks
Typically larger parks that include a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities. There are 26 community parks in Irving.

Greenbelt Parks
These are larger open spaces with various natural amenities. Most of Irving’s 14 greenbelt parks are located along the Elm Fork of the Trinity River.

Special-Use Parks
These parks are designed for a specific, unique purpose. There are a total of 5 special-use parks in Irving.

Linear Parks & Beautification Areas
Linear parks are connected, narrow tracts of land and beautification areas are green spaces typically along roadways. Irving has 9 of these areas.

Inter-Local Agreement Parks
These parks have joint ownership and maintenance between two entities. Irving has developed 18 parks through this process.

School Parks
Located on school property, these parks serve the surrounding community who are able to use these spaces at designated times. Irving has 4 designated school parks.

Pocket Parks
Small pockets of green space typically fulfilling community need for gathering space and for passive activities. Irving currently has 9 pocket parks.

The below graphic shows the make-up of the current parks system by acreage.
6 Recreation Centers
Irving has six small to medium-sized recreation centers throughout the city that are intended to serve the surrounding neighborhoods instead of a larger portion of the city.

7 Aquatic Facilities
Aquatic facilities in Irving are split into three categories: traditional outdoor pools, outdoor leisure pools, and indoor pools.

1 Senior Center
The Heritage Senior Center is located in downtown Irving and provides space for traditional senior activities and also contains an indoor pool.

1 Youth Center
The Lively Pointe Youth Center provides youth programming for ages 12-18.
MASTER PLAN VISION
The overall concept for this plan builds upon the vision of the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan and consists of five themes: Centers, Corridors, Connections, Community and Celebration.

**CENTERS**
Integrate meaningful parks and open spaces into urban centers.

**CORRIDORS**
Identify areas for creating green and active corridors.

**CONNECTIONS**
Identify opportunities to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.

**COMMUNITY**
Create signature gathering spaces where everyone feels welcome.

**CELEBRATION**
Celebrate the unique people and places of Irving.

**PLAN GOALS**
Seven goals have been established to guide the City of Irving Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan.

**PARK ACCESS**
Creatively work toward increasing park access for all residents.

**RECREATION FACILITIES**
Enhance recreation programs and offerings as trends and demands continue to evolve.

**TRAILS**
Improve trail and bikeway connections between parks and trails and to recreation facilities, schools, and other cities.

**MAINTENANCE**
Ensure current and future parks and recreation facilities are maintained in a quality and sustainable manner.

**FUNDING**
Maximize and expand funding options to meet current and future resident demands.

**FLOODPLAINS**
Coordinate park and open space with floodplain management needs.

**SUSTAINABILITY**
Implement sustainable practices in planning, designing, constructing, maintaining, and operating parks and recreation facilities.
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

PARKS & OPEN SPACE

The graphic below shows the amount of parkland deficit in 2018 and 2040 towards reaching the target level of service of 10 to 12 acres per 1,000 residents. To address these deficits, a long-term process of strategic acquisitions is recommended and split into three categories: areas of park need, expansion of existing parks, and meeting demands driven by population growth.

Overall Parks & Open Space Recommendations:
- Process of strategic acquisition and partnership opportunities to address areas of park need
- Create additional connectivity opportunities
- Improve bike-friendly corridors
- Incorporate meaningful parks & open space in urban centers
- Improve sense of community and celebration in existing parks

INDOOR RECREATION & AQUATICS

The needs assessment conducted for indoor recreation and aquatics resulted in the following recommendations:

- Make near-term improvements to existing recreation centers.
- Perform a comprehensive recreation and aquatic feasibility study to look at the future of facilities in more detail.
- Implement multi-generational facilities over time.
- Update, replace, and implement new aquatic facilities in a phased manner.

PARKLAND DEFICIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET YEAR</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Acres LOS Target</td>
<td>903 Acres</td>
<td>1,034 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Acres LOS Target</td>
<td>1,637 Acres</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campion Trail
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

Assessment of operation and maintenance in Irving’s parks, recreation, and open spaces have revealed that the most critical needs include establishing a larger work force, increased efficiency, and better distribution of city-wide responsibilities. Currently, maintenance staff is overwhelmed, which has resulted in a decline in the quality of work as staff works to stay on top of maintenance demands. Overall, the maintenance staff has been forced to be reactive to maintenance issues, rather than proactive because of a severe lack of staff, distribution of labor, and resources.

STRATEGIES

Through analysis of existing operation and maintenance needs, key strategies to improve the operation of Irving’s park system have been developed, including:

- Improve quantity, efficiencies, and specialization of staff.
- Explore use of more technology in the automation of park system operations.
- Make enhancements to the physical maintenance yards and buildings.
- Make adjustments to budgets to account for rising maintenance costs.
TOP PRIORITY ITEMS
This list represents the major actions in the short-term action plan, which corresponds to years 1-5 of plan implementation. These actions are not listed in any particular order.

- Park improvements to Oak Meadow, Lanotte, and Keeler Park
- Master Development Plan & Design for Senter, Senter East, and Fritz Park
- Southwest Park Improvement or Renovation Plan
- Irving Soccer Complex Improvement or Renovation Plan
- Thomas Jefferson Park Master Development Plan
- Implement new entry monument signage at parks
- Replace pools at Lively and Senter with more modern aquatic amenities
- Develop a Comprehensive Recreation & Aquatics Feasibility Program
- Recreation center near-term improvements
- Finish Lake Carolyn promenade
- Design & construct Delaware Creek trail from Centennial Park to Lively Park
- Conduct a Trails and Bikeway Master Plan
- Acquire land for a community park near SH 161 between Northgate and Rochelle and conduct a master plan
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IRVING CONTEXT

The City of Irving is a unique, diverse community with access to many major amenities in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. It serves as a major employment center, centrally located between Dallas and Fort Worth. The City of Irving is approximately 67.7 square miles roughly bordered by I-35 E to the east, I-30 to the south, SH 360 to the west, and just north of I-635 to the north. As of 2018, Irving was the fifth most populous city in the Dallas-Fort Worth region and is consistently listed as one of the most diverse areas in the country. Irving is also home to 6 Fortune 500 companies, offering residents across the region quality employment options.
PLAN BACKGROUND & PURPOSE

The City of Irving serves as an international gateway to the DFW Metroplex; many travelers arriving at DFW International Airport or Dallas Love Field Airport travel through Irving to get to other parts of the region. Close proximity to airports, highways, and regional passenger rail makes Irving one of the most accessible cities in the region. Because of the City’s location, it can also be coined as a pass-through location as citizens travel through the City to various parts of the Metroplex. However, the City also has much to offer as a destination within the region. Quality parks, recreation, open space, and trails are vital quality of life amenities that make new communities attractive and considered a destination. Thus, the purpose of this plan is to conduct a thorough assessment of parks, recreation, and open space in Irving and make recommendations to position the City in such a way that commuters and visitors see Irving as a quality destination within the DFW Metroplex.

Irving has an interconnected network of highways connecting to downtown Dallas, DFW International Airport, and central and northern parts of the region. These highways serve as commuter routes passing through the City. A network of arterial streets serve more local traffic. It is important to provide pedestrian access and connectivity for residents and those traveling to Irving as a destination. Trail enhancements and roadway improvements coupled with directional and wayfinding signage near parks and recreation amenities can help both vehicles and pedestrians better circulate and navigate to and from the parks and recreation system.

The last update to the Irving Parks Master Plan was completed in 2000; this Plan recommended 25 capital improvement projects. The City’s most recent Comprehensive Plan, Imagine Irving, also had a significant section dedicated to parks and recreation and identified an updated parks master plan as a future need of the City.
The City of Irving initiated an update to the Parks Master Plan in Spring 2018. This resulting plan, called Let’s Play, Irving: Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan, will establish recommendations to address the City of Irving’s parks and recreation needs now and for the future. The Plan will follow a community-driven vision to establish a high-quality park system that meets national parks and recreation best practices.

Below are the goals and objectives of the 2000 Parks Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan Update.

### 2000 PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE MASTER PLAN UPDATE

**Goal:** Provide a parks and open space system that meets the recreational needs of all residents of Irving.

**Objective A:** Provide a regionally balanced network of parks of varying sizes and functions distributed throughout Irving initiated by completion of a new Parks and Recreation Master Plan delineating land and facility standards and developmental needs by region.

**Objective B:** Ensure that people of all interests, age groups, and abilities have access to the recreational, cultural, and leisure facilities and programs of their choice.

**Objective C:** Develop a comprehensive greenway system structured around parks, open spaces, the Trinity River, and other waterways.

**Objective D:** Encourage appropriate public involvement in Parks and Recreation Department activities and programs.

**Objective E:** Identify and implement financial, regulatory, and other mechanisms to support development, operation, and maintenance of the parks and opens space system.
PLANNING PROCESS

The development of this Plan spanned about 18 months. First, a complete analysis of existing conditions was conducted to make appropriate recommendations for the future. Current and future needs were then assessed and compared to national best practices to develop recommendations. Then, an implementation action plan was developed that prioritized all of the Plan recommendations.

Throughout the process City staff, focus groups, stakeholders, City leaders, and citizens were engaged to guide the Plan recommendations. The resulting community-driven vision forms the foundation for the future of parks, recreation, and open space in Irving for the next 20 years. The graphic below defines the steps involved in the planning process.
PLAN STRUCTURE

The *Let’s Play, Irving: Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan* is separated into seven chapters.

**CHAPTER 1 | INTRODUCTION**
Defines the purpose of the Plan, reviews the previous Plan’s goals and objectives, defines the Plan concept, and describes the planning process.

**CHAPTER 2 | COMMUNITY PROFILE**
Analyzes the attributes that influence Irving’s parks and recreation system such as history, natural and cultural resources, demographics, lifestyle trends, and other planning efforts. Additional context is provided about the previous Park Master Plan.

**CHAPTER 3 | VISION**
Reviews public and stakeholder input received throughout the Plan process and establishes the overall vision and goals for the Plan.

**CHAPTER 4 | PARKS & OPEN SPACE**
Establishes an inventory of existing parks and open space and identifies needs for additional park amenities or parkland acreage based on level of service assessments.

**CHAPTER 5 | AQUATICS & INDOOR RECREATION**
Analyzes recreation needs in Irving and makes recommendations for improvements to existing facilities and potential new facilities.

**CHAPTER 6 | OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE**
Assesses existing operations and maintenance procedures and makes recommendations to be more efficient.

**CHAPTER 7 | IMPLEMENTATION**
Summarizes key priorities, policy recommendations, and implementable action steps resulting from the Plan.
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

The overall concept for this Plan builds upon the vision of the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan, which is to create Centers, Corridors, and Connections. These elements are applicable to parks and recreation through park centers, multi-modal corridors, and trail connections. This Plan builds upon the vision established in the comprehensive plan and adds the themes of Community and Celebration.

CENTERS
Integrate meaningful parks and open spaces into urban centers.

CORRIDORS
Identify areas for creating green and active corridors.

CONNECTIONS
Identify opportunities to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.

CATALYST SITES
determined by the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan

LAS COLINAS URBAN CENTER & CIVIC CENTER

RECREATION CENTERS

MAJOR CORRIDORS

NEIGHBORHOOD CORRIDORS

BIKE and PEDESTRIAN Friendly CORRIDORS

RAIL ACCESS to Regional Centers

Areas of WALKABILITY and BIKEABILITY

TRAILHEAD OPPORTUNITIES

CONNECTIVITY OPPORTUNITIES
INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

COMMUNITY
Create signature gathering spaces where everyone feels welcome.

- Renovate/enhance PARK FACILITIES
- Modernize amenities and ensure equitable access to RECREATION CENTERS
- Increase TRAIL CONNECTIVITY, WALKABILITY and BIKEABILITY
- Preserve NATURAL AMENITIES/FEATURES

CELEBRATION
Celebrate the unique people and places of Irving.

- BRANDING the parks system
- INTEGRATING parks, open space, and GREEN LINKAGES into urban centers
- SIGNATURE and COMMUNITY EVENTS
- TRAILHEAD OPPORTUNITIES
- TRAILS
TPWD COMPLIANCE AND CAPRA ACCREDITATION COMPONENTS

This Plan was developed to be consistent with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department’s (TPWD) eligibility requirements for Outdoor Recreation grants as well as the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) requirements for accreditation for excellence in operation and service. This section describes where the required elements for both TPWD and CAPRA are found in this Master Plan document.

TPWD COMPLIANCE: To be eligible for TPWD funding, the agency requires that a municipality submit an updated park master plan every five years and a completely new plan every 10 years. Minimum requirements include:

- Summary of accomplishments since previous plan (see Previous Master Plan section in Chapter 2)
- New, pertinent public input (see Public Input section in Chapter 3)
- Inventory data (see Parks Inventory section in Chapter 4)
- Updated needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4-5)
- Priorities (see High Priority Needs section in Chapter 7)
- Implementation plan (see Chapter 7)
- Demographics (see Demographics section in Chapter 2)
- Goals and objectives (see Goals and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Standards (see Recommendations section in Chapters 4-6)
- Maps (see Figures 4.26 and 5.8 for recommendation maps)
CAPRA ACCREDITATION: This recognition sets parks and recreation agencies apart for excellence in operation and service. The Parks Master Plan is one required element of the accreditation process and plans must include the following items:

- Agency mission and objectives (see Department Mission and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Recreation and leisure trends analysis (see Trends and Lifestyle Benchmarking section in Chapter 2)
- Needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4-5)
- Community inventory (see Natural & Cultural Resources, Physical Development, and Demographics sections in Chapter 2)
- Level of service standards (see Needs Assessment section in Chapter 4)
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter evaluates past and current community trends in Irving. Information about demographics, natural and cultural resources, the built environment, and past planning efforts are critical to define existing conditions and inform the updated recommendations identified later in this Plan.
PLANNING AREA

Located on the northwest edge of Dallas County, Irving is centrally located within the DFW Metroplex, as seen in Figure 2.1. There are major amenities within and surrounding the City including: Trinity River, DFW Airport, Dallas Love Field Airport, and Interstates 30, 35 E, and 635. The City is also located just a few miles from Grapevine Lake and just south of Lewisville Lake. The access, location, and amenities that Irving offers makes it an attractive community of choice within the DFW Metroplex.

Major developments in Irving include the Las Colinas Urban Center, Downtown Heritage District, the Trinity Railroad Express, Irving Convention Center, and Toyota Music Factory. Transportation, natural amenities, central location, and unique developments make the City of Irving stand out in the region.

Figure 2.1 – Location of Irving in the Dallas-Forth Worth Metroplex
CITY HISTORY

One hundred years before Irving’s main population boom, settlers came to the area in the 1850s establishing communities such as Union Grove, Bear Creek, Estelle, Sowers, Kit, Shady Grove and Finley. In 1902, J.O. Schulze and Otis Brown bought 80 acres of land from the Britain family. Irving was founded the following year in 1903, which encapsulated new settlements. It is believed that co-founders Schulze and Brown named the City after Netta Barcus Brown’s favorite author Washington Irving.

HISTORIC TIMELINE

1889 | Settlers first arrived and called the area Gobit
1903 | The City of Irving founded by J.O. “Otto” Schulze and Otis Brown
1909 | Irving public school system established
1914 | City of Irving incorporated with Otis Brown as the first mayor
1925 | Irving’s early population reached 325
1930s | The beginning of Irving’s population boom
1956 | The University of Dallas founded
1971 | Texas Stadium built as the home field of the Dallas Cowboys
1990 | Irving’s population exceeded 150,000
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Natural area and open space preservation is both a desire and priority for residents in the City based on public feedback during the visioning process discussed in Chapter 3. Natural features within the City include forests, canals, wetlands, lakes, and the Trinity River (Elm Fork). Green corridors, such as the Campion Trail, provides both a natural recreational amenity but also an alternative mode of transportation for connectivity. **Figure 2.2** depicts the location of natural features in Irving.

Known for its various cultural and ethnic amenities and communities, Irving is one of the most culturally and racially diverse cities in the DFW Metroplex. With a large resident pool comprised of both bilingual and multi-lingual residents, residents speak English, Spanish, Chinese, Hindi, Arabic and numerous other languages. The City has various civic assets that strengthen the community culture such as museums, colleges, parks, libraries, and performing arts centers.

**Figure 2.2** – Natural Features in Irving
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

Irving’s proximity to the airport provides an international draw for both transportation and employment. Irving also has both residential and employment hubs such as Las Colinas Urban Center, Irving Heritage District, and Valley Ranch. Connectivity between these hubs and the parks and recreation system should be enhanced with improvements to bus systems, rail, pedestrian facilities and bicycling infrastructure. Major corridors, neighborhoods, employment centers, and transit routes are easily accessible throughout the City by car, but not as much by other modes of transportation.
DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic makeup of a community is important to understand at the beginning of the planning process. Demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, and income can help determine the need for different parks and recreation amenities.

GROWTH TRENDS

The City of Irving’s population boom began during the 1950s as cities within the DFW Metroplex experienced massive growth. In 1950, the population was about 2,615; in 2010, the population was 216,290. This is approximately an 870% increase in the past 60+ years. According to the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan, the City is projected to grow to approximately 301,541 people by 2040 which is a 20% increase from Irving’s 2017 estimated population of 240,373 residents. Figure 2.3 shows historic population growth in Irving.

Figure 2.3 Historical Growth in Irving, 1930-2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
POPULATION PROFILE

AGE AND GENDER CHARACTERISTICS
Evaluating population by age and gender helps ensure that the community has an appropriate mix of parks and recreation facilities. As of 2016 the largest population cohort in Irving is individuals ages 30 to 34, followed by ages 25 to 29. A young adult population is an indication of a growing community. Figure 2.4 illustrates the current population composition.

Additionally, females make up 51% of the total population and outpace their male counterparts in the age cohorts older than 55. The median age in Irving in 2016 was 32 years, which is lower than the Dallas-Forth Worth region median of 34.5.

Figure 2.4 Age and Gender, 2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
RACE AND ETHNICITY CHARACTERISTICS

Irving is a diverse community with pockets of various ethnic groups sprinkled across the City. Residents of various cultural backgrounds play sports such as cricket and table tennis, the demand for which is increasing as the City continues to grow. According to the 2016 American Community Survey data, 45% of Irving’s population is minority; this figure has risen from 38% in 2010. Table 2.1 shows changes in race and ethnicity over time. Additionally, in 2016, 35% of Irving residents were born in a foreign country; this figure far exceeds the percentage of foreign born residents in the Dallas Fort Worth region, which was only 18% in 2016.

### Table 2.1 Race and Ethnicity, 1990-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>155,037</td>
<td>191,615</td>
<td>210,025</td>
<td>232,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>64.20%</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
<td>55.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity (of any race)</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>40.60%</td>
<td>41.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS
Characteristics of households are also an important element of the Plan as it indicates what type of parks and recreation facilities or amenities residents may demand. The percentage of renter-occupied housing units in Irving has increased and outpaces the number of owner-occupied units. This is consistent with national trends where millennials, the largest population group within Irving, tend to put off buying a home and having children. Table 2.2 presents a summary of key household characteristics since 2000.

Table 2.2 Household Characteristics, 2000-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>80,293</td>
<td>90,079</td>
<td>90,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>28,396</td>
<td>31,899</td>
<td>31,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Mortgage Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,583</td>
<td>$1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>47,845</td>
<td>47,756</td>
<td>52,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Cost</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$847</td>
<td>$953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>76,373</td>
<td>80,615</td>
<td>84,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$44,956</td>
<td>$47,248</td>
<td>$54,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (with earnings)</td>
<td>$70,287</td>
<td>$72,978</td>
<td>$76,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

LANGUAGE
Given the number of foreign born residents in Irving, the number of languages spoken by residents in the City is also diverse. In 2016, 12.5% of households in Irving were considered to have limited ability to speak English. This is important to consider especially related to advertising for Irving parks and recreation programs. Table 2.3 depicts key language characteristics.

Table 2.3 Language Spoken at Home by Household, 2000-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>50,115</td>
<td>42,758</td>
<td>37,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Only</td>
<td>6,467</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>8,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Language Only</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>2,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>26,670</td>
<td>36,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76,373</td>
<td>80,792</td>
<td>85,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.
ESRI TAPESTRY SEGMENTATION

ESRI, a demographic and mapping company, has developed a demographic assessment called Tapestry Segmentation to help identify consumer markets per zip code. Using Tapestry Segmentation, residential areas within the U.S. are divided into broad market segments based on the socioeconomic and demographic composition. The following represents the most common tapestry segments found in the City of Irving. **Figure 2.5** depicts the location of zip codes in Irving and the associated tapestry segments.

**Figure 2.5 – Irving Zip Codes**
ZIP Code 75063
Enterprising Professional

Enterprising professionals are often residents who work in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM fields). Approximately 50% of households are married couples. Housing preferences typically include suburban single-family homes and single-family attached dwellings built after 1980.

ZIP Code 75039
Metro Renters

One of the fastest growing segments nationwide, Metro Renters are residents in their late twenties and thirties living primarily in single-person households. Renters make up close to 80% of all households and many live close to work and may walk or take transit.

ZIP Codes 75038 and 75062
Young and Restless

This segment is made up of well-educated young workers who are more likely to move each year. The majority of residents live alone or in non-family households. Residents tend to favor densely populated neighborhoods in large metropolitan areas.

ZIP Code 75061
NeWest Residents

This segment is primarily made up of young Hispanics with young families. The language barrier is higher for this group, with nearly one-third of households that are linguistically isolated. Many residents are employed in the service industry.

ZIP Code 75060
American Dreamers

American Dreamers primarily own their own home further out from the City where housing is more affordable. Many households are composed of younger married-couple families with children and grandparents.
REVIEW OF RELEVANT PLAN & STUDIES

2017 IMAGINE IRVING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
A broad community engagement program, called Vision for Irving, established the framework of the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan. The plan describes the community’s vision for the future and lays out the concepts for how Irving will grow and capitalize on its many assets, how it will adapt to changes, which areas should be preserved, and how the City will look and feel in the next 30 years. The plan includes guiding principles, and focuses on three primary areas: centers, corridors, and connections.

2015 CITY PARKS FACTS REPORT
This compendium of parkland facts provides detailed data that allows readers to see how Irving compares to other cities’ park systems. Information is available about park uses, levels of funding, number of visitors, demographics, and other characteristics.

2014 SNAPSHOT – IRVING
This document is a look at the state of the City of Irving following the release and validations of 2010 Census information. Population, demographics, land use, employment, education, and housing are among the topics included.

2013 URBAN CENTER MASTER PLAN – LAS COLINAS
The City of Irving and the Las Colinas Association’s master planning effort incorporated a real estate market analysis and an investigation of regional mixed-use developments. The recommendations in this master plan intend to revitalize the Las Colinas Urban Center into a pedestrian-friendly, vibrant, mixed use live/work district, and to restore the area’s position as one of the premier corporate office locations in the Dallas metropolitan area.

2016 IRVING STRATEGIC PLANNING REPORT
This report details the results of a process to develop and agree on a framework to guide the decisions of both elected leaders and appointed managers as other ongoing planning efforts took place. The report validates and reconfirms the City’s vision, mission and core values, and analyzes impacts and current trends affecting operations. A set of six strategic goals is included in the report around which key policy decisions can be evaluated and important organizational and operational activities can be managed.
**2009 IRVING BOULEVARD ENHANCEMENT STUDY**

The plan proposes transforming the existing Delaware Creek concrete drainage channel into an active greenway park corridor and trail extending north to Lively Park. The design proposes visual enhancements such as public art and installation of green gateways, new open spaces, neighborhood linkages, and infill development for underutilized spaces along Delaware Creek. The park elements include numerous trail linkages and a potential overlook pavilion that extends Millennium Park to the east; both will allow residents, visitors and workers to relax and connect with one another. Irving Boulevard, located in downtown Irving, is viewed as a catalyst for investment and development within the corridor.

**2008 HERITAGE DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES**

The Heritage District is a historic downtown Irving neighborhood that presents opportunities for mixed-use developments in a walkable environment. Streets, sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit will support growth in downtown restaurants, shops, green spaces, and other amenities close to housing. The design guidelines for the Heritage District were developed through a civic-minded task force. The redevelopment design guidelines integrate housing, shops, parks, employment areas, and civic facilities into a densely spaced community. The design guidelines describe site planning, landscaping, architecture, and construction for the Heritage redevelopment area.
TRENDS & LIFESTYLE BENCHMARKING

Like many other community assets, parks, open space, and recreation areas need to remain relevant and flexible to adapt to changing needs and trends of the surrounding community. The social, health, and economic benefits of parks and recreational facilities are prompting cities to make further capital investments in these areas as part of community enhancement and revitalization efforts. Cities are engaging in collaborative partnerships to capitalize on the value creation that parks and recreation investments provide, such as:

- **Social interaction** of diverse populations
- **Civic engagement** with parks and recreational initiatives, and
- **Environmental resiliency** associated with being good stewards of the natural environment. (http://civiccommons.us)

Being proactive in understanding community context relative to prioritizing capital expenditures is an important aspect of being a proactive parks and recreation agency. Many of the latest trends are relevant to this Plan for the City of Irving.

PARKS ACCESSIBILITY

According to the Trust for Public Land (TPL), the national median size of a park is 3.8 acres. This number does not typically include parkland used through joint-use agreements with schools or other informal open spaces used for public parks. Approximately 70% of the U.S. population in the 100 largest cities live within a 10-minute walk from a park. The TPL, Urban Land Institute (ULI), and National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) seek to make a 10-minute walk from a park a reality nationwide throughout the U.S. through a partnership agreement entitled the 10-Minute Walk Campaign.

Aspirations of residents continue to emphasize access to parks to partake in the many benefits and opportunities for passive and active recreation as well as enjoying natural scenery. Improving access to and between parks by way of safe and adequate sidewalks, on-street and off-street bike lanes, and trails enables the 10-minute walk goal to be a reality. Parks ultimately raise property values and add to the civic
culture of communities, but this is dependent on how accessible they are to the public. Cities are making park investments that are addressing geographic and demographic inequities.

Park trends related to access have also included the concept of equity, whereby capital investments are made in traditionally underserved communities to increase park benefits to a variety of citizens. Essentially, cities are deliberately guiding funding for repairs and improvements for parks that have been neglected. In turn, the hope is that these underserved areas would benefit from economic development opportunities as a result of the capital investment in these areas and allow the greatest number of people the ability to access parks and open space.

OPEN SPACE PROTECTION

In general, people are more aware of their impact on the environment now more than ever. This has led to an increased emphasis on protecting open space and natural areas in communities to balance impervious cover in heavily built-out areas, and to protect floodplains. In Irving, natural open space makes up a small proportion of the City’s land use (less than three percent) and includes undevelopable floodplains, private easements, and other open space identified in appraisal records. Areas adjacent to the Campion Trail with views of the Elm Fork and West Fork branches of the Trinity River offer scenic benefits, habitat protection, and environmental education opportunities. Within Irving’s park system, approximately 90 percent of all park land is developed and available for public use, which leaves a small percentage of undeveloped parkland which could be considered open space. Parks such as the Mountain Creek Preserve provide open space for active use, while at the same time its low topography assists with flood control.

“A fully connected park system begins at the doorstep of each resident and serves as an infrastructure that supports health and well-being. Parks provide the places where many of life’s most profound experiences are celebrated — designing parks as linked elements within a parks infrastructure can transform our suburbs, towns and cities so that these beloved places are also our partners in health.”

- Joanna Lombard, AIA, LEED, AP, Professor at the University of Miami School of Architecture and the Department of Public Health Sciences
BENCHMARK COMMUNITIES

To compare Irving with similar communities, four benchmark communities were identified. These include two local communities and two communities from across the country which are similar to Irving in terms of size, demographics, and income profile. Table 2.4 shows the most recent population figures, acres of developed parkland, and associated acreage level of service for the four benchmark communities and Irving. The benchmark cities are Arlington, Texas, Plano, Texas, Glendale, Arizona, and Aurora, Colorado.

One element that is used to compare parks systems is the Trust for Public Land’s ParkScore tool which ranks the park systems in the 100 largest U.S. cities based on a variety of factors. These factors include overall park acreage, access to parks, per capita spending, and availability of various park facilities. In 2018, Irving was ranked 82nd out of the 100 largest cities and was tied with Fort Worth which also has a ParkScore of 82. The City of Plano ranks the highest out of the 12 cities listed in Texas with a ParkScore rating of 18. The City of Irving has many opportunities to increase its ParkScore rating by improving access to parks and providing more amenities per capita.

ARLINGTON, TX

Arlington, Texas is located approximately 15 miles southwest of Irving with a population of 383,549. In 2018, Arlington was ranked 63rd on the TPL ParkScore. In 2018, the Arlington Parks and Recreation Department (APRD) won the Gold Medal Award, presented by the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration (AAPRA), in partnership with the NRPA demonstrating excellence in long-range planning, resource management and innovative approaches to delivering outstanding park and recreation services with fiscally-sound business practices. APRD maintains one athletic center, three recreation centers with a broad array of sports and fitness programming, a senior recreation center and separate senior activity center, and a tennis center. A proposed combined East Arlington Recreation Center and Library is currently under construction, and a Southeast Recreation Center will begin construction in 2019. APRD sponsors innovative programs and events within the city and manages a user-friendly, interactive, and informative website for park activities. Arlington brands its parks and recreation activities “Naturally Fun,” which is also the namesake of the department’s newsletter.

Table 2.4 Benchmark Communities Key Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2017 Population</th>
<th>Total Park Acreage</th>
<th>Acres per 1,000 residents</th>
<th>2018 ParkScore Ranking</th>
<th>Parkland as percentage of City Area</th>
<th>Number of people served per park acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irving, TX</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>8.2 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>82nd</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, TX</td>
<td>383,549</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>12.3 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>63rd</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale, AZ</td>
<td>247,440</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>8.7 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>71st</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>287,360</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>15.1 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, CO</td>
<td>368,200</td>
<td>10,541</td>
<td>28.8 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Trust for Public Land ParkScore, 2018
Arlington’s Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Master Plan was last updated in 2015. In the Master Plan, APRD recommended specific park standards highlighting needs and shortfalls for each of its 12 park planning subareas factoring in projected 2030 populations when Arlington is projected to reach build-out.

The Trinity River and the West Fork of the Trinity River and its tributaries flow through the northern part of the city. Land surrounding the river is primarily parkland as part of the River Legacy Parks system. The City intends to expand its trail network to connect to the many entertainment districts in Arlington, and other locations in the city.

APRD develops parks, open spaces and trails to encourage interaction with, and between, neighborhoods with emphasis on “focused placemaking” which reflects the community character. A greenway network is currently being expanded to improve public health by providing a means for residents to obtain physical exercise in proximity to their neighborhoods. The network of trails would be used for transportation and recreation and is a key component of the 2011 Hike and Bike System Master Plan. The city asks developers to provide connections to the greenway network within its development ordinances so it could be used as a viable transportation alternative.

The city has recently completed a $24 million Texas Rangers Golf Club renovation which is the first Major League Baseball-branded golf course and is a result of a partnership between Arlington and the Texas Rangers. The collaborative branding provides the city an opportunity to have a destination golf course for residents and visitors in the Texas Rangers Ball Park and Entertainment District. There are plans to provide diverse socio-economic access to the facility by partnering with the local school district to benefit from instructional opportunities.

Similar to the City of Irving, the City of Arlington continuously monitors flood and erosion risks and identifies ways to manage flood control. Floodplains and watersheds present opportunities for parks, trail and open space amenities if properly designed.
Glendale, Arizona is a city in Maricopa County, located about nine miles northwest from downtown Phoenix. The City of Glendale is ranked 71st on the 2018 ParkScore list. Glendale is 38,196 acres in size and parkland is approximately 5.6 percent of the total city area. Glendale’s median park size is 4.8 acres, which is slightly higher than Irving. Glendale is very similar in size to Irving in terms of the city area and population, however Glendale has approximately 225 more acres of available parkland. Glendale’s ParkScore also indicates a larger percentage of persons living within a ½ mile of a park, and more per capita amenities such as playgrounds, dog parks, basketball courts, and aquatics than Irving. However, Irving’s ParkScore for recreation facilities per capita is higher than Glendale’s. Glendale has identified some service gaps at four locations within the city boundaries.

Glendale maintains a youth sports complex, one conservation park, 55 neighborhood parks, eight community parks, six regional parks, two golf courses as well as eight recreation centers (which includes two aquatics centers and one adult center). The Glendale Parks and Recreation Department also maintains a state of the art tennis center. Unique to Glendale is its 26,000 square foot “X-Court” for multiple users (bikes, boards, blades). Many of the facilities in Glendale are ADA accessible. The city also constructed a Sensory Garden which offers a serene, sensory experience for the public and showcases public art. Glendale actively welcomes community involvement in its Partners-N’-Parks program which invites the community to adopt and help maintain parks, or park amenities.

The city runs approximately 112 youth activities and 138 adult programs. One park location serves a new water recharge facility. There are plans for additional after school programs, and a new parks maintenance facility.

Glendale has one very substantial natural resource area and a great trail and bikeway system. The City now has 90+ miles of on-street bike routes and 25+ miles of off-road bike paths and trails. Similar to Irving, Glendale has a series of canals which are bordered by linear parks or floodplains.

Source: https://naturallyfun.org/
Neighborhood park development in Glendale has kept pace with the city’s growth, while development of community parks, community centers and sports complexes has until recently not kept pace. Currently, Glendale is constructing a new 81-acre park with new amenities to include archery, splash pads, volleyball, and a skateboarding, in-line skating and BMX facility with concessions.

Glendale has expanded and relaunched its Parks Ranger Program to two full-time, and 12 part-time employees. The park rangers focus on community outreach and protecting and preserving park resources, recreation opportunities and facilities that enhance the quality of life for city residents and visitors. The park rangers have been helpful in connecting citizens and identifying challenges in the city. For example, their interaction with homeless populations has helped connect them to community service providers.

Source: https://www.glendaleaz.com/ParksandRecreation/index.cfm

**PLANO, TX**

Plano, Texas is a North Texas city 25 miles northeast of Irving that frequently ranks high in the number of park resources and dollars spent per capita on park-related activities and improvements. The community is considered a success story in parks planning and management with emphasis on park maintenance, staffing, and strategic planning. With a ParkScore ranking of 18 out of 100, Plano parks have in excess of 12 million visitors per year, of which 80 percent are adults. The 45,812-acre city consists of 4,322 acres of parkland (9.4 percent).

Distribution of parks around the city makes it possible for varied-income residents to access parks within a reasonable distance. Similarly, park amenities are well-distributed across the city, with residents having access to outdoor passive and active greenspace, pavilions, playgrounds, sports fields, basketball courts, and picnic tables. Plano provides a good example of the economic development benefits of parks. Approximately 71 percent of Plano’s businesses identified parks as a factor in locating their business in Plano. The city’s “recreation economy” is enhanced as residents spend $32.7 million annually on sports, recreation, and exercise.

Plano recently updated and adopted their Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan in October 2018. The plan outlined 10 primary goals which it set to address the particular needs against a backdrop of a park system that was largely constructed over 30 years ago. The detailed master plan and implementation plan outlines strategies to complete the parks system, manage aging infrastructure, acquire new parkland, and maintain a quality of excellence.

Plano has an extensive inventory of parks including 31 neighborhood parks, 19 community parks, 16 linear parks, three open space preserves, nine specialized use facilities, two public golf courses, and 81 miles of paved trails. Notable parks include the Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve, Arbor Hills Nature Preserve, and Bob Woodruff Park. The master plan provided details on specific areas to be acquired for the growth and expansion of parks in the city, listed opportunities for interdepartmental cooperation and devised a plan to ease zoning requirements to increase the amount of meaningful public open space. The plan developed some specialized standards to adopt across a variety of parks that are being considered...
for new development or redevelopment; a strategy that would benefit the City of Irving.

As reported in the recently updated Parks and Recreation Master Plan, pickleball has also boomed in popularity in recent years as the median age has increased. To accommodate these newer sports, flexibility in field space and within recreation centers is important. Plano currently rotates different activities through sports turf fields and multi-use courts in recreation centers throughout the year.

The TPL reported in 2017 that the City of Plano has seen substantial economic benefits of local parks and amenities by improving health, enhancing property values, attracting visitors and new residents, and generating tax revenue. The city’s “park premium” calculation estimates for all homes close to parks and recreational amenities raised the market value by $337 million, and property tax revenues increased by $1.19 million a year. (Source: TPL, Economic Benefits of Plano’s Park and Recreation System, 2017).

As a city close to build-out, parks and recreation officials and the City Council have continued to look at parks as an important community asset that must be maintained as development pressures and demographic trends in change over time.
**AURORA, CO**

The City of Aurora (the third largest city in Colorado) is nearly 99,000 acres in size of which approximately 11% is defined as parkland. Similar to Irving, Aurora is racially and ethnically diverse (over 53% Latino or non-White) with a total population of 368,200. The city is approximately a 15-minute drive to the Denver International Airport. The City has an overall ParkScore ranking of 20 out of the top 100 largest cities.

The 2018 Comprehensive Plan developed a place type called “Urban Green Space” to better define land uses containing parks, trails and open space. Using eight defining features, the Urban Green Space is improved by 1) its proximity to neighborhoods; 2) accessibility to playgrounds, sports fields, and open spaces; 3) preserved vegetated areas to provide stormwater benefits and beautification; 4) minimized non-local traffic conflicts when constructing parking access to community parks; 5) comprehensive networks of trails, linear parks, sidewalks, and bike routes; 6) high quality programming and events in community gathering areas; 7) strong turf management with water-wise practices; and, 8) buffering creek and drainage corridors to protect neighborhoods from flooding. The city’s preferred approach is to maintain open drainage systems serving multiple public purposes, including parks and trails, recreation, open space, flood protection, habitat, and stormwater management.

In relationship to the availability and access to parkland, the city received a ParkScore of 12 out of 40. This includes the number of dog parks, basketball hoops, recreation centers, playgrounds, and splash pads. Construction of a two-story recreation center of approximately 55,000 square feet on a 20-acre parcel is anticipated to be completed in 2019. Aurora is also known for a vast array of volunteer programs run by the Parks and Recreation Department to prompt the public to get involved in stewardship of their community. The city has committed resources to youth development and a center for active adults (ages 50 and up). Of special note is Aurora’s Therapeutic Recreation Program, which encourages meaningful recreation opportunities and programs for individuals with disabilities to enhance and expand social, cognitive, affective and physical abilities.

Land conservation is also important to the City of Aurora, where the Parks and Recreation Department manages two nature centers and one conservation center.

Aurora’s Parks and Recreation Department hosts many community special events celebrating holidays, veterans, and outdoor fun. The City runs an active Park Stewards program to promote community pride and improve park aesthetics and safety.

The City of Aurora includes 97 developed parks and over 5,000 acres of open space. In addition to parks, the Aurora parks, recreation, and open space system includes a broad range of facilities including parks, recreation centers (which includes large comprehensive centers, a Senior Center, and several neighborhood recreation centers which house preschools and other specialized programming), six golf courses, three heavily programmed nature centers, and numerous dog parks, park shelters, playgrounds, sports fields, running tracks, swimming pools and a variety of outdoor activities at two reservoirs within the city limits. The city provides over 90 miles of local and regional trails across Aurora, many of which connect to the larger regional network and provide access connecting neighborhoods, mixed-use districts and other destinations. The city also supports those with mobility disabilities by enabling use of assistive technologies and services in its parks, trails, and open space system. (Aurora’s Places: Planning Tomorrow’s City, 2018).
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- INPUT STRATEGIES & FINDINGS
- DEPARTMENT MISSION & GOALS
- MASTER PLAN VISION, GOALS, & OBJECTIVES
INTRODUCTION

The Master Plan Concept introduced in Chapter 1 serves as the foundation for the Let’s Play, Irving Parks Master Plan. It builds upon the Center, Corridors, and Connections concept of the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan, while, incorporating key objectives that are reflective of the City and residents. The additional focus on Community and Celebration was developed based on City, stakeholder, and community input during the Plan visioning process.
INPUT STRATEGIES & FINDINGS

A comprehensive approach to the public engagement process was necessary to ensure that the most citizens possible were engaged in the development of this Plan. The approach included utilizing a variety of input strategies for information and data collection from citizens, City staff, and stakeholders. This allowed for measurable feedback, which ensures that the Let’s Play, Irving Parks Master Plan embodies the desires and initiatives of residents, elected leaders, and City staff. These strategies included: an appointed visioning committee, an online community survey, a project website, and community public meetings as well as other outreach events. This section discusses each of these different input strategies in more detail and highlights the key findings from each.
VISIONING COMMITTEE

The Visioning Committee was formed at the beginning of the process with members appointed by City Council. Members included representatives from the Parks and Recreation Board, the Independent School Districts (ISD), recreation centers, and residents. The committee met three times throughout the planning process to provide direction and ensure that the Plan followed City and community initiatives. The three stages of the project that the Visioning Committee reviewed were project direction/purpose, preliminary recommendations, and final review.

FINDINGS

Overall, members of the Visioning Committee believe that the City’s cultural diversity, proximity to local and international travel options, cost of living, employment opportunities, parks, and recreational facilities make Irving a desirable place. The committee envisions Irving in the next 20 years as having improved connectivity, alternative transportation modes, increased development in downtown and south Irving, and more recreational opportunities.

VISIONING EVENTS

- **Visioning Committee Meeting** | Monday, June 11, 2018 at 4:00 PM
- **Park Board Meeting** | Monday, June 11, 2018 at 6:00 PM
- **Focus Group Meetings** | Monday, June 11, 2018
  Wednesday, June 13, 2018
  Thursday, June 14, 2018
- **Interdepartmental Discussion** | Thursday, June 14, 2018
- **Public Open House #1** | Tuesday, June 12, 2018 at 6:00 PM
  (Heritage Senior Center)
- **Public Open House #2** | Tuesday, July 10, 2018 at 6:00 PM
  (Lee Recreation Center)
- **Teen Event** | Tuesday, July 11, 2018 at 6:00 PM
  (Lively Pointe Youth Center)
- **Public Open House #3** | Thursday, July 12, 2018 at 6:00 PM
  (Cimarron Recreation Center)

STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUPS

At the beginning of the planning process a series of stakeholder listening sessions were held to seek input from various groups. Three separate listening sessions were held with the following invited attendees:

- **MEETING 1**: Area school districts, colleges, universities, area Chamber of Commerce’s, arts and culture boards, YMCA, surrounding cities park staff
- **MEETING 2**: Homeowner associations, neighborhood groups
- **MEETING 3**: Sports leagues and organizations

Key findings from the stakeholder focus groups included an emphasis on improving existing parks, expanding trail opportunities, and reflecting the overall diversity of Irving in parks.
PROJECT WEBSITE

The project website, www.letsplayirving.com, was developed and launched in May 2018 and remained open throughout the course of the project. This platform provided information on upcoming events, the online survey, and opportunity to submit comments and subscribe to email updates. The website also described the purpose for the plan, allowed residents to ask questions, and kept the public updated on the planning process. After each meeting or major milestone, documents were uploaded to the website. This provided the opportunity for citizens to review the plan and provide their feedback. Over the course of the planning process, over 7,000 people visited the site.
PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public meetings were held during the planning process to further engage the public. Three initial open houses were held to introduce the plan process and to seek input on community needs and desires. The first set of meetings were held on Tuesday, June 12th; Tuesday, July 10th; and Thursday, July 12th, 2018. Key feedback from the public meetings are illustrated below:

The second set of meetings was held in May 2019 to present and seek feedback on the draft plan recommendations.

The result of these meetings with citizen comments are included in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITIES/FACILITIES RESPONDENTS BELIEVE IRVING IS MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRICKET FIELDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOR SWIMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLASH PADS/PARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOR WALKING/JOGGING TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG PARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKATE PARK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP 4 RECREATION FACILITIES UTILIZED BY MEETING ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE SENIOR CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE PARK &amp; RECREATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTER PARK &amp; RECREATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMARRON &amp; RECREATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OUTREACH EVENTS**

A community booth at an outreach event was set up for the purpose of gathering public input from residents who were unable to attend the public meeting, where additional resident input was collected. The community booth consisted of information about the Plan and a brief questionnaire. Over 100 visitors at Canal Fest held in June 2018 visited the booth and engaged with the project team.

**COMMUNITY SURVEY**

An essential component to the planning process is input from the public. For residents that are not able to attend meetings in person, surveys are a great way to still get crucial input. For this master plan a community survey was conducted from June 2018 and closed in September 2018. There were 22 questions focusing on various aspects of Irving’s parks and recreation facilities. In total there were over 1,440 respondents, 92% of which are residents of Irving. Key results include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Respondents Felt That It Was Important For The City To Build Additional...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Respondents Felt That It Was Important For The City To Build Additional Athletic Or Sports Fields Such As:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Soccer Fields</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Basketball Courts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Baseball Fields</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennis Courts</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VISIONING MEETING SUMMARY**

Key findings from the public input process showed that citizens would like to see an increased diversification of parks and recreation facility uses, unified parks and trail system, connectivity to transit, and new recreation facility locations throughout the city. Park and recreation users would like to see more open space preservation, development of new active recreation amenities, and increased opportunities for organized sports. This input demonstrates the demand for and the value of a successful park and recreation system within the City of Irving. The purpose of this effort is to plan for those opportunities, thereby creating a framework that provides outdoor opportunity for Irving’s active community.

Below is an overall summary of the feedback received that focuses on what makes Irving a desirable place to live.

**DIVERSITY | CULTURE**

Irving is a melting pot of diverse cultures and ethnic groups. This diversity is reflected through the variety of dining, retail, and annual events occurring around the city.

**CONNECTIVITY | TRANSIT**

Irving’s location is central to major highways, transit, and airports, positioning the City as a transportation hub with global connectivity.

**DEVELOPMENT | ECONOMY**

Irving is not only a major transportation hub but is also home to several Fortune 500 companies. Residents enjoy the affordability the City offers as well as the proximity to local employment.

**PARKS | RECREATION**

Irving currently offers quality parks, trails, and recreational facilities and with the amount of available land in the city, there is potential to capitalize on these assets to enhance parks and recreation in the city.

**COMMUNITY**

Although Irving is a growing city at the center of the Metroplex, the city still has a “small town feel” with a great variety of dining options and family-friendly activities and programs.

**THE ARTS**

Irving has a multitude of cultural attractions and entertainment venues that appeal to a wide range of citizens and visitors.
DEPARTMENT MISSION & GOALS

The City of Irving recently developed a strategic plan that references the City’s mission, vision, and values in recognition of its importance to ensure long-term future success.

VALUE STATEMENTS

- We exhibit personal integrity with every decision.
- We serve by leading and lead by serving.
- We show a high level of respect and concern for our coworkers and customers.
- We encourage creativity and innovation to improve our effectiveness.
- We learn and grow in a progressive work environment.
- We excel through desire, determination, and dedication.

MISSION

Deliver exceptional services and promote a high quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.

VISION

The City of Irving will be the model for safe and beautiful neighborhoods, a vibrant economy and exceptional recreational, cultural and educational opportunities.

MASTER PLAN VISION, GOALS, & OBJECTIVES

This Plan builds upon the previously stated department mission as well as the vision of the Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan, which is to create Centers, Corridors, and Connections. This plan adds the themes of Community and Celebration.

GOALS & OBJECTIVES

The updated goals and objectives were developed based on a review of these elements from the 2000 Master Plan and the parks section of the 2017 Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan. The resulting seven goals and subsequent objectives are outlined on the following pages. These goals and objectives serve as the framework for the recommendations presented later in the Plan document.
VISION

Chapter 3

GOAL 1:

PARK ACCESS
Creatively work toward increasing park access for all residents.

OBJECTIVES:
- (1.1) Strategically acquire new parkland in Irving’s inventory that attracts widespread usage, is accessible from major centers and activity corridors, and has the potential to generate revenue.
- (1.2) Add acreage to existing parks where possible to increase service areas.
- (1.3) Explore and adopt methods to ensure new development provides public park land and resources to develop needed park and open space facilities.
- (1.4) Encourage creative placement of parks and leisure space when redevelopment occurs.

GOAL 2:

RECREATION FACILITIES
Enhance recreation programs and offerings as trends and demands continue to evolve.

OBJECTIVES:
- (2.1) Explore public recreation options in partnership with developers or private operators where possible.
- (2.2) Identify locations for potential land purchase or partnering to accommodate recreation center demand and allow for future flexibility in programming.
- (2.3) Identify recreational facilities that are underutilized or not cost effective, and reprogram or repurpose to other program areas needed within the community such as athletic fields, additional recreation and leisure classes, organizational meeting space, or community education use.
TRAILS
Improve trail and bikeway connections between parks and trails and to recreation facilities, schools, and other cities.

GOAL 3:

OBJECTIVES:
• (3.1) Coordinate with other City departments to review new residential, commercial, and mixed-use development for public parks, open space, or trail components.
• (3.2) Protect and maintain greenspaces around schools.
• (3.3) Continue to pursue Dallas County funding to complete additional linkages along Campion Trails.
• (3.4) Establish trail and bikeway connections connecting the Campion Trails to other parts of the city.

MAINTENANCE
Ensure current and future parks and recreation facilities are maintained in a quality and sustainable manner.

GOAL 4:

OBJECTIVES:
• (4.1) Improve the quality of the park system by prioritizing maintenance, rehabilitation, and completion of existing facilities prior to new park acquisition and development. Revisit the sale of bonds for parks, infrastructure, and other improvements planned for Irving with the goal of increasing approved bond sales.
• (4.2) Implement technology advancements to reduce maintenance costs over the long term.
• (4.3) Continue to monitor maintenance agreements with local homeowners associations for pocket parks and beautification improvements.
• (4.4) Increase the number of negotiated agreements with school districts, private athletic associations, etc., to offset park maintenance costs where feasible.

FUNDING
Maximize and expand funding options to meet current and future resident demands.

GOAL 5:

OBJECTIVES:
• (5.1) Explore new funding options such as establishing an impact fee ordinance for developers to include public parks, use of sales tax funding to acquire park land to compensate for unsold bonds.
• (5.2) Establish a coordinated program between the Parks and Recreation, Planning, and Capital Improvement departments to plan for purchasing land slated for parks while still economically feasible.
• (5.3) Complete an analysis of parks and recreation study of user fees, and examine other parks and recreation expenditures to determine how to maximize services and user fees in an equitable manner.
• (5.4) Ensure funding aligns with the City’s five to 10 year action plan.
GOAL 6:

FLOODPLAINS
Coordinate park and open space with floodplain management needs.

OBJECTIVES:

• (6.1) Protect and conserve open space, particularly in the floodplain, for future park improvements.
• (6.2) Develop a consensus on the balance between floodplain management and any open space that should remain “protected” from future development. Develop clear consistent policies and mapping for those sites considered “undevelopable” during the next 25 years.
• (6.3) Encourage environmentally-friendly drainage systems to improve flood control, and provide a green aesthetic to the community.
• (6.4) Encourage additional interdepartmental and regional coordination on watershed management and status of park conditions.

GOAL 7:

SUSTAINABILITY
Implement sustainable practices in planning, designing, constructing, maintaining, and operating parks and recreation facilities.

OBJECTIVES:

• (7.1) Invest in resilient infrastructure and sustainable materials for parks, recreation facilities, and trails.
• (7.2) Expand educational programs at the City of Irving’s Tree Farm at Mountain Creek Preserve.
• (7.3) Develop a tree maintenance plan for the City of Irving’s parks, streetscape and trails to enhance the stormwater management program, and to reduce impervious cover.
• (7.4) Seek LEED certification of future recreation centers and SITES certification for parks where feasible.
• (7.5) Ensure adequate landscaping costs and associated operation and maintenance costs are budgeted for as part of infrastructure improvements.
PARKS & OPEN SPACE

- PARK CLASSIFICATION
- PARK INVENTORY
- NEEDS ASSESSMENT
- SYSTEM-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS
- INDIVIDUAL PARK REVIEW
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to take inventory of Irving’s existing parks, assess the needs of the park system based on existing standards and relevant approaches, and create system-wide recommendations. The overarching goal is to establish a classification system of parks and understand how they individually and collectively serve the city, and to develop a strategy for future park, recreation, and open space enhancement and expansion.
### PARK CLASSIFICATION

#### PARK TYPOLOGIES

The City of Irving has eight park typologies:

- Neighborhood Parks;
- Community Parks;
- Greenbelt Parks;
- Special Use Parks;
- Linear Parks and Beautification Areas;
- Pocket Parks;
- Inter-Local Agreement Parks; and,
- School Parks.

*Figure 4.1* illustrates the location of the existing parks in Irving.

Each park typology has varying standard size, amenities, service area, and in some cases, ownership. The basic analysis for each park typology for the Let’s Play, Irving Parks Master Plan establishes the level of service needs and analyzes the park service area. The following pages describe each park type and its basic amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</th>
<th>LINEAR PARKS &amp; BEAUTIFICATION AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks are designed to be within walking distance to a neighborhood. They typically offer neighborhood active and passive amenities such as playgrounds, multi-purpose fields, trails, benches, pavilions, and more.</td>
<td>Linear parks are classified as narrow tracts of green spaces, usually containing trails and associated amenities, connecting schools, residential areas, public spaces, and other parks. Beautification areas are small pockets of parkland typically adjacent to roadways or intersections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PARKS</th>
<th>POCKET PARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community parks are larger parks that typically include a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities such as ball fields, swimming pools, playgrounds, trails, and other significant recreational resources.</td>
<td>Pocket parks are small park spaces that fill in gaps in park coverage. Activities taking place in these spaces are usually passive and are meant to serve the immediately surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREENBELT PARKS</th>
<th>INTER-LOCAL AGREEMENT PARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt parks consist of large open spaces with a variety of natural amenities. There is no typical size of a greenbelt park, but rather it is often determined by the surrounding natural features.</td>
<td>Inter-local agreement parks in Irving are park spaces that are owned, operated, and maintained through a partnership between the City and another entity. The majority of inter-local agreement parks in Irving are with the Las Colinas Management Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL USE PARKS</th>
<th>SCHOOL PARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Use parks vary in typical size, category, and area because they are designed to serve a specific, unique purpose. In Irving, examples include The Heritage House and Garden and Art Center.</td>
<td>School parks represent joint-use agreements between the City and a school for shared use of park spaces on school grounds at certain times of day. Through this agreement these green spaces or playgrounds can meet the recreational needs of students and the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1 – Irving Parks System
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PARK INVENTORY

An inventory of existing parks allows for a greater understanding of the current park uses and amenities to accurately determine future needs. This section describes the current recreation classifications within the City, current amenities, age of current facilities, and location of amenities. Figure 4.2 displays the current park system by park type.

There are a total of 110 developed and undeveloped parks fairly well-spaced throughout the city. There are currently 1,932 acres of developed parkland. Currently, community parks and greenbelt parks make up the largest park acreage within the city. Over 1,000 acres of community parks are developed and over 700 acres of greenbelt parks are developed. These parks provide the community access to nature but also provide regional recreation amenities for the city.

The majority of neighborhood and community parks are located in the southern portion of the city, while the northeastern portion of the city has a limited amount of parkland as a whole.

As Irving grows, access to and diversity of parks will become more important. Since the city is landlocked, there is little room to grow to add new amenities. Retrofitting existing uses and capitalizing on greenspace will be extremely important to meet the future parks and recreation demands for the city.
Figure 4.2 – Irving Parks Inventory
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Neighborhood parks are designed to be within walking distance to a neighborhood. They typically supply neighborhood active and passive amenities such as playgrounds, multi-purpose fields, trails, benches, and pavilions.

As of 2019, there are 22 developed neighborhood parks and 2 undeveloped neighborhood parks within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.3.

The City has a total of 136.24 acres of neighborhood parks and they range in size from approximately 0.5 acres to 22.5 acres.

Table 4.1 provides an inventory of neighborhood parks in table format.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champions Park</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>455 Cowboys Parkway</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorris Park</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>4150 Dorris Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop Park</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1126 Hilltop Drive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital District Greenspace</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1727 Sunnybrook Drive</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz Park</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>608 N. Nursery Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeler Park</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>520 S. Rogers Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanotte Park</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1416 &amp; 1326 Irving Heights</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzon Park</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900 Luzon Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markwood Park</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>1001 S. MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols Park</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2310 E. Newton Circle</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake Ranch Park</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1317 Ranch Trail</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate Park</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rochelle Boulevard</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Meadows Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>Between Southwest &amp; Running Bear Parks</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakview Park</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest corner of 5th &amp; Story</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan Park</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>6th &amp; Nursery Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeo Park</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9801 Rodeo Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Meadows Park</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grauwyler &amp; Rose Street</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Trail Park</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>799 W. Vilbig Street</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stardust Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>Golden Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Park</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1809 E. Union Bower Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towne Lake Park</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>800 Esters Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhaven Park</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 Hanover Lane</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodridge Park</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3516 N. Story Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyche Park</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2850 W. Pioneer Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acreage** 125.17 11.07

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
COMMUNITY PARKS INVENTORY

Community parks are larger parks that typically include a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities such as ball fields, swimming pools, playgrounds, trails, and other regionally significant recreational resources.

As of 2019, there are 25 developed community parks and one undeveloped community park within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.4.

The City has a total of 1,019.43 acres of community parks.

Table 4.2 provides an inventory of community parks in table format.
### Table 4.2 Community Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Centennial Park</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>444 W. Second Street</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cimarron Park</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 Red River Trail</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cottonwood Creek Park</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>4051 N. Story Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fritz Park</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>312 E. Vilbig Street</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Heritage Park</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>217 Main Street</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Heritage Square Park</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 S. Jefferson Street</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Irving Soccer Complex</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>3585 World Cup Way</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jaycee Park</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 W. Airport Freeway</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lee Park</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000 Pamela Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lively Park</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>909 O'Connor Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Millennium Park</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 S. Sowers Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mustang Park</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2223 Kinwest Parkway</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Northwest Park</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2800 Cheyenne Street</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Running Bear Park</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>2601 S. Story Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Senter Park (Includes Senter East)</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>901 S. Senter Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Senter Park Annex South</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>W. of Fritz, S. of Grove &amp; E. of Senter Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Southwest Park</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>2800 Shady Grove Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Thomas Jefferson Park</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1201 Hidden Ridge</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Trinity View Park - Athletic Complex</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2221 E. Hwy 356</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Irving Golf Club</td>
<td>290.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 E. Shady Grove Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Twin Wells Park</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1900 E. Shady Grove Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Veteran’s Memorial Park</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>644 Rock Island Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Victoria Park</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>3051 W. Northgate Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 W.O. Harrington Park</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>5350 Valley View Lane</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 West Irving Aquatic Center Park</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>3101 Conflians Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 West Park / Georgia Farrow Rec.</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>530 Davis Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Acreage 1,008.81 10.62

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
GREENBELT PARKS

Greenbelt parks consist of large open spaces with a variety of natural amenities. In Irving, the majority of greenbelt parks are along the Elm Fork of the Trinity River. The typical size of the greenbelt park is determined by the natural features surrounding the park.

As of 2019, there are 13 developed greenbelt parks and one undeveloped greenbelt park within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.5. The City has a total of 707.94 acres of greenbelt parks.

Table 4.3 provides an inventory of greenbelt parks in table format.
### Table 4.3 Greenbelt Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird’s Fort Trail Park</td>
<td>57.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>5756 Riverside Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Trail Greenbelt (Elm Grove Forest)</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>West of Mountain Creek Preserve</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Trail Greenbelt (Lone Star Junction)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>Along Hunter Ferrell Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Trail Greenbelt (Mesquite Pass)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>East of MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Trail Greenbelt (Platner Crossing)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>East of Luper Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Trail Greenbelt (Rose Bud Pass)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shady Grove to Trinity View Park</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Crossing Park</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>5198 Riverside Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Channel Greenspace</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>West of Luper Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenan’s Crossing Park</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. of Royal Ln. at Trinity River</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Creek Preserve Park</td>
<td>91.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 E. Hunter Ferrell Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Hills Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.96</td>
<td>Pioneer Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston Trail Park</td>
<td>193.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>101 E. I 635</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Trail Park</td>
<td>82.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside Drive, S. of Royal Lane</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W. Richardson Park</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>333 E. I 635</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>601.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>105.96</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
SPECIAL USE PARKS

Special use parks vary in typical size, category, and area because they are designed to serve a specific, unique purpose.

As of 2019, there are five special use parks and facilities within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.6. The City has a total of 4.21 acres of special use parks. Table 4.4 provides an inventory of special use parks in table format.
### Table 4.4 Special Use Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bear Creek Heritage Center</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3925 Jackson Street</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community House Grounds</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>135 S. Jefferson Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Environmental Learning Center</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>3900 Clay Avenue</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Garden &amp; Arts Center</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>906 S. Senter Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Heritage House</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>303 S. O’Connor Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
LINEAR PARKS & BEAUTIFICATION AREAS

Linear Parks are narrow tracts of green spaces connecting schools, residential areas, and other park spaces. Beautification areas are small green spaces typically adjacent to roadways and intersections.

As of 2019, there are nine developed linear parks and beautification areas within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.7.

The City has a total of 44.93 acres of linear parks and beautification areas.

Table 4.5 provides an inventory of linear parks and beautification areas in table format.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Belt Line Road Median Landscape Area</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunter Ferrel to Rock Island</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dr. George Susat Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Iowa Street Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry to Senter West Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Irving Boulevard Median &amp; Parkway Landscape Area</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>East City Limit to SH 183</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Limetree Lane/Grauwyler Beautification Area</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1429 Limetree Lane</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MacArthur Boulevard Median Landscape Area</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunter Ferrell to Northgate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MacArthur Boulevard Streetscape</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Loch to Rochelle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 O’Connor Greenspace</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2304 &amp; 2305 O’Connor Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Story Road Streetscape</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2501 N. Story Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
INTER-LOCAL AGREEMENT PARKS

The City of Irving has several parks that are under joint-agreement with another entity. The majority of these parks are part of a partnership with the Las Colinas Management Association.

As of 2019, there are 18 developed inter-local agreement parks within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.8.

The City has a total of 54.53 acres of inter-local agreement parks.

Table 4.6 provides an inventory of inter-local agreement parks in table format.
### Table 4.6 Inter-Local Agreement Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges at Las Colinas - Apollon Hill</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>2811 Fountain Drive</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges at Las Colinas - Passerelle Trails</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>2501 Fountain Drive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges at Las Colinas-Sulis Square</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>7300 Ridgepoint Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Hollows Park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>7914 Renderbrook Bend</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6700 Plaza Via</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Optiz Park</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>TLCA Property</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escena Park</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>6631 Escena Boulevard</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vallita - Plaza Feliz Park</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Tienda</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vallita - Reunion Park</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Camino Real</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vallita - Rio Vista Park</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Camino Lago</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vallita - Plaza Victoria Park</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Barcelona</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladera Trail Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLCA Property</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindamood Park</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>6631 Escena Boulevard</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside East - Lee Dog Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6900 N Belt Line Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside East - Commons Park</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospect Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside East - Prospect Park</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>6744 Prospect Way</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside West - Parkside Point Park</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>7301 Arches Avenue</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingren Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLCA Property</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.53</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
**SCHOOL PARKS**

School parks are those located on school property, usually containing playground equipment or athletic fields, that can be accessed by children and families outside of the school hours through an agreement made between the school district and the City. Generally, these parks serve the residents surrounding these schools.

As of 2019, there are four school parks and facilities within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.9.

The City has a total of 7.5 acres of school parks.

Table 4.7 provides an inventory of school parks in table format.
### Table 4.7 School Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A.S. Johnston Elementary - Playground Park</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2801 Rutgers Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M.C. Lively Elementary - Playground Park</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800 Plymouth Drive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sally B. Elliott Elementary - Playground Park</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1900 S. Story Road</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 North Lake College Natatorium</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>5001 N. MacArthur Boulevard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
POCKET PARKS

Pocket parks provide intimate, accessible green space in areas otherwise lacking outdoor gathering spaces. While they are too small for more intense activities, they provide a passive space to spend time, particularly for the immediately adjacent community.

As of 2019, there are nine developed pocket parks within the City of Irving as shown in Figure 4.10.

The City has a total of 2.97 acres of pocket parks.

Table 4.8 provides an inventory of pocket parks in table format.
### Table 4.8 Pocket Parks Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>DEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>USE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Irving Heights Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irving Heights at Irving Boulevard</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MacArthur Boulevard / Grauwyler Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>NW &amp; SW corner of MacArthur &amp; Grauwyler Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 O’Connor / Grauwyler Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1460 N. O’Connor Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pleasant Run Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>3707 Pleasant Run Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Post Oak Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1014 6th Street</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Red Bird Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 Redbird Drive</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reflection Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2100 W. Rochelle Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Three Waters Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1010 W. Grauwyler Road</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Whistle Stop Plaza</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.97</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the intended use of the park in regards to park rules and regulations.
ATHLETICS

Sports and athletic fields are an integral component of the overall parks, recreation, and open space system in Irving. As of early 2019, the Athletics Division is made up of 12 full-time employees and one part-time employee. The Division oversees operations and maintenance of the roughly 60 athletic fields within the parks system. Table 4.9 shows the total number of sports fields by type within Irving.

Today, there are three main users of sports fields in Irving:

- **Irving All Sports Association**: The City of Irving is a co-sponsor with the association. In 2019 there were approximately 745 teams active in the association. Teams in these leagues get preference for scheduled use of fields.

- **City-Sponsored Teams**: There are about a dozen City-sponsored teams, including DFW Adult Baseball, North Texas Women’s Soccer and Softball, Oak Cliff Frisbee, and Ultimate Dallas Frisbee Organization.

- **Pick-up Leagues**: The third primary user group is teams outside of an established league that participate in pick-up games. These groups must reserve the space ahead of time when there are not scheduled league games occurring.

Recent data on sports league participation is included in the Demands Based Approach section later in this chapter.

The biggest need for the Athletics Division today is more staff to be able to maintain all of the fields in a quality condition. Additionally, many of the sports fields in Irving are located in the floodplain, so when heavy rain events occur, games are cancelled. More sports fields located outside of the floodplain is a common desire. Other needs include updated lighting, concessions, restrooms, and additional practice fields.

The City of Irving also maintains an 18-hole golf course on the southern edge of the city limits that offers stunning views of downtown Dallas. The Irving Golf Club recently went through a major renovation that included a new irrigation system, redesign of the course, and new grass on the tee boxes, fairways, and greens. Given the substantial investment put into the golf course in recent years, the City should prioritize proactive maintenance of the course.

### Table 4.9 Sports Fields by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPORTS FIELD TYPE</th>
<th># OF FIELDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Outdoors)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Miracle Field at Cottonwood Creek Park](image1.png)
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SPECIAL EVENTS

During certain times of the year, a significant amount of Parks and Recreation staff time is devoted to setting up, staffing, and tearing down special events. The special events held annually in Irving include:

- MLK Observance
- Frost Fest
- Citywide Egg Hunt
- Taste of Irving
- Arbor Day Celebration
- Irving Concert Series
- Irving Concert Series 4 Kids
- Canal Fest
- Independence Day Celebration
- Laughs by the Lake
- Irving Main Street Event
- Holiday Extravaganza

These events are generally well-attended by the community and provide affordable entertainment options for residents. However, due to the amount of time Parks and Recreation staff dedicate to assisting with special events, it may make sense in the future to have a division of the Parks Department dedicated just to special events, so other staff members can focus on their regular duties.
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

To determine current and future park needs in Irving, a three part approach was utilized.

1 | ACREAGE AND LEVEL OF SERVICE APPROACH

The Acreage/Level of Service (LOS) Approach compares current and future population figures to acreage of parks within the city. With this analysis, access to and distribution of parks is also mapped throughout the city to identify gaps in park coverage. It is important to note that this approach is just one way to assess park need, and often the results are unrealistic for built-out cities like Irving.

2 | DEMAND BASED APPROACH

The Demand Based Approach analyzes public input and facility usage to determine what facilities are most used within the city and what residents most desire. This analysis was completed through an online survey, public meetings, focus groups, and an assessment of facility usage data.

3 | RESOURCE BASED APPROACH

The Resource Based Approach identifies current amenities and opportunities within the city to locate potential locations for future park amenities. These opportunities typically include natural systems, floodplains, schools, and vacant open spaces.

NEEDS BASED ON ACREAGE AND LEVEL OF SERVICE

PARK ACREAGE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Acreage LOS is generally shown as a per-capita figure, such as “X acres per 1,000 population.” The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) has developed standards for park acreage LOS and based on these national standards, a target LOS (TLOS) was developed for the City of Irving. Table 4.10 shows the NRPA LOS range for neighborhood parks, community parks, and the entire park system.

Table 4.10 Park Acreage Standard LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK TYPE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>1-2 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>5-8 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park System</td>
<td>10-12 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Park Service Areas by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK TYPE</th>
<th>STANDARD RADIUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>½ mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>1 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Parks</td>
<td>1 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>¼ mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Parks</td>
<td>½ mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Local Agreement Parks</td>
<td>½ mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Parks</td>
<td>½ mile radius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARK SERVICE AREAS

The NRPA also establishes a general service area for different types of parks. Table 4.11 shows the typical service area for each park type in Irving. When considering the service areas of all parks, approximately 93% of Irving is currently served by a park, which amounts to about 3,000 acres. Gaps in the park service area are generally located in undeveloped portions of the city, including natural systems and near the airport where development is restricted.
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND PARK SCORE/PARK SERVE

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is leading a national campaign to ensure that all Americans have access to a quality park within a 10-minute walk from home. TPL utilizes the ParkServe platform to measure and analyze current access to parks in cities and towns nationwide. The ParkScore tool ranks the park systems in the United States based on a variety of factors. These factors include overall park acreage, access to parks, per capita spending, and availability of various facilities. Irving’s ParkScore results from 2018 are shown in Table 4.12.

Currently, TPL states that there are 95 parks within the City of Irving with over 1,590 acres of parks, which is very close to the actual developed acreage. The City of Irving is above the national average in almost every category of park access in relation to race, income, and age. TPL found that 59.7% of residents are within a 10-minute walk of a park. In other words, approximately 140,916 people live near a park, and 95,174 people do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKSCORE MEASURE</th>
<th>2018 RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Acreage</td>
<td>13 of 40 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Park Size</td>
<td>8 of 20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland as % of City Area</td>
<td>5 of 20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in Parks</td>
<td>11 of 40 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>15 of 40 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Access</td>
<td>17 of 40 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ParkScore</td>
<td>35.2 of 100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ParkScore Ranking</td>
<td>82 out of 100 cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Trust for Public Land
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK LOS

As shown in Table 4.13 there is a 121-acre deficit within the City of Irving to meet the minimum NRPA target LOS of one acre per 1,000. Even with the addition of currently undeveloped parks, the LOS in 2040 will still be less than the one acre per 1,000 target.

Irving has 24 neighborhood parks that are generally located within the southern portion of the city. The service area for neighborhood parks is a 1/2-mile radius. As shown in Figure 4.11, roughly a quarter of the city is served by a neighborhood park. The service area shown is general and does not factor in barriers to access such as highways, water features, or lack of sidewalks.

Table 4.13 Current and Target LOS for Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 DEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2018 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2040 DEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2040 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>119 acres</td>
<td>136 acres</td>
<td>119 acres</td>
<td>136 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current LOS</td>
<td>0.50 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.57 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.40 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.45 acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 1-acre Target LOS</td>
<td>121-acre deficit</td>
<td>104-acre deficit</td>
<td>182-acre deficit</td>
<td>165-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 2-acre Target LOS</td>
<td>361-acre deficit</td>
<td>345-acre deficit</td>
<td>484-acre deficit</td>
<td>467-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2040 projected population from the 2017 Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan
Figure 4.11 – Neighborhood Park Service Area
COMMUNITY PARK LOS

For this analysis, greenbelt parks are included in the LOS and service area calculations in addition to traditional community parks given that they are a significant active recreation resource. As shown in Table 4.14, currently there is an approximately 400-acre surplus of community parkland above the minimum NRPA target LOS of five acres per 1,000. This surplus remains in 2040 even as the population grows.

Irving has 26 community parks and 14 greenbelt parks that are distributed throughout the city. The service area for community parks and greenbelt parks is a 1-mile radius. As shown in Figure 4.12 approximately 80% of the city is served by a community park or greenbelt park.

The service area shown is general and does not factor in barriers to access such as highways, water features, or lack of sidewalks.

Table 4.14 Current and Target LOS for Community Parks

| CURRENT AND TARGET LOS FOR COMMUNITY PARKS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>Acreage to acquire to meet 5 acre Target LOS</th>
<th>Acreage to acquire to meet 8 acre Target LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 DEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2018 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2040 DEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2040 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 DEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2018 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2040 DEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td>2040 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>1,607 acres</td>
<td>1,724 acres</td>
<td>1,607 acres</td>
<td>1,724 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current LOS</td>
<td>6.69 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>7.17 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>5.33 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>5.72 acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 5 acre Target LOS</td>
<td>405-acre surplus</td>
<td>522-acre surplus</td>
<td>100-acre surplus</td>
<td>216-acre surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 8 acre Target LOS</td>
<td>316-acre deficit</td>
<td>199-acre deficit</td>
<td>805-acre deficit</td>
<td>688-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2040 projected population from the 2017 Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan
Figure 4.12 – Community Park Service Area
OTHER PARKS LEVEL OF SERVICE

The Inter-local agreement parks have a half mile service area and maintain a similar function to neighborhood parks. The majority of the northern part of the city is served by this park type. These parks have filled in many of the park gaps within the northern portion of the city.

The special use parks within the City of Irving have unique cultural and historical value. These parks have a 1/2-mile service area and are designed for a specific use.

Pocket parks are intended to fill in the gaps of park facilities and are only meant to serve the immediate community. The pocket park service area is only a 1/4-mile radius because it is only meant to serve the immediate neighborhood. There are a few pocket parks centered in the middle of Irving.

PARK SYSTEM LEVEL OF SERVICE

As shown in Table 4.15, in 2018 there is a 558-acre deficit of overall parkland to reach the Target LOS of 10 acres per 1,000 residents. As the population grows, this deficit increases to over 1,000 acres of needed parkland. Since acquiring an additional 1,000 acres is not feasible, the recommendations in this plan will focus on strategic partnerships and enhancements to existing parks.

Figure 4.13 shows the overall park system service area for all parks. The majority of Irving is covered by a park service area, except for small pockets throughout the city. The service area shown is general and does not factor in barriers to access such as highways, water features, or lack of sidewalks.

Key Takeaways: Level of Service Approach

- The majority of neighborhood parks are in the southern part of the city.
- There is a need for additional neighborhood park acreage.
- When greenbelt parks are included, there is not an immediate need for additional community park acreage.
- There is about a 400-acre deficit to reach the target LOS for all parks in 2018 and that deficit grows to approximately 1,000 acres in 2040.

Table 4.15 Current and Target LOS for All Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 DEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2018 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2040 DEVELOPED PARKS</th>
<th>2040 DEVELOPED &amp; UNDEVELOPED PARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>240,373</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
<td>301,541*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parks</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>1,846 acres</td>
<td>1,981 acres</td>
<td>1,846 acres</td>
<td>1,981 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current LOS</td>
<td>7.68 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>8.24 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>6.12 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>6.57 acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 10 acre Target LOS</td>
<td>558-acre deficit</td>
<td>423-acre deficit</td>
<td>1,170-acre deficit</td>
<td>1,034-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage to acquire to meet 12 acre Target LOS</td>
<td>1,039-acre deficit</td>
<td>903-acre deficit</td>
<td>1,773-acre deficit</td>
<td>1,637-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2040 projected population from the 2017 Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan
Figure 4.13 – Overall Parks System Service Area
DEMAND BASED APPROACH

As discussed in Chapter 3, community input was gathered through various means. Key themes that emerged from the public and stakeholder visioning process included:

- Adding more diverse amenities (including cricket fields and indoor swimming);
- Increasing trail connectivity throughout the city;
- Enhancing amenities at existing parks;
- Reflecting the diversity of Irving residents in parks and recreation offerings;
- Providing more spaces for family-friendly activities; and,
- Increasing park accessibility for all residents.

The following graphs illustrate the amenities and facilities that are most desired by the public based on responses received through the public input process, both at public visioning meetings and through the on-line public survey. Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.15 show the public’s preferences for additional non-competitive outdoor amenities/facilities. Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.17 show the public’s preference for additional athletic or sport amenities/facilities.

DESIRED OUTDOOR AMENITIES AND FACILITIES

The survey responses for the non-competitive outdoor amenities/facilities, shown in Figure 4.14, reflect a desire for areas where families can gather, the preservation of natural areas, and trails that are accessible to all and are accommodating for various uses. From these responses it is clear the highest demand for outdoor spaces are those focused on maintaining a natural environment that is accessible to the public.

The results of the public meeting vision exercise, summarized in Figure 4.15, revealed that most people are interested in the preservation of natural spaces, a variety of recreational paths, and amenities for promoting social gathering. Largely, the public has a high level of demand for increasing the number of accessible natural spaces.

The input gathered from both the survey and public visioning meetings indicate the public’s desire for the provision of spaces that support a natural environment that welcomes passive recreation and leisure activities.
Figure 4.14 – Survey Responses for Additional Non-Competitive Outdoor Amenities/Facilities
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Figure 4.15 – Public Meeting Input for Additional Non-Competitive Outdoor Amenities/Facilities
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Figure 4.16 – Survey Responses for Additional Athletic or Sport Amenities/Facilities

DESIZED ATHLETIC AMENITIES AND FACILITIES

The above graph, Figure 4.16, shows the desired additional athletic or sports amenities/facilities based on survey responses. Amenities targeting Irving’s youth population were the topics that survey respondents strongly prioritized. The four top choices of desired amenities reflect a desire to grow the number of outdoor athletic spaces that can be used for both spontaneous recreation and organized sports leagues. Additionally, the results of the survey indicate that the public primarily wishes to expand the type of existing athletic and sports amenities rather than develop entirely new spaces dedicated to athletic activities that currently don’t exist.
Figure 4.17 – Public Meeting Input for Additional Athletic or Sport Amenities/Facilities

Figure 4.17 illustrates the desired additional athletic and sports amenities/facilities based on results for public visioning meetings. The focus of these results is on providing additional spaces where spontaneous recreational activities can occur as well as the ability to expand on the city’s current organized sports leagues. The most desired amenity is multi-use courts, reflecting the public’s desire for flexible outdoor athletic spaces that are accessible to all and provide the opportunity to serve a variety of uses.
PARTICIPATION IN LEAGUES & FACILITY USERS

In addition to community input, the demand based approach considers usage of facilities and participation in sports leagues.

Table 4.16 shows the number of participants in Irving’s City-sponsored leagues and the participants that rent courts and fields for games and tournaments. The two largest leagues are for soccer.

Table 4.17 shows data for the number of teams and total participants in the various leagues offered through the Irving All Sports Association. The largest league is Youth Soccer, followed by Cricket and Adult Soccer.

Table 4.18 categorizes the number of participants for different athletic and non-athletic events hosted through the Irving All Sports Association. The total overall participation in these hosted events is 86,410 participants.

Table 4.19 summarizes the trail events and the number of participants for each of these events. The trail events hosted between October 2016 and September 2017 attracted a total of 4,318 participants.

Table 4.16 City Sponsored League & Rentals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY SPONSORED LEAGUES AND RENTALS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFW Adult Baseball</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas Women’s Softball</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Sporting Events Baseball Tournaments</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Sports Soccer Tournament</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Veterans Soccer Tournament</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Softball A League/C League</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hills Prep</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplift Summit Prep</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 Irving All Sports Association Leagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRVING ALL SPORTS ASSOCIATION - CO-SPONSORED</th>
<th>TEAMS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASA (Adult Softball)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBBA (Baseball)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBAFA (Football)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA (Youth Soccer)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGSL (Girls Softball)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS (Adult Soccer)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTCA (Cricket Clubs)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBA (Basketball)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGCA (Cheerleading)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDG (Disc Golf)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA (Gymnastics)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Soccer Ref Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracle League</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>745</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,647</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways: Demand-Based Approach

- Based on the results of the survey and league information, there is the greatest demand for more sports fields, particularly soccer and cricket.
- The sport with the greatest participation in the Irving All Sports Association and City-sponsored leagues is soccer.
- Based on the results of the visioning meetings, cricket fields, indoor swimming, and splash pads were the most desired amenities.

Table 4.18 Irving All Sports Association Overall Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAGUE</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leagues</td>
<td>31,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>18,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournaments</td>
<td>11,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sponsors</td>
<td>9,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Field Rentals</td>
<td>10,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and Events</td>
<td>4,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Softball A League/C League</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hills Prep</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 Trail Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2016</td>
<td>Brighter Tomorrow</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2016</td>
<td>NATS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/2016</td>
<td>TANA Foundation</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2016</td>
<td>UNHP</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2016</td>
<td>Blue Red Run</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2017</td>
<td>Irving Marathon</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/2017</td>
<td>HIS Student Council</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2017</td>
<td>Wounded Warriors Half Marathon</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/2017</td>
<td>KASA Korean American Association</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/2017</td>
<td>Run for Recovery</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/2017</td>
<td>Run with the Sun</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,318</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOURCE BASED APPROACH

The third element of the needs assessment is the resource based approach. This method identifies existing resources that have the potential to be utilized as future parks, recreation, and open spaces. Re-appropriating these spaces enables the City to fill current gaps in park service areas and increase accessibility for all residents. For the City of Irving, the three resources with the greatest potential to be used as park spaces include:

- Undeveloped Land
- School Playgrounds/Fields
- Natural Features

These resources represent land within Irving that is currently underutilized and presents the opportunity to be used for the enhancement of the city’s overall park, trail, recreation, and open space system. Figure 4.18 shows the existing resources and the opportunities they provide to expand Irving’s park network.
UNDEVELOPED LAND
There is limited undeveloped land in Irving; however, the undeveloped land that is available could be obtained to create future parkland. The majority of the undeveloped land resides along major highways running through the city, specifically along State Highways 114 and 161. Additionally, the location of vacant land in Irving is in areas where there are gaps in the current park service area. Strategically acquiring and transforming undeveloped land would provide for a more complete and accessible parks, recreation, and open space system.

SCHOOL PLAYGROUNDS/FIELDS
Another strategy for future park development is shared use agreements with schools, particularly those with amenities such as playground equipment or athletic/sport facilities. Through a shared-use agreement between the City and school district, spaces possessing recreational amenities can be used by the community during specified times, therefore improving resident accessibility to parks. Today, this type of shared space exists in moderation in Irving. Community access to the North Lake College Natatorium and three elementary school parks are currently the only existing joint-use agreements between the City of Irving and educational institutions. Figure 4.18 shows Irving public schools and a quarter and half mile walking radius.

NATURAL FEATURES
Existing natural features within the city are valuable and nearly irreplaceable. Therefore, it is crucial that these natural areas are identified, protected, and maintained. The creation of policies ensuring the preservation of these spaces is necessary to perpetuate the extent of Irving’s parks, recreation, and open space system. Figure 4.18 shows the large expanse of natural features, particularly those related to water within Irving’s boundaries.

Irving’s natural features include:
• Floodplain
• Elm Fork of the Trinity River
• Creeks and Streams
• Lake Carolyn in Las Colinas

Key Takeaways: Resource-Based Approach
• There is limited vacant land available in Irving as the city approaches build-out.
• Schools present a great partnership opportunity, especially in areas of park need where land acquisition is difficult.
• There are existing parks and open space amenities within natural areas of Irving, but additional features could be integrated into the parks system.
SYSTEM-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

This section represents the overall recommendations for parks and open space in Irving. These recommendations are integrated into the implementation action plan in Chapter 7. Recommendations for recreation and aquatics are in Chapter 5 and recommendations for parks operations and maintenance are in Chapter 6.

LAND ACQUISITION

Given that Irving is primarily built out, significant land acquisition is not feasible. However, since this plan represents a long-term vision, there are strategic acquisitions that could be made over time. The recommendations for land acquisition are split into three categories: areas of park need, expansion of existing parks, and meeting demand.

Areas of Park Need: As demonstrated in the Needs Assessment section, there are minimal areas of Irving that are not served by an existing park. Figure 4.19 on the following page highlights areas of Irving that are not served by an existing park service area. Some of these areas do not have any residences, such as DFW Airport and the industrial area in the southwest corner of the city and therefore do not need park space. However, there are some areas that would be better served with some type of park or open space added in the future.

These areas generally include:

- **Old Cowboys Stadium Site.** The Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as a catalyst site for mixed-use development. Any development that occurs at this site should incorporate meaningful parks and open space.

- **Area near PGBT and Royal Lane in northern part of the city.** Additional multi-family residential has been built in this area over the past decade, creating a denser concentration of residents. Given the proximity to major employers in Las Colinas, the City should seek a corporate partnership to develop a community park in this area.

- **Area near Rock Island and Story Road.** There is a gap in parkland coverage in this area just south of SH 183. A small neighborhood park would serve these residents with better park access.

- **Area near Story Road and Rochelle.** Due to SH 183 as a barrier, there is not good park access in this area. A small neighborhood park would serve these residents with better park access.

Expansion of Existing Parks: Perhaps a more feasible approach to increasing park access to residents is to expand upon existing parks where feasible. There are parks located throughout the city that have small pockets of vacant land located adjacent to the park. These include Lee, Mustang, and Fritz Parks. In some cases, the City already owns the land and would just need to designate the acreage as parkland.

Meeting Demands: As discussed previously in this chapter, there are demands for more sports fields outside the floodplain. Since sports fields can require a significant amount of acreage, this might best be achieved through a partnership with the school districts or surrounding municipalities.

An additional opportunity would be to work with DFW Airport to implement a land swap for land between SH 161, Northgate, Esters, and Rochelle. The airport previously bought out homes in this area as part of a noise mitigation process. This roughly 15-acre site is outside of the floodplain but limited in terms of what could be developed, so parkland with sports fields may be the best use of the land.

Additionally, as more growth occurs in the northern part of the city, the park facilities will experience more use and subsequently become harder to maintain over time. As new development and redevelopment occurs, the Parks Department should be involved in the development review process to ensure that meaningful, quality parks or open spaces are incorporated.
Figure 4.19 – Areas Not Served by Parks
PARK DEVELOPMENT & IMPROVEMENT

As the City of Irving continues to evolve and mature as a community, quality parks and open space can set the city apart from other areas of the Metroplex. The overall vision of this master plan is to transform the parks system through:

Centers + Corridors + Connections
Community + Culture

This section focuses on opportunities to integrate this vision into future new parks or enhanced existing parks.

MASTER PLAN VISION: CENTERS

The Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan identified six centers within Irving that are major destinations. As these centers continue to develop and redevelop, meaningful parks and open space should be integrated. This parks master plan focuses on incorporating iconic green space into two specific centers: the Las Colinas Urban Center and the Civic Center. Figure 4.20 shows the locations of the catalyst centers from the Imagine Irving comprehensive plan.
Las Colinas Urban Center: The Las Colinas Urban Center has evolved from a purely corporate campus environment to a true urban center with residential, office, retail, and entertainment opportunities within close proximity. However, as the area developed over the past few decades, minimal amount of land was set aside for parks and open space. As Las Colinas continues to become denser, making use of what parkland the City and the Las Colinas Management Association does have will be critical. The City recently acquired approximately six acres on south side of Lake Carolyn to serve as an event space. This site, called Levy Event Plaza, is meant purely for special events and is limited in terms of what can be built on the site.

Therefore, there is still a need for a signature urban park space in the Las Colinas area. The City should consider acquiring approximately two to three acres of land along Lake Carolyn to create an urban park.

Given the proximity of Lake Carolyn to residential, commercial, and entertainment uses, there is ample opportunity to make this a green destination in the heart of the urban area.

Figure 4.21 represents a concept of a unique, signature urban park in the Las Colinas Urban Center. The concept integrates a unique overlook, a terraced lawn, and a continuation of the boardwalk promenade along Lake Carolyn. This concept activates the waterfront but still allows for development to occur around it. Since land in the Las Colinas Urban Center is valuable, the City should prioritize identifying property and acquiring the land in the near-term before land prices get more expensive.
Civic Center Park Improvements: The Civic Center area, also known as Heritage Crossing, covers the original downtown area of Irving along Irving Boulevard south of SH 183. Redevelopment has occurred in the area in recent years, with new homes being built just south of City Hall. The area is amenity-rich in terms of destinations, but the majority of the destinations are not linked together.

Major amenities in the area include the City Hall, Library, Veteran’s Park, Millennium Park, and Centennial Park. However, these amenities are disjointed and could be better connected. The concept shown in Figure 4.22 presents an option for improving connectivity in the core downtown area. The long-term concept shows Sowers Road being closed off to vehicular traffic and transformed into an extension of parkland. This space could be used for formal events, for food trucks, or just as a safe crossing of Irving Boulevard.

The concept also recommends intersection enhancements along Rock Island Road, Irving Boulevard, and 2nd Street. Since this is the heart of downtown Irving, the experience on these roadways should be elevated to signify the unique amenities in the area. Additionally, in this concept, the concrete drainage channel is shown as naturalized to improve the visual aesthetics and also improve the riparian function of the channel.

Further south following the Delaware Creek Channel the City is designing a trail to connect Centennial Park to Fritz Park. There are opportunities to provide trailhead amenities and signature experiences along this trail once constructed. Figure 4.23 represents how the currently vacant parkland at Senter Park East could be transformed into a trailhead for the Delaware Creek Trail. This concept also includes opportunities for bridge crossings along the channel to connect to the Senter East Building as well as passive park amenities.
Figure 4.23 – South Irving Green Linkages Concept
MASTER PLAN VISION: CORRIDORS

The Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan classified roadways in Irving as either major corridors, neighborhood corridors, or bicycle/pedestrian friendly corridors. Figure 4.24 depicts the locations of these corridor types.

**Major Corridors:** These roadways serve as major travel routes throughout the city. The comprehensive plan identified MacArthur, O’Connor, Belt Line, and Story as major corridors. Potential improvements for these corridors should be sidewalk improvements, intersection enhancements, and gateway features.

**Neighborhood Corridors:** These roadways connect major neighborhoods together. The comprehensive plan identified Walnut Hill, Royal, Las Colinas Boulevard, Rochelle, and Grauwlyer as neighborhood corridors. The focus for improvements to these corridors should be bicycle/pedestrian enhancements and safety improvements.

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Friendly Corridors:** These roadways have lower traffic speeds and traffic volumes, making them more attractive for non-motorized traffic. The comprehensive plan identified Nursery, Rock Island, Northgate, Kinwest, and others as bicycle/pedestrian-friendly corridors. Strategies for these roadways include signage, striping, and landscaping improvements.

---

**Figure 4.24 – Corridor Opportunities**
MASTER PLAN VISION: CONNECTIONS

While this master plan does not assess trails and bikeways in detail, a high-level overview of connectivity opportunities was completed. This section briefly discusses major opportunities to enhance bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between parks, recreation facilities, schools, employment centers, residential areas, and major destinations.

Last Mile Connections: Connecting to existing transit routes is critical to serve as first and last-mile connections for commuters. Within Irving there are eight DART light rail stops and two Trinity Railroad Express stops. A priority for the City should be to conduct an assessment of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations within 1/2 mile of all of the transit stops and implement accessibility improvements.

Connecting to the Campion Trails: The Campion Trails follow along the Elm Fork of the Trinity River and offer opportunities for cyclists, runners, walkers, skaters, and more. A critical need in the city is to provide more bicycle/pedestrian connections to the Campion Trails. These opportunities are shown in Figure 4.25.

Connecting Existing Parks & Recreation Amenities: Also shown in Figure 4.25 are opportunities to link existing parks and recreation amenities, including the Delaware Creek corridor and between key parks.
MASTER PLAN VISION: COMMUNITY

The vision concept of community represents the notion that Irving parks should be signature gathering spaces where everyone feels welcome. This section outlines considerations for enhancing an overall sense of community when Irving parks are improved in the future.

Signature Amenities: Many neighborhoods place pride in their neighborhood or community park. As parks in Irving are renovated or as new ones are built, signature amenities such as splash pads, architecturally significant pavilions, or interpretative signage should be added. Efforts should also be made to consider the context, history, and diversity of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Increased Comfort: Parks should be inviting even during the intense Texas summers. Shade structures and shade trees are critically important to combat the heat, especially around playground equipment. Another aspect of comfort is ADA accessibility. Many older parks do not meet current ADA standards, and as they are renovated these issues should be addressed.

Improved Access: Improvements to park wayfinding signage would enhance access both to and within existing parks. Additionally, as discussed in the special review park section, more consistent signage is needed within parks. Access to surrounding neighborhoods should also be addressed with improved sidewalks and intersection enhancements.

Safety & Security: All park patrons should feel safe when visiting Irving parks. Strategies to deter vandalism and unwanted activity include security lighting, occasional police presence, and cameras, where warranted.

Athletics: As discussed previously in this chapter, a system-wide need is additional sports fields outside of the floodplain. This could be achieved through partnership agreements with surrounding cities or school districts. For existing athletic complexes, the City should integrate artificial turf over time to promote regional tournament play.

All-Abilities Play Equipment: An increasing number of communities are incorporating inclusive play equipment that is accessible to children of all abilities. When replacing or upgrading playground equipment, all-abilities equipment should be incorporated.

Example of Shade Structure
MASTER PLAN VISION: CELEBRATION

The vision concept of celebration encompasses the notion that parks should celebrate the unique people and places of Irving. This section outlines considerations for enhancing the sense of celebration in parks today and in the future.

**Branding:** A hurdle that many parks and recreation agencies face is lack of resident awareness of all the department has to offer. With the “Let’s Play, Irving” brand established for this park master plan effort, the City should similarly brand future park and recreation design and planning efforts. The brand could also be incorporated on the department website.

**Signature Events:** As discussed previously, the City of Irving has a multitude of special events that occur in parks each year. The City should continue this emphasis on special events, but consider establishing a Special Events division within the department to have a team dedicated to implementing the events throughout the year.

**Iconic Trail Amenities:** There are several trailheads along the Campion Trail today. However, as the number of trails increase, additional trailheads should be added to signify entrances into the City or significant areas. Locations of potential trailhead opportunities are shown in Figure 4.25.

**Public Art:** Sculptures, murals, and other art pieces in parks provide a sense of culture and celebration. Many communities have established public art programs in which pieces by local artists are rotated throughout public facilities.

**Embrace Nature:** Irving is rich in natural amenities, which should be evident in the parks system. Adding elements such as interpretative signage that highlights the unique natural features, nature viewing areas, and outdoor classrooms would highlight the importance of natural areas in Irving without adversely impacting the natural resources.

**Reflect Diverse Cultures:** One element that was heard consistently throughout the plan process was that Irving is proud of the diverse cultures represented in the community. These cultures are represented to a degree in park amenities and programming, but could be more deliberate. The City should continue to survey residents about desired programming even outside the master planning process and incorporate trends where possible.
PARKS MASTER PLAN MAP

**Figure 4.26** represents the overall park master plan recommendations discussed throughout this chapter. The following sections describe each recommended element shown on the map.

**Areas of Park Need:** These circles represent areas of park need as identified through the needs assessment and discussions with staff. There are four areas shown - three north of SH 183 and one south of SH 183, which aligns with the needs for parks based on the current system. The Implementation chapter discusses next steps for these areas of park need.

**Strategic Acquisition:** The area shown in orange represents an opportunity for the City to acquire acreage in an area that is not suitable for any other development because of proximity to DFW Airport. The image below represents a concept of how the site could be developed with multi-purpose soccer and cricket fields, which are both in high demand in the City.

**Proposed Urban Center Parks:** As described previously in this chapter, this plan recommends park enhancements in the downtown Civic Center area and the Las Colinas Urban Center. These areas are shown as pink circles in the proposed park master plan map. In the Civic Center area, the focus is to improve connectivity between the existing parks, municipal buildings, TRE station, and retail along Main Street. In Las Colinas, the focus is to add more public park space that takes advantage of the scenic views of Lake Carolyn and the surrounding urban development.

**Additional Connectivity Opportunities:** “Connections” is one of the primary components of the overall master plan vision. While this plan doesn’t incorporate a comprehensive trails & bikeways master plan, **Figure 4.26** does identify additional connectivity opportunities to be studied in further detail in subsequent trail planning efforts. The map identifies the following trail opportunities:

- Connect the existing Campion Trails to other parts of Irving;
- Extend the Campion Trails in the north to connect with surrounding communities;
- Extend the planned trail along the Delaware Creek channel to Lively Park in the north; and,
- Incorporate bicycle/pedestrian improvements along Irving Boulevard from the Civic Center area northwest to SH 183.

**Bike-Friendly Corridors:** The Imagine Irving Comprehensive Plan identified roadways throughout the city as “Bike-Friendly Corridors.” These are roadways with lower speeds and traffic volumes that could support improvement such as bicycle signage or striping. Similar to the additional connectivity opportunities, additional study is needed to determine the feasibility of specific improvements along these corridors.
INDIVIDUAL PARK REVIEW

Given the number of parks located in the parks system today, the project team and City staff selected 10 parks to assess in greater detail. The recommendations discussed could be applied to other parks throughout the system as well.

For this individual park review, seven community parks, two neighborhood parks, and one greenbelt park were selected. Figure 4.27 depicts the location of each of the 10 parks in relation to the Park District in which they are located. The assessment and recommendations for these parks are located in the appendix.
Figure 4.27 – Special Review Park Location
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AQUATICS & INDOOR RECREATION

- FACILITY INVENTORY
- NEEDS ASSESSMENT
- RECOMMENDATIONS
INTRODUCTION

Indoor recreation and aquatics are a critical component of Irving’s parks and recreation system. The first recreation center in Irving was built in 1954 and the most recent was built in 2003. The centers are neighborhood-focused, with quality programming and activities. However, as recreation trends evolve, investments must be made to renovate and enhance the recreation centers and be competitive with other cities. This chapter assesses each of the existing recreation and aquatic facilities, determines facility needs, and presents overall recommendations for enhancing recreation in Irving.
FACILITY INVENTORY

In total, Irving has six recreation centers open to the general public, one senior center, and one youth center. Adults 55 and older can attend the Senior Center and youth ages 12-18 can attend the Youth Center. Each recreation center is relatively small, meant to serve the surrounding neighborhood instead of a larger section of the community like in other cities.

Aquatic facilities in Irving include three traditional outdoor pools, two outdoor leisure pools, and limited access to indoor swimming pools at the Senior Center and North Lake College.

Figure 5.1 and Table 5.1 depict the locations of recreation facilities in Irving.

The remainder of this section discusses each of the centers in greater detail, presenting both observations and opportunities. Overall, piecemeal renovations and improvements to centers over time have resulted in major needs for recreation facilities in Irving. Even with steady population growth, no center has been built since 2003. This chapter discusses short-term improvements to centers and long-term recommendations for providing recreation facilities that better serve Irving’s citizens.

Table 5.1 Irving Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>SQUARE FEET</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cimarron Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>201 Red River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustang Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>17,844</td>
<td>223 Kinwest Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td>800 Cheyenne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>3000 Pamela Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Farrow Recreation Center</td>
<td>16,217</td>
<td>530 Davis Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senter Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>35,528</td>
<td>901 Senter Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Senior Center*</td>
<td>45,849</td>
<td>200 S. Jefferson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively Pointe Youth Center</td>
<td>20,332</td>
<td>909 O’Connor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Square footage for Heritage Senior Center includes the indoor pool.
Figure 5.1 – Irving Recreation Centers
CIMARRON PARK RECREATION CENTER

201 Red River Trail
Founded 1998
19,257 S.F.

AMENITIES

• Cardio/Weight Room
• Game Room
• Gymnasium
• Outdoor Leisure Pool
• Administrative Offices
• Large Multi-Purpose Room
• Small Multi-Purpose Room

DESCRIPTION

When Cimarron Park Recreation Center opened roughly 20 years ago this area of Irving was still developing. The area around the center is now fully developed, which has resulted in overcrowding in the facility. This facility neighbors Tom Landry Elementary School and shares a parking lot with the school. The facility offers both indoor recreation and outdoor leisure aquatics, tennis, and basketball courts. As the city has continued to develop, demand on this center has continued to grow to a point that it is not supporting the needs of this part of the city.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This center has three overarching needs:

First, minimal maintenance in the past has caused the center to reach a point of requiring large scale repairs and replacements. The areas requiring maintenance includes both interior spaces and exterior improvements. Addressing these areas of concern will increase the longevity of the building.

Second, lack of capacity is artificially capping the number of people able to use the center. The addition of the below items would help to relieve this issue:

- Additional gym space
- Additional activity room
- Expanded cardio room
- Walking track
- Lounge space for waiting
- Creating one entrance for better occupancy control

Third, exterior items to address the overall aesthetics and longevity of the building include:

- Replace existing irrigation system
- Regrade to move water away from building
- Rework flatwork to provide safe movement and ADA compliance
- Refresh landscape with new plant material
- Provide updated signage for center

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

- Implementing a control desk
- Additional gym space
- Adding an indoor walking track
- Adding an activity room
- Renovating existing cardio room and lounge
- Improvements to centers overall exterior

Project Cost Estimate: $6-$7 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
MUSTANG PARK RECREATION CENTER

223 Kinwest Parkway  
Founded 2002  
17,844 S.F.

AMENITIES

• Cardio/Weight Room  
• Administrative Offices  
• Game Room  
• Large Multi-Purpose Room  
• Gymnasium  
• Small Multi-Purpose Room

DESCRIPTION

Mustang Park Recreation Center is located just south of Lyndon B. Johnson Freeway and serves an area of the city that has experienced intense growth in the years since its construction. The center provides indoor recreation opportunities, as well as outdoor recreation amenities such as a tennis court and playground. The center is located across the street from Las Colinas Elementary School.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since its opening 17 years ago, Mustang Park Recreation Center has experienced no major renovations to its interior. The current orientation of the parking lot does not provide direct access to the front entrance, encouraging many people to enter through the back entrance. Having two entrances is problematic for controlling occupancy and security of the center. Within the building, the exposed duct work blocks the natural light and the current artificial lighting is insufficient for the central spine. Heavy use of spaces within the center have resulted in overcrowded conditions.

The exterior of the Mustang Park Recreation Center is experiencing water ponding against the building and movement of flatwork, although some exterior flatwork removal and replacement has been performed in the past. The center’s exterior appearance could be enhanced by addressing the unhealthy state of the grass and providing additional vegetation around the building.

Areas of improvement include:

- Addition of a half-sized gymnasium and activity room
- Better utilization of spaces in the center
- Elimination of one of the two entrances for improved security and control
- Improved interior lighting levels
- Addressing locker/toilet needs
- Replacing existing irrigation system
- Regrading to move water away from building
- Rethinking current parking layout as existing parking presents security concerns and is disconnected to the main entrance

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years:

- Maintain gym
- Assess feasibility of constructing a new multi-generational center on site with senior component, modern recreation amenities, and indoor family leisure/play pool (70,000-80,000 sq ft)

Project Cost Estimate: $35-$40 Million* (represents cost of new center that could occur in a 5-10 year planning window).

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
NORTHWEST PARK RECREATION CENTER

800 Cheyenne Street
Founded 1967, Rebuilt 2002
15,846 S.F.

AMENITIES

• Cardio/Weight room
• Game Room
• Gymnasium
• Large Multi-Purpose Rooms
• Small Multi-Purpose Rooms
• Administrative Support Areas

DESCRIPTION

This 17 year old facility was constructed in Northwest Park on a bluff overlooking the park. The drainage channel to the east and the property line to the west makes expansion problematic. There are signs of movement in the foundation of the center, and the west side of the gym is experiencing water infiltration issues.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With growing and changing demands the facility has several areas in need of expansion and repair:

- Expansion of existing teen/game room
- Expansion of existing daycare room
- Additional striping for badminton and other games in gym
- Additional classrooms and expansion of existing classrooms
- Additional storage space

Repair work includes:

- Leveling of outdoor patio slab
- Addressing drainage issues around building

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

- Expand existing teen/game room
- Expand existing daycare area
- Create additional classroom spaces
- Add striping to gym floors
- Repair areas where foundation movement has occurred
- Repair gym water issues

Project Cost Estimate: $3-$4 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
LEE PARK RECREATION CENTER

3000 Pamela Drive
Founded 1965 | Renovated & Expanded 2001
23,596 S.F.

AMENITIES

• Cardio/Weight room
• Game Room
• 2 Gymnasiums
• Racquetball Courts
• Outdoor Pool

• Large Multi-Purpose Rooms
• Small Multi-Purpose Rooms
• Administrative Areas

DESCRIPTION

This recreation facility includes both indoor recreation opportunities as well as an outdoor pool. Lee Park Recreation Center was originally constructed 54 years ago and went through a major expansion and renovation in 2001. The Lee Park Pool is adjacent to the facility and Brandenburg Elementary School is across the street. This recreation facility is a very active center for Central Irving.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Using the average daily attendance as a benchmark, the Lee Park Recreation Center has been very successful. Some of the amenities within the center that could be improved to keep the center relevant include:

- Expansion of existing after school space
- Expansion of existing cardio/weight area
- Addition of an outdoor basketball court
- Expansion and improvements to playground

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

- Expand existing after school room
- Expand existing cardio room
- Implement an outdoor basketball court
- Renewal of playground

Project Cost Estimate: $1.5-$2 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
GEORGIA FARROW RECREATION CENTER

530 Davis Drive
Founded 1989 | Renovated & Expanded 2018
16,217 S.F.

AMENITIES

- Gymnasium
- Cardio/Weight Room
- Meeting Room
- Support Kitchen
- Multi-Purpose Room
- Lobby
- Administrative Offices
- Game Room

DESCRIPTION

The Georgia Farrow Recreation Center is located in a beautiful park setting with numerous trees and a dry creek bed creating a unique environment. The center is heavily used and will be undergoing a small expansion to address the growing attendance in 2019. However, the terrain and tree cover limits the ability to significantly expand the current center.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As previously mentioned, an expansion and renovation is planned in 2019 for the Georgia Farrow Recreation Center, which will provide more programming space and update the facility’s appearance. However, there are needs that were not able to be addressed including:

• Adding a canopy over outdoor basketball courts
• Adding a shade structure over the playground
• Increasing the size of toilet facilities
• Increasing the size of the game room and preschool room

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

• Add cover over basketball courts
• Implement a new playground
• Expand current restrooms
• Expand existing game room
• Expand preschool room

Project Cost Estimate: $1.6-$2 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
SENTER PARK RECREATION CENTER

901 S. Senter Street
Founded 1954 | Renovated & Expanded 2000 | Renovated 2018 - Present
35,528 S.F.

AMENITIES

• Cardio/Weight Room
• 2 Large Activity Rooms
• Game Room
• Small Activity Room
• 2 Gymnasiums
• Administrative Areas
• Outdoor Pool
• Racquetball Courts

DESCRIPTION

Senter Park Recreation Center was first constructed in 1954 and has undergone three expansions/renovations since its establishment: 1970, 2000, and 2018. The center is located in Senter Park and is adjacent to Senter Park Pool. Available parking for the center includes a large parking lot (approximately 135 spaces) located on the south side of the building, as well as off-street parking on the north side.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The three expansions/renovations the center has experienced over its 64-year life has compromised the organization and flow of spaces when compared to a building constructed at one time. This has resulted in many areas of the center being difficult to monitor except for through a camera system. Over the Senter Park Recreation Center’s lifespan the interior has been well maintained. During the 2018 renovation a decision was made to relocate the weights and cardio equipment to improve the overall interior environment.

Items for future renovation in the center include:

- Creating new entrance signage for the center
- Updating interior colors
- Replacing lights to brighten spaces
- Integrating new audio/visual technology into center
- Seeking opportunities to open space to the south views of the park

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

- Renovation to entrance of center
- Update lighting
- Refresh colors and finishes
- Update A/V systems
- Open center to south views

Project Cost Estimate: $500,000-$750,000*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
HERITAGE SENIOR CENTER

200 S. Jefferson Street
Founded 2003
45,849 S.F. (Including indoor aquatics)

AMENITIES

- Administrative Offices
- Ballroom/Meeting Room
- Fitness Room
- Computer Room
- Multi-Purpose Rooms
- Billiards Room
- Arts & Crafts
- Living Room/Library
- Dining Room
- Kitchen
- Indoor Pool

DESCRIPTION

This senior-oriented facility contains both indoor aquatics and senior activity spaces. The aquatics area includes a six lane fitness lap pool, open water area, and hot tub. The pool is designed with a separate outdoor entrance that allows access for non-seniors on a scheduled basis. The indoor senior area has traditional senior activity spaces as described in the amenities. The length of travel between elements in the center is organized around an outdoor rectangular courtyard, which is problematic in maintaining visual control of the center. Over the past few years, attendance has declined slightly.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Heritage Senior Center has not been updated since its opening in 2003. Since then, a new generation of users has influenced and altered the programming needs for the 55 and older residents. Additionally, there have been changes in the way the center is used, which provides guidance for desired modifications to the center going forward.

Future facility modifications include:

- Repurposing computer room and multi-purpose room
- Expanding existing fitness room
- Additional gymnasium area
- Adding storage space to the building
- Updating audio/visual system to increase operational efficiency
- Updating all finishes - lighting, flooring, and walls
- Repairing/replacing warped flooring in the dance hall

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

- Update all finishes, including new wood floor, technology, and A/V system
- Renew cardio equipment
- Expand fitness area and half gym
- Convert computer area to a more utilized space

Project Cost Estimate: $800,000-$1.2 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
**LIVELY POINTE YOUTH CENTER**

909 N. O’Connor Road  
Founded 1968 | Renovated & Expanded in 2008  
20,332 S.F.

**AMENITIES**

- Cantina  
- Game Room  
- Classrooms  
- Gymnasium  
- Computer Lab  
- Kitchen  
- Craft Room  
- Multi-Purpose Room  
- Gymnasium  
- Multi-Purpose Room  
- Fitness Room  
- Theater/Media Room

**DESCRIPTION**

The Lively Pointe Youth Center has served a number of purposes in its 50+ years of existence. Initially, the building was the City Library, later it was remodeled and became the Senior Center, and in 2008 it was remodeled to its current use as the Youth Community Center. It is located across the street from Irving High School and close to Lorenzo De Zavala Middle School, which is ideal for youth programming. The center is located adjacent to outdoor activities such as the Lively Park Pool and Lively Skate Park. The center has also evolved from youth only activities to an important special needs programming facility.
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The current center is displaying signs of slab movement, and in some areas the movement is significant. Changing the physical layout of spaces would address the special needs programming, especially therapy needs, in a more efficient manner. The current layout of the control desk makes it difficult to oversee the center in its entirety, including monitoring center activities as well as the sign-in of visitors.

Unique facility needs include:

• Employment of a full-time custodian
• Separate gym space for special needs programs
• Space for the growing after-school program
• Remodeling toilets to better serve special needs users
• Providing new cardio equipment to encourage teen fitness
• Assistance in developing social media outreach to youth

IMPROVEMENT PHASING & COSTS

Short-term recommendation priorities within the first five years include:

• Convert areas to accommodate special needs programs
• Renew cardio equipment
• Expand after school program area
• Address excess foundation movement

Project Cost Estimate: $1-1.25 Million*

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
AQUATIC FACILITIES

Irving has been a leader in providing outdoor aquatic opportunities from 1970s to the present. Within Irving, three variety of pools are offered:

- Outdoor Leisure Pools
- Outdoor Traditional Pools
- Hybrid Indoor Aquatic Centers (focused on fitness)

OUTDOOR LEISURE POOLS

Cimarron Family Aquatic Center: Located in North Irving within Cimarron Park, this facility opened in 1998 and has an average annual attendance of 40,768 over the past five years. Amenities found at Cimarron include a lap pool, splash pool, water playground, slides, zero-depth entry pool, concession stand, locker rooms, and restrooms. Programs offered include public swim, lap swim, learn to swim, and Summer Sharks swim team. Although the facility is supposed to function as a water park, it serves as a neighborhood pool since there are no other municipal pools in the northern part of the city.

West Irving Aquatic Center: Opened in 2010, amenities at this facility include a lap pool, shaded pool, splash pool, current channel, water playground, slides, zero-depth entry pool, rock climbing wall, concession stands, locker room, and restrooms. Programs offered include public swim, lap swim, learn to swim, and Summer Sharks swim team, and AquaStars. During the pool season this facility is heavily used, with a average annual attendance of 60,523 over the past five years. The biggest need at the West Irving Aquatic Center is for additional staffing; currently the facility lacks swim coaches and uses lifeguards to fill the void.

OUTDOOR TRADITIONAL POOLS (NEIGHBORHOOD POOLS)

Lee Park Pool: Amenities include a roughly 4,700 SF pool, shade structures, and picnic tables. Programs offered at Lee include public swim, family swim night, learn to swim, and Summer Sharks swim team. Lee Park Pool has an average annual attendance of 7,087 over the past five years. In comparison to the other outdoor pools in Irving, Lee Park Pool has held up fairly well since opening in 1963, but staff is starting to see signs of major water loss due to leaks.

Lively Park Pool: Opened in 1958, with an average annual attendance of 4,586 over the past five years, amenities include a roughly 4,900 SF pool, 1 meter diving board, shade structures, and restrooms. Programs offered include open swim and family swim night. Over time there has been substantial water loss at the pool. Consideration should be given to transitioning the pool into a more modern aquatic amenity over time given that attendance at this pool has declined while costs to operate have increased.

Senter Park Pool: Opened in 1954, with an average annual attendance of 10,086 over the past five years, amenities include a roughly 9,200 SF pool and restrooms. Programs offered at Senter include open swim, lap swim, learn to swim, water fitness classes, and advance swimming lessons. Similar to Lively, there has been substantial water loss at the Senter Park Pool. Options to consider in the future include replacing the pool with a more modern amenity.
INDOOR POOLS

Heritage Aquatic Center: This indoor pool, located within the Heritage Senior Center, opened in 2003 and has an average annual attendance of 40,042 over the past five years. Amenities at this aquatic center include a 20-yard lap pool, spa, accessible chair lift and ramp, water chair, and water walking channel. The pool recently went through a renovation that included replacing tile, resurfacing the spa, installing a climate control unit, and adding a LED overhead lighting system. Programs include senior swim classes and specific times for adult and public swim. Given that the function of this pool is primarily for seniors, there is pent-up demand for indoor aquatics in south Irving.

North Lake College Natatorium: Through a partnership with the City of Irving, Irving ISD, and Dallas County Community College District, the natatorium located on North Lake’s campus is open to Irving residents during certain times of the day, and has served an average of 61,996 people annually over the past five years. The pool represents the only Olympics-sized pool in Irving and is used by Irving ISD, USA Swim Club, and other local swim teams. The facility offers locker, shower, and toilet facilities, and special needs chair lifts and entry/exit ramps. Recent renovations include a permanent roof, new locker room, climate control, and new deck surface. Future needs include replacing piping, pool resurfacing, and updating underwater lighting.

AQUATIC FACILITIES ASSESSMENT

One of the biggest challenges facing the city’s outdoor traditional pools is the excessive maintenance they require due to age as well as declining attendance, especially in recent years which has created an excessive cost per visitor to these pools. Irving currently has two outdoor Family aquatic centers (Cimarron and West Irving) which reflects the current municipal model of providing outdoor aquatics to its citizens. Family Aquatic Centers combine play and fitness for all ages and serves as the first introduction of aquatics to young children. The attendance disparity between these pools and the traditional pools in Irving present a compelling case for a broader look at the future of aquatics for Irving.

Looking at recreation pool trends both nationally and regionally, providing indoor leisure aquatics has become more desirable in communities similar to Irving. Currently, this type of pool is not available in Irving. By making indoor pool options available this could provide for year-round swimming opportunities, which is a draw for young families.

The factors discussed above suggest that a strategic approach to aquatics could address not only improvements to efficiencies, but also aging facility concerns.

One near-term recommendation is to phase out the under-performing traditional outdoor pools that have significant issues and replace them with more modern aquatic amenities.

Table 5.2 Irving Aquatic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>POOL TYPE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cimarron Family Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Outdoor Leisure Pool</td>
<td>199 Red River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Irving Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Outdoor Leisure Pool</td>
<td>3701 Conflans Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Park Pool</td>
<td>Outdoor Traditional Pool</td>
<td>3000 Pamela Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively Park Pool</td>
<td>Outdoor Traditional Pool</td>
<td>903 N. O’Connor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senter Park Pool</td>
<td>Outdoor Traditional Pool</td>
<td>901 Senter Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>200 S Jefferson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake College Natatorium</td>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>5001 N MacArthur Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

In order to assess recreation level of service, a set of benchmark cities has been assembled. These cities were selected based on demographics and growth trends similar to Irving. Using the existing conditions of the benchmark cities and through an understanding of their recreational operations, comparisons can be drawn to Irving.

Indoor Facilities: Indoor facility level of service (LOS) defines the number of recreational facilities that serve the population. They are expressed as the square footage of indoor facility per capita. In 2018, Irving’s indoor facility LOS was **0.45 SF per resident**, which is less than the regional average of 0.78 SF per resident. The resultant square footage of indoor recreational space necessary to fulfill the demand of the city’s current population is between 70,000 and 80,000 additional SF. This roughly translates to one large multi-generational center or two additional neighborhood centers.

**Senior Facilities**: Irving’s senior center LOS in 2018 was **0.12 SF per resident**, which was just below the regional average and exceeded the national average. Therefore, an additional stand-alone senior center is not needed at this time. This square footage comparison does include the aquatics components for the senior centers included in the analysis.

**Aquatics**: There is no standard square footage LOS for aquatic facilities. However, compared to benchmark communities, Irving is deficient in indoor leisure pools.

![Figure 5.2 – Recreation & Senior Center LOS Comparisons](image-url)
DEMAND BASED APPROACH

INDOOR FACILITIES

The Demand Based Approach analyzes overall facility usage to determine what facilities are most used within the city and what residents most desire. This analysis was completed through an assessment of facility usage data, such as recreation center use density and participation in available recreation programs.

On a daily basis, most of the attendees at Irving’s recreation centers do not participate in the programs offered by the centers, as shown in Table 5.3. This reveals that the daily attendance of these facilities is not heavily dependent on demand for program availability.

Table 5.4 shows the use density for each of the recreation centers, which summarizes the amount of square footage available for the centers’ average number of attendees. Most of the centers that have the highest average attendance also have the least amount of square footage per user. Cimarron and Mustang have the least amount of SF per average attendee, while Heritage and Lively have the greatest amount of SF per attendee.

AQUATIC FACILITIES

Looking at trends in aquatics for the City of Irving, traditional pools are underperforming compared to leisure pools based on average attendance. As shown in Figure 5.4, from 2012 to 2017 the average attendance for outdoor traditional pools has declined significantly. This likely coincides with the opening of the West Irving Aquatic Center.

Although attendance at outdoor leisure pools has dropped between 2012 to 2017, the overall attendance remains significantly higher than traditional outdoor pools, as shown in Figure 5.5.
### Table 5.4 Use Density of Centers

**RECREATION CENTER ATTENDEE DENSITY (SQUARE FOOT PER USER)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE (SF)</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF ATTENDEES</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOT (SF) PER ATTENDEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cimarron Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustang Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>17,844</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>15,846</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Farrow Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>16,217</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senter Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>35,528</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Senior Center</td>
<td>Senior Activity Center</td>
<td>45,849</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>158.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively Pointe Youth Center</td>
<td>Youth Activity Center</td>
<td>20,332</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>194,469</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recreation Less Senior &amp; Youth Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>128,288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figures

**Figure 5.4** – Outdoor Traditional Pool Attendance

**Figure 5.5** – Outdoor Leisure Pool Attendance
**Figure 5.6** – Survey Responses for Additional Indoor Recreation Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Indoor Recreation Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Adult Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Cardio/Weight Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Walking/Jogging Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium/Indoor Basketball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Volleyball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Instruction Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESired INDOOR RECREATION AMENITIES**

*Figure 5.6* illustrates the survey results for additional indoor recreation amenities. Respondents show a strong desire for the addition of indoor swimming, cardio/weight rooms, spaces focused on active adult activities, and indoor walking/jogging tracks. The top amenities from the survey, some of which are currently available at certain recreation centers, reveal a need for expanding existing spaces as well as creating new spaces to serve current and future demands.

*Carpenter Park Recreation Center, Plano, TX*
The results from the public meeting visioning exercise, shown in Figure 5.7, reveal that the primary demand is for the provision of indoor pools, followed by the desire for fitness classes, indoor courts, and outdoor pools. While the demand for indoor pools far exceeds the other amenities, there is still significant demand for creating more variety within Irving’s existing recreation centers. The demands drawn from the public meeting show that people are mainly interested in the provision of dedicated spaces for specific activities within the City’s recreation centers.

![Figure 5.7 – Public Meeting Input for Additional Indoor Recreation Amenities](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Classes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio/Weight Room</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Turf Fields</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Activities</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Activities</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Room</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Fitness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYSTEM-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECREATION CENTERS

The individual recreation center reviews on the preceding pages offer short-term and overall recommendations for each of the eight facilities in Irving. These recommendations should be implemented over time, but other overarching decisions need to be made as well.

As demonstrated in the needs assessment and review of individual facilities, there is demand for additional recreation programming in Irving. Many communities in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex have begun developing large, multi-generational recreation centers that serve the needs of youth, adults, and seniors under one roof and often incorporate indoor/outdoor leisure aquatics as well. These include both new and rapidly growing cities as well as established cities that are changing their model for how they are providing recreation amenities to their communities. This represents a major shift in how recreation has been offered by Irving in the past. Since Senter Park Recreation Center was first built over 60 years ago, the city has followed the model of building small recreation centers that are meant to serve the immediate neighborhoods. These neighborhood recreation centers have presented a growing challenge over time to maintain and operate in a sustainable manner. It has become increasingly difficult to ensure a balance between improvements at each of the centers. Therefore, if Irving decides to introduce larger multi-generational centers that serve a broader swath of residents, difficult decisions will have to be made concerning the existing neighborhood centers.

A priority recommendation will be to conduct a comprehensive recreation feasibility study to determine the best path moving forward. Figure 5.8 on page 145 represents an option to introduce two multi-generational centers over time in Irving – one on the north side and one on the south side. The sequence of the approaches described in the following section would need to be confirmed in the comprehensive recreation feasibility study.

During the course of public involvement for this plan some residents expressed the desire for a neighborhood recreation center in the southwest park planning district. The results of the needs assessment and analysis of usage data reveal that a new center wouldn’t be feasible in that area. Recent expansions at Senter and Georgia Farrow (closest to the southwest area) make them the largest recreation centers in the city, but the average attendance is among the lowest, therefore they are not close to capacity. To improve access in the Southwest park planning area, this plan does recommend adding outdoor recreation amenities at Southwest Park.
SYSTEM-WIDE APPROACHES

APPROACH 1
Implement all of the recommended improvements to existing centers as described previously in this chapter.

APPROACH 2
Develop a new multi-generational facility including a dedicated senior component (70,000-80,000 SF) with indoor leisure aquatics in northern part of Irving. This facility could be located on a new site or at Mustang Park to replace the existing facility. Develop a new multi-generational facility (60,000-70,000 SF) with a future outdoor leisure pool in the southern part of Irving. This site could be located at Senter Park to replace the existing facility.

APPROACH 3
Develop a joint recreation center/library in the Las Colinas Urban Center area to create an identity with those employed in the Urban Center and provide municipal recreation amenities to the growing number of residents in the area. Assess the feasibility of a partnership with North Lake College to build a recreation facility on the campus that would be jointly operated and open to the public and students.
AQUATIC FACILITIES

As discussed in this chapter, attendance at the traditional outdoor pools has been declining, maintenance costs are increasing for these aging pools, and there is demand for additional indoor aquatic options. Much like recreation, it is recommended that a comprehensive feasibility study be performed for aquatics, which will assist Irving in creation of a strategy for addressing these identified challenges. Major priorities for aquatic facilities in Irving include:

- Additional staffing to support operations
- Phase out under-performing neighborhood pools over time and maintain an aquatic presence in the neighborhood with more modern amenities
- Additional indoor aquatics
- Expansion to West Irving Aquatic Center to address overcrowding
- Refresh existing Cimarron Aquatic Center with new play features and amenities
- Assess and update user fee costs to recover more costs
- Add family bathrooms and changing room facilities
- Add restroom space at facilities that do not meet code requirements
- Add party rooms, storage space, and deck space at facilities
Figure 5.8 – New Center Development Zones

*Feasibility and phasing to be determined by subsequent recreation facility feasibility study.
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

- INVENTORY
- ASSESSMENT
- STRATEGIES
INTRODUCTION

The maintenance staff within the Parks and Athletic Division have played a crucial role in the continued success of the Irving Parks System. However, since 2006, funding for maintenance has not kept pace with the capital improvement investments or expansion of parks and facilities. Additionally, the maintenance responsibilities have surpassed the capacity for the existing number of full-time employees to manage. In a 2014 public survey conducted in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan, the community noted that areas for improvement include maintenance, landscaping, and quality of parks and park facilities. This chapter of the report will discuss the physical condition of the two main service centers, staffing, and recommendations for operating improvements to support the goal of a premier park system in Irving.
FRITZ PARK SERVICE CENTER

312 Vilbig Street (within Fritz Park)

Crews based out of this service center are responsible for parks and facilities located south of State Highway 183. The demands of the service center have increased over time and have reached the point where the center is unable to meet staff or equipment needs. The office building, which is over 50 years old, and maintenance yard are positioned at a lower elevation than the adjacent street, creating flooding issues during times of heavy rain. Additional observations include:

- The break room and number of toilets are not large enough for the current staff of 30 employees
- Flooding of the building occurs during heavy rain events
- Inadequate staff parking
- Parking and vehicular maneuvering is constricted on the site
- Age of the building contributes to inefficiencies because of the lack of work and storage space
- The center needs more covered parking to protect valuable equipment
- The greenhouse produces roughly 60,000 plantings per year
- Previous master plan recommended facility to be moved and downsized to just a greenhouse

RECOMMENDATIONS

Relocate Fritz Park Service Center to a new location in the general vicinity of the current facility.

- Obtain approximately 2-3 acres (depending on parcel shape)
- Build a new approximately 3,750 SF facility
- Build a new yard with cover for equipment
- Provide 35 staff parking spaces
- Maintain greenhouse at current location within Fritz. Remove remaining facilities except for paving around the greenhouse
LAS COLINAS SERVICE CENTER

5992 Riverside Drive

The Las Colinas Service Center is located on a site shared by the Police Department, and has become a general storage space for multiple departments as well as a city fueling station. Staff located here are responsible for all park related facilities located north of State Highway 183. Campion Trail maintenance staff is also housed in this location. The City purchased this center and has been able to use it without significant modifications. The service center portion of the site has offices, a yard, and general storage. Additional observations include:

- The storage area has become a catch all used by many departments and therefore requires significant reorganization
- The front gate is the only means of access from the parking lot, which requires opening the gate to allow staff and visitor access to offices
- Some issues arise with shared outside storage, which could potentially be alleviated by implementing fencing in some areas
- Reorganization of outside storage is needed to make better use of the space for maintenance use

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Minor interior renovations needed to address needs of the department
- Develop site master plan to organize yard and create separation from other departments
- Add a side pedestrian gate to access the office or create a new door to offices from the west parking lot
- Shared warehouse should have rules for all users that provide a more orderly storage of materials
ASSESSMENT

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS

The operation and maintenance of Irving’s parks, recreation, and open spaces is characterized by the immediate need for a larger work force, increased job quality and efficiency, and better distribution of citywide responsibilities. This department in the city is seen as a catch-all for addressing not only maintenance demands but also assisting with special events and setting up holiday decorations.

The primary concern for Irving’s current maintenance staff is the shortage of employees. The existing staff members charged with maintaining current parks and open spaces are overwhelmed, making it difficult to address all the maintenance needs throughout the city. Having a staff that is overloaded has resulted in a slip in quality of work, and future plans to develop more park and trail space will perpetuate the strain on staff.

Additionally, the small number of existing staff is required to travel across the city to reach the parks and open spaces for which they are responsible. The amount of time spent traveling throughout the day significantly affects staff’s ability to efficiently address all maintenance needs.

Overall, Irving’s maintenance staff has been mainly focused on being reactive to operational issues, and due to inadequate staffing the team is unable to be more proactive. Skilled workers are not being tasked with jobs that would best use their abilities, instead these individuals are needed to help with more unskilled work to keep up with citywide demand.

STAFFING LEVELS

Through a review of staffing levels for the time period from 2008-2019, several key findings are evident:

- Irving’s population has experienced a 21.3% increase
- The Parks and Recreation Department has seen a 7.9% decrease in staffing
- The ratio of population per park maintenance staff has decreased from 2008-2019. The 2008 ratio was 1 staff per 2,295 residents and the 2019 ratio is 1 staff per 3,025 residents

Between 2006 and 2014 the Parks Department completed projects that totaled to approximately $38,000,000; this includes the two newest aquatic centers at Cimarron Park and West Irving and an expansion of the Lively Pointe Youth Center.
**Figure 6.1** depicts the gap between capital improvement projects which have increased over time and maintenance funds which have virtually remained the same.

The growth in parks, trails and open spaces in Irving, without parallel staff support, has resulted in strain on the understaffed Parks and Recreation Department. This apparent LOS shortage is supported by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) data that state the average parks and recreation agency has 8.3 full-time employees (FTE) for every 10,000 residents. Irving currently has a ratio of 5.8 FTE per 10,000 residents, significantly less than the NRPA stated average.

This low staffing LOS will continue to have a detrimental impact on the quality of maintenance of facilities, parks, and trails. Several corrective actions that would address this issue include:

- Outsourcing the majority of mowing responsibilities to allow skilled staff to focus on jobs that require their expertise
- Increase staff as needed
- Discuss the potential impact on staff needs when planning for improvements in the park system, and make budget adjustments accordingly
- Review organization structure to identify areas of unique need, for example establishing a Special Event Division to alleviate current staff being pulled from routine duties to assist with various events
- Review travel time from service center to work zones to determine if existing procedures and geographical locations of work can become more efficient for staff time
- Provide training and advancement opportunities for staff
- Cross train staff to enable the department to respond more efficiently during times of peak demand
- Employ seasonal workers dedicated to specific tasks that currently overwhelm available staff and their regular responsibilities
STRATEGIES

Strategies for building upon past recognition of an excellent park system and steps to return Irving to that standard is centered around four key maintenance elements:

- Staffing
- Physical improvements
- Integration of automation
- Alignment of operations budget with capital improvements

STAFFING

The number of staff has remained almost constant over the preceding 10 years while Irving’s population and number of park amenities has increased. The city’s population, since 2008, has grown approximately 21.3% and there has been approximately $38,000,000 spent in new and renovated park improvements. This has placed a demand for more man-hours from existing park staff.

These circumstances are compounded by the fact that many of the built facilities are reaching the end of their useful life and require a maintenance level above what new facilities require.

Many of the recommendations for facilities in this master plan are a product of deferred maintenance, which in some cases is potentially reducing the life span of some facilities if not addressed. The deferred maintenance needs in the Comprehensive Plan was noted as $8.8 million in 2017. This number has increased since that time. Additional strategies include:

- Develop cross trained staff to strengthen the department’s forestry division, irrigation team, aquatics maintenance, and administrative services
- Increase the number of acres where mowing and maintenance can be outsourced, including neighborhood parks, remote locations and City properties; allowing for the re-allocation of some existing employees
- Develop staffing opportunities for specialized services: section chief-irrigation, crew leader-irrigation, urban forester, aquatics mechanic, groundskeepers - horticulture, and administrative assistant
PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS

- Relocate Fritz Park Facility with new yard and new building
- Allocate funds to organize and increase efficiency of the Las Colinas Service Center, including both interior and exterior improvements

AUTOMATION INTEGRATION

Adopt new standards for increasing technology automation in park system operations. Take advantage of current automation available and adopt a policy of exploring new opportunities as they develop.

Current automation practices on the market to consider incorporating in Irving include:

- **Irrigation Central Control Systems**: Replace outdated lines and operating system with new automated systems that provide 24/7 flow monitoring. This will save water and man hours that can be allocated in other areas of parks.
- **Payroll System**: Adopt a payroll system that integrates with the City system. The current system requires extensive man hour effort which takes away staff from performing their normal duties each time staff pay is required. It also provides easier reporting, budgeting, and audit control.
- **Lighting**: Currently the City is utilizing new controls for lighting on a year to year basis within each year’s budget. The City should explore how this could be accelerated and accomplished on a system-wide basis. This could be more cost effective and allow staff to be assigned to other tasks. Additionally, the City should consider Control-Link technology, which provides facility safety through improved sports/security lighting and remote monitoring.
- **Security**: The cost of security cameras has been greatly reduced over time and the City may want to develop a master plan for security cameras system-wide. This would allow for improved monitoring of facilities as well as act as a deterrent to suspicious activity. This includes facilities, parks, trails, and fields.

OPERATIONS BUDGET/CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ALIGNMENT

A recommended strategy to provide sufficient man hours for maintaining park and facility improvements would be to align additional man hours required with new improvements being discussed. This would provide an agreed upon basis for accurate budgeting adjustments when these improvements were completed. As shown in the Implementation Chapter, each recommended improvement factors in a 2-4% maintenance cost per year to account for maintaining improvements over time.
IMPLEMENTATION

- ACTION PLAN
- FUNDING SOURCES
- TPWD MASTER PLAN COMPLIANCE & CAPRA ACCREDITATION
INTRODUCTION

The recommendations provided in this master plan are intended to be realized over a period of 25 years. This chapter outlines the recommendations discussed in previous chapters, designates priorities of action items, and reviews potential funding sources. This chapter represents an implementation plan meant to serve as a framework for taking next steps for future budgeting, capital expenditures, and bond programs.
ACTION PLAN

The action plan is structured into three timeframes, or phases: short-term, medium-term, and long-term.

Short-term action items are intended to be pursued in the first five years and represent immediate needs or are relatively easy to implement.

Medium-term action items should be addressed within 6-10 years and represent actions that are more complex or expensive to implement.

Long-term action items are focused beyond year 10 of the plan and will likely be reviewed during the next master plan update before implementation.

The actions identified in this plan are categorized into the following types:

**Land Acquisition:** Land to be purchased or dedicated for use as parkland.

**Master Plans/Consultant Studies:** Follow up studies on specific issues or areas of the City to determine the most appropriate solution.

**Park Development and Improvement:** Recommendations to develop parkland and to make improvements to existing park infrastructure.

**Recreation and Aquatic Facilities:** Recommendations to develop recreation and aquatic facilities and to make improvements to existing infrastructure.

**Trails and Bikeways:** Recommendations for design and construction of trail and bikeway infrastructure.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Policies are official procedures used to guide City decisions. Key policy actions that should be initiated as a result of this master plan include the following:

**Contract mowing:** As discussed in the Operations and Maintenance chapter, a significant amount of labor goes into mowing all of the parks and other City properties. Many other communities contract mowing services to an external company so City maintenance workers can focus on maintaining parks and facilities. This would also allow the maintenance division workers to focus on tasks that are more suited to their skill levels.

**Expand Special Events and Marketing Staffing:** Current Parks and Recreation staff often are requested to help with set up, staffing, tear down, and marketing for special events. Since there is no dedicated division for these elements, staff is pulled away from their normal duties. Moving forward, efforts should be made to expand the number of staff focused on special events and marketing, perhaps even considering a separate division in the future if the need grows.

**Parkland dedication ordinance:** A parkland dedication ordinance requires either land or a fee for park development from developers. Irving does not currently have this type of ordinance in place, but as more redevelopment occurs within the city, it will be critical to have such an ordinance in place to meet park needs as the population continues to grow.

**Review of program fees:** Another policy action is to review the fees associated with parks and recreation programs (recreation center memberships, classes, pool fees, rental reservations, etc.). While it is not expected that the City would recover all costs from user fees, Irving should assess fees compared to similar communities in the region that offer similar programs.
HIGH PRIORITY NEEDS

The following list represents high-priority needs for the City to implement in the first 1-5 years. These items are not listed in any particular order.

Park improvements to Oak Meadows, Lanotte, and Keeler Parks: These three neighborhood parks have concepts and cost estimates already prepared and should be prioritized for design and construction of park improvements.

Master Development Plan & Design for Senter, Senter East, and Fritz Parks: These three parks in the southern part of Irving serve as a green linkage from the civic center down to the preserve on the city’s southern border. There is a lot of potential to make these parks a signature amenity for the community, which a master development plan will identify.

Southwest Park Master Development Plan: This plan should identify outdoor recreational amenities for this park, such as fitness stations, futsal courts, updated playground, and covered basketball.

Irving Soccer Complex Master Development Plan: As identified in the special review parks discussion, there are several limitations preventing this site from being a premier destination for tournaments. An updated master development plan would assess lighting, parking, shade, and building improvements.

Thomas Jefferson Park Master Development Plan: Using the framework from the special review parks discussion, conduct a master plan for this heavily used park in the northern part of the city. A hydrology assessment may be needed as part of this study.

Acquire land for a community park near SH 161 between Northgate and Rochelle & conduct a master plan: The airport mitigation property could be utilized for cricket fields to meet a growing demand in Irving.

Implement new entry monument signage at parks: Design and construct new entry monuments to enhance existing parks and ensure consistency of entry signage throughout the park system.

Develop a comprehensive recreation & aquatics feasibility program: Using the framework in the master plan as a guide, this program would provide a comprehensive assessment of the trade-offs related to the future of the recreation and aquatic facilities, including assessing the feasibility of introducing multi-generational centers in Irving.

Recreation center near-term improvements: This represents the near-term improvements outlined in Chapter 5 for existing recreation centers.

Replace pools at Lively and Senter with more modern aquatic amenities: These two traditional outdoor pools require significant repairs and would benefit from being replaced with more modern amenities. Engagement from the surrounding community will be important to determine the best amenity for each site.

Finish promenade around Lake Carolyn: The boardwalk promenade in Las Colinas surrounding Lake Carolyn is heavily-used by residents, employees, and visitors alike. There is a small gap near the Convention Center on the northern side of Lake Carolyn that should be prioritized for construction to complete the loop and be coordinated as development in that area occurs.

Design & Construct Delaware Creek trail from Centennial Park to Lively Park: Continue the Delaware Creek Trail north to Lively Park to connect more parks and facilities along this linear greenbelt.

Conduct a Trails and Bikeways Master Plan: This plan should identify, assess, and prioritize trail and bikeway corridors to be ready to move to funding and implementation.
## 1 TO 5 YEAR ACTION PLAN (SHORT-TERM)

The action plan for the initial five years of the plan includes land acquisition, near-term planning and feasibility studies, park and facility improvements, and trail design and construction. *Table 7.1* on pages 158-161 represents the short-term action plan.

### Table 7.1 – 1 to 5 Year Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Community Park (DFW Airport Mitigation Land near SH 161 between Northgate &amp; Rochelle) 1.5 Acres</td>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Las Colinas Urban Park 3 Acres</td>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Land Acquisition: 1-5 Years (18 Acres)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plans/Consultant Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Aquatics Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Trails &amp; Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Community Park Master Plan &amp; Design (DFW Airport mitigation land)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Senter, Senter East, Fritz Park Master Plan Development</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson Park Master Plan (includes H&amp;H assessment &amp; survey)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Irving Soccer Complex Master Plan Development (includes survey, building evaluation)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Southwest Park Master Development Plan (includes survey)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Master Plan/Consultant Studies: 1-5 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$810,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$810,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.1 – 1 to 5 Year Action Plan (Continued)

#### 1 to 5 Year Priority Actions & Associated Estimates of Probable Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Special Park Review Short-Term Improvements (Towne Lake Park)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>Special Review Park Short-Term Improvements (Mustang, Lee, Northwest Parks)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Special Review Park Short-Term Improvements (Mountain Creek Preserve)</td>
<td>Greenbelt Park</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Lanotte Park Improvements (includes site demo, grading drainage)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Oak Meadows Park Improvements (includes site demo, grading/drainage)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Keeler Park Improvements (includes site demo, grading/drainage)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Community Park Development (DFW Airport mitigation land)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>New Park Entry Signage - Phase 1 ($5,000 - $10,000 per entry sign)</td>
<td>All Parks</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$12,230,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,730,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance budget for park development and improvement - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10% $1,223,000

**Subtotal Park Development and Improvement: 1 to 5 Years** $13,453,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Cimarron Park Rec Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Northwest Park Rec Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Lee Park Rec Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Georgia Farrow Rec Center (doesn’t include current renovation)</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Senter Park Rec Center (doesn’t include current renovation)</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Heritage Senior Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Lively Pointe Youth Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,200,000</td>
<td>$18,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance budget for recreation facilities and aquatic centers - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%

$1,820,000

Subtotal Recreation Facilities and Aquatic Centers: 1 to 5 Years $20,020,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Delaware Creek Trail from Centennial to Lively Park (0.75 miles)</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>General fund, CIP, Bonds, 70/30 matching TA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Complete Promenade along Lake Carolyn</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>General fund, CIP, Bonds, 70/30 matching TA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>Construct 2 miles of trail (easement, design, construction)</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$9000,000</td>
<td>General fund, CIP, Bonds, 70/30 matching TA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,850,000</td>
<td>$1,755,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance budget for recreation facilities and aquatic centers - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%

$585,000

Subtotal Trails and Bikeways: 1 to 5 years $6,435,000
### Table 7.1 – 1 to 5 Year Action Plan (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Associated Estimates of Probable Cost for Short-Term (1-5 years) Actions</th>
<th>Estimated 2019 Dollars</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acquisition (18 acres)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Master Plan/Consultant Studies</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Park Development and Improvement</td>
<td>$13,453,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Recreation &amp; Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>$20,020,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td>$6,435,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Costs (2019 Dollars)</td>
<td>$42,218,000</td>
<td>$30,995,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Costs shown are 2019 values at a pre-design level, and will vary as more detailed design occurs. List is for guidance in planning, and not all items may be implemented. Land costs taken from DCAD where available or estimated at an average of $50,000 per acre for land not in the floodplain and $25,000 per acre for land in the floodplain at an estimated 2019 value. Land costs shown are general estimates intended to establish allowances and will vary. Grants, donations and park land dedication may reduce the cost of each item significantly. Trails and Bikeway costs include planning level estimates for construction and design (20% of total construction costs).
### 6 TO 10 YEAR ACTION PLAN (MEDIUM-TERM)

The action plan for years 6-10 include acquiring approximately 30 acres of land, additional planning and design studies, park improvements, a new multi-generational recreation facility, and trail design and construction. Table 7.2 on pages 162-165 represents the medium-term action plan.

**Table 7.2 – 6 to 10 Year Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Neighborhood Parks (2) - see Proposed Parkland Map 10 Acres</td>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Community Park - near SH 161 and Las Colinas Boulevard 15 Acres</td>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program, TIF Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Expansion to existing parks (Fritz, Lee, Mustang) 5 Acres</td>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Land Acquisition: 6-10 Years (30 Acres)** $750,000 $750,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Las Colinas Urban Park Master Plan &amp; Design</td>
<td>Urban Center Park</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Civic Center Park Improvements Master Plan &amp; Design</td>
<td>Urban Center Park</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park Design (2)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Lively Park Master Development Plan</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Master Plan/Consultant Studies: 6-10 Years** $485,000 $485,000
## Table 7.2 – 6 to 10 Year Action Plan (Continued)

### 6 to 10 Year Priority Actions & Associated Estimates of Probable Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Special Review Park Mid-Term Improvements (Towne Lake Park)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Special Review Park Mid-Term Improvements (Mustang, Lee Northwest Parks)</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Special Review Park Mid-Term Improvements (Mountain Creek Preserve)</td>
<td>Greenbelt Park</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Senter, Senter East, Fritz Improvements</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson Park Improvements</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Irving Soccer Complex Improvements</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Southwest Park Improvements</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Lively Park Improvements</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$915,000</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>Las Colinas Urban Park</td>
<td>Urban Center Park</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>New Park Entry Signage - Phase 2</td>
<td>All Parks</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$28,290,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,790,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance budget for park development and improvement - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%

**Subtotal Park Development and Improvement: 6-10 Years** $31,119,000
### 6 to 10 Year Priority Actions & Associated Estimates of Probable Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Aquatic Facilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multi-Generational Center in North Irving (70,000-80,000 SF)</strong></td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bond Program, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td><strong>Construct 2 miles of trail (easement, design, construction)</strong></td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, 70/30 matching, TA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance budget for recreation facilities and aquatic centers - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%

Subtotal Recreation Facilities and Aquatic Centers: 6-10 Years $44,000,000

Subtotal Trails and Bikeways: 6-10 Years $3,300,000
### Table 7.2 – 6 to 10 Year Action Plan (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Associated Estimates of Probable Cost for Short-Term (6-10 years) Actions</th>
<th>Estimated 2019 Dollars</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acquisition (30 acres)</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Master Plan/Consultant Studies</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Park Development and Improvement</td>
<td>$31,119,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Recreation &amp; Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Costs (2019 Dollars)</td>
<td>$84,934,000</td>
<td>$61,225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Costs shown are 2019 values at a pre-design level, and will vary as more detailed design occurs. List is for guidance in planning, and not all items may be implemented. Land costs taken from DCAD where available or estimated at an average of $50,000 per acre for land not in the floodplain and $25,000 per acre for land in the floodplain at an estimated 2019 value. Land costs shown are general estimates intended to establish allowances and will vary. Grants, donations, and park land dedication may reduce the cost of each item significantly. Trail and Bikeway costs include planning level estimates for construction and design (20% of total construction costs).
11 TO 25 YEAR ACTION PLAN (LONG-TERM)

The long-term action plan includes an update to the parks and trail master plan, significant park development, development of additional destination recreation and aquatic facilities, and trail design and construction. It is important to note that a full update to this parks and recreation master plan is likely to occur in this time period so these actions may change depending on future circumstances. Table 7.3 on pages 166-167 represents the long-term action plan.

Table 7.3 – 11-25 Year Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plans/Consultant Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Years</td>
<td>Parks and Trails Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Master Plans/Consultant Studies: 11-25 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$400,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$400,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Development and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Years</td>
<td>Civic Center Park Improvements</td>
<td>Urban Center Park</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Years</td>
<td>Neighborhood Parks - 2 (see proposed Parkland Map)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Years</td>
<td>Community Park Development</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance budget for park development and improvements - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Park Development and Improvement: 11-25 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,700,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.3 – 11-25 Year Action Plan (Continued)

#### 11 to 25 Year Priority Actions & Associated Estimates of Probable Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2019)</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
<th>Major Sources of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational and Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>Multi-Generational Center in South Irving (60,000-70,000 SF)</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>Joint Recreation Center/Library in Las Colinas Urban Center</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, TPWD grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance budget for recreation facilities and aquatic centers - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Park Development and Improvement: 11-25 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>Construct 5 miles of trail (easement, design, construction)</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>General Fund, CIP, Bonds, 70/30 matching, TA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance budget for trails and bikeways - calculated at 2-4% per year of development cost; rounded to 2% per year for 5 years = 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Trails and Bikeways: 11-25 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Associated Estimates of Probable Cost for Short-Term (11-25 years) Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated 2019 Dollars</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Master Plan/Consultant Studies</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Park Development and Improvement</td>
<td>$7,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Recreation &amp; Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>$66,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td>$8,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Costs (2019 Dollars)</td>
<td>$82,350,000</td>
<td>$53,150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Cost shown are 2019 values at a pre-design level, and will vary as more detailed design occurs. List for guidance in planning, and not all items may be implemented. Land costs taken from DCAD where available or estimated at an average of $50,000 per acre for land not in the floodplain and $25,000 acres in the floodplain at an estimated 2019 value. Land costs shown are general estimates intended to establish allowances and will vary. Grants, donations, and park land dedication may reduce the cost of each item significantly. Trail and Bikeway costs include planning level estimates to construction and design (20% of total construction costs).
Table 7.4 – Summary of All Costs for Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Associated Estimates of Probable Costs for All Actions</th>
<th>Estimated 2019 Dollars</th>
<th>City Assumed Cost (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acquisition (48 acres)</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Master Plan/Consultant Studies</td>
<td>$1,695,000</td>
<td>$1,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Park Development and Improvement</td>
<td>$52,272,000</td>
<td>$39,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Recreation &amp; Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>$130,020,000</td>
<td>$93,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associated Costs: Trails and Bikeways</td>
<td>$17,985,000</td>
<td>$4,905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Costs (2019 Dollars)</td>
<td>$204,222,000</td>
<td>$140,585,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Cost shown are 2019 values at pre-design level, and will vary as more detailed design occurs. List is for guidance planning, and not all items may be implemented. Land costs are estimated at an average of $50,000 per acre for land not in floodplain and $25,000 per acre for land in the floodplain at an estimated 2019 value. Land costs shown are general estimate intended to establish allowances and will vary. Trail and Bikeway costs include planning level estimates for construction and design (20% of total construction costs).
FUNDING SOURCES

There are a diverse number of funding sources that can be utilized to realize the plan recommendations. This section details typical City-generated funding sources, state and federal funding sources, and additional opportunities, such as establishing shared-use agreements and partnerships.

CITY-GENERATED FUNDING SOURCES

General Fund Expenditures are primarily used for improvements or repairs to existing parks and facilities. Typical general fund expenditures are for smaller repairs and replacement efforts.

Bond Funds are primarily targeted for new facilities. The City of Irving has had success with bond programs in the past and this implementation action plan should be used to help guide capital projects in the future.

Parkland Dedication Ordinance is a type of ordinance a City can enact to impose a fee on developers when a new development is built to pay for developing or improving parks. Depending on the structure of the ordinance, the City can require land to be dedicated for parks, cash in lieu of land for park development, or park development fees.

Electric Utility Partnerships can be established for utility easement trails. This partnership typically does not involve monetary contributions. However, it does include use agreements for easements held by utility companies.

Park Donations Funds can be used for applicable projects, equipment, and general facility improvements.

Tree Mitigation Funds are fines that a City levies against developers for removing quality trees for development. The revenue generated is used to plant trees and to irrigate City properties.

STATE FUNDING SOURCES

TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT (TPWD) funds the follow grants:

Outdoor Recreation Grants provide 50% matching grant funds to cities, counties, Municipal Utility Districts (MUDs), and other special districts with a population less than 500,000 to acquire and develop parkland or to renovate existing public recreation areas. There are two funding cycles per year with a maximum award of $500,000. Projects must be completed with three years of approval. Application deadlines are October 1st of each year (the master plans submission deadline is 60 days prior to application deadline). Award notifications occur six months after deadlines.

Indoor Recreation (Facility) Grants provide 50% matching grant funds to municipalities, counties, MUDs and other local units of government with a population less than 500,000 to construct recreation centers, nature centers, and other facilities (buildings). The grant maximum is $750,000 per application. The application deadline is October 1st of each year (with master plan submission deadline 60 days prior to application deadline). Award notification occurs the following January.

Community Outdoor Outreach Program Grants provide funding to local governments and non-profit organizations for programming that introduces under-served populations to environmental and conservation programs as well as TPWD mission-oriented outdoor activities. This is not a land acquisition or construction grant; this is only for programs. Grants are awarded to non-profit organizations, schools, municipalities, counties, cities, and other tax-exempt groups. Minimum grant requests are $5,000 and maximum grant requests are $50,000. The application deadline is February 1st each year.

Recreational Trail Grants are administered by TPWD in Texas under the approval of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The grants can be up to 80% of project cost with a maximum of $200,000 for non-motorized trail grants. Funds can be spent on both motorized and non-motorized recreational trail projects such as the construction of new recreational trails, improvements to existing trails, development of trailheads or trailside facilities, and acquisition of trail corridors. Application deadline is February 1st each year.
FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

**National Park Service (NPS) Programs** include the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act (UPARR), which provides funds for parks and recreation. Congress appropriates both funds. Typically, the funding sources have supported traditional parks rather than linear systems. From 1965 to 2014, LWCF has provided more than $4.1 billion as grants to state and local governments.

**Transportation Alternatives Program & Safe Routes to School Program**
The Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA Set-Aside) Program was authorized under Section 1109 of Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) and provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives. NCTCOG is sub-allocated program funds to award to cities in the Dallas-Fort Worth region. General types of projects eligible under this program include on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure associated with Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects that will substantially improve safety and the ability for students to walk and bicycle to school.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)**
CMAQ funds are lump sum, state-apportioned funds available through the FHWA as a continuing program under the FAST Act. CMAQ funding availability is a proportion of the overall apportionment for each state. CMAQ funds are meant to assist in funding projects that improve air quality and relieve congestion. Eligible projects are likely to contribute to the attainment of air quality standards and reduce air pollution, and the projects must be included in an MPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). CMAQ funds may be used on, but not limited to, the following transportation improvements: bicycle lanes, separated bicycle lanes, sidewalks, shared use paths, and signage. In Texas, CMAQ funds are included within TxDOT’s Category 5 funding.

OTHER FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Organizations and shared-use agreements are other funding opportunities that have proven successful in many communities. Organizations that could be utilized to partner for funding opportunities include:

- Adopt a Park
- Friends Groups
- Service Groups
- Business Sponsorship Opportunities
- Youth Service Providers

Given the concentration of large corporations in Irving, particular consideration should be given to corporate sponsorship opportunities.

Irving currently has agreements in place with other entities, including the Las Colinas Management Association and North Lake College, to provide park and recreation services. Other potential partnerships include:

- **Joint Programs:** Jointly planned programs executed by two or more entities (i.e., wellness activities with local hospitals or special events with the Chamber of Commerce).
- **Social Issue Action:** Opportunity for entities to partner to take on a critical or important social issue.
- **Joint Facility Usage:** Agreement to share facilities, often with school districts or other recreation providers.
- **Inter-City Partnerships:** Opportunities exist to partner with surrounding cities to pursue joint-use park and recreation facilities.
CONCLUSION

The master planning process is a critical exercise for parks and recreation departments to undergo every 5-10 years. The previous master plan in Irving hadn’t been updated since 2000, so a lot of improvements and decisions were made in isolation instead of considering the system-wide impacts.

This updated master plan will now serve as a guide for future budgetary, programming, and capital expenditure decisions for the entire parks and recreation system in Irving. It is recommended that a minor update occur in five years and a full update occur in 10 years to provide a comprehensive assessment of needs at that time.

The vision of Centers, Corridors, Connections, Community and Celebration can only be achieved with buy-in from citizens, numerous departments across the City, elected and appointed officials, and the development community. The recommendations outlined in this master plan should serve as blueprint to achieve that overall vision.
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Fritz Park is an 88-acre park located in the Southeast Planning District, and is bounded by Shady Grove Road to the north, Senter Road to the west, Oakdale Road to the south, and Maple Street and Mayo Street to the east. Fritz Park is a large community park rich with amenities at the heart of a mature residential area, but is also a central piece of a larger network of city park spaces. Fritz Park offers the opportunity to function as the linkage or pivot to connect Senter Park, Centennial Park, Millennium Park, Veterans Memorial Park and City Hall to the north, with The Irving Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) conducted internal design studies for the park in 1992 and again in 2001, but these did not lead to wide-scale improvements or changes to the park. Now there is renewed interest in developing Fritz Park to a new level of function and amenity, and there are numerous opportunities to bring the existing park to its full potential.

Fritz has a highly pastoral character distinguished by its rolling topography balanced by the centralized stream channel and interesting lines of sight through and around mature tree groupings.

The open areas have a meadow-like character and offer distinct opportunities for differing planting treatments to achieve a range of aesthetic and environmental goals from stream buffering to wildflower meadows and pollinator habitat.

A key strength of the park is the number of existing neighborhood connections, with additional opportunities for formal entrances at Senter Road, Shady Grove Road, Mayo Street and King Lane, and along Maple Street. The City has expressed concerns in the past related to these access points, particularly on the issue of congested vehicular circulation into the park. There is a wealth of research and case studies that confirm the benefits of increasing rather than limiting park access. This is especially true in how improved neighborhood connectivity and walkability correlates directly with increased park usage, which in turn is inextricably linked to community support for ongoing maintenance and development of the City park system generally.
Delaware Creek serves a crucial function in managing and directing heavy stormwater flows, and significant effort and investment has been made to harden and constrain the channel. Irving’s Flood Control Division is gearing up for additional improvements to the Delaware Creek channel to handle larger volumes of water. Currently, expansion of Delaware Creek trails is underway to tie directly to the downtown area.

Vehicle parking is limited to lots on the western side and northern end of the park. This constraint limits some of the programming potential at the park. Existing programmed facilities and fixtures include a gazebo, two baseball fields, two basketball courts, a disc golf course, playgrounds, a small event facility, shelters and shaded picnic areas, narrow but ADA-accessible walking trails, and open lawn areas. The City has administrative and greenhouse facilities on the western side of the park, as well as a system-wide maintenance facility for the department. An area of Fritz Park off Willow Oak Drive is designated as “Safety Town,” providing educational benefits for young children in a simulated town setting, and an adjacent area is allocated for a petting farm. Park lighting is adequate, with a range of fixture heights and configurations.

Figure A.1 – Fritz Park Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

Fritz Park has several placemaking opportunities that would begin to encourage lasting impact for the park. Overall, the park should be preserved in its entirety as a valuable community asset with rehabilitation and renovation of key features.

A primary opportunity includes providing additional parking on-site. Limited parking translates into limited ability to let the park grow in popularity. The PARD has identified a few options to address this parking shortage. First, remove and relocate both the maintenance facilities and the greenhouse facilities which occupy one of the main entrances into the Fritz Park. Second, designate an additional parking lot on the parcel between Senter Road and Shady Grove Road where visitors can park and be provided with ADA access to the interior of Fritz Park. Special consideration would be in place to allow for materials that would be suitable to address stormwater runoff. A special event shuttle could also be provided to or from this location. A third option to provide additional parking is to allow for parallel parking bays along East Oakdale Road and Senter Road that would create safe spaces for access and egress while not disrupting traffic flow.

Safety concerns at Fritz Park could be addressed by improving safety barriers near rocky and steep slopes in the Delaware Creek canal. Signage improvement in design and placement would provide more information to park users about exactly where to use the most precaution.

Minimizing interior vehicle conflicts could be managed through developing an interior circulation plan that separates pedestrian and bike traffic and perhaps limits the number of vehicle entrances into the park. Rehabilitate or redesign the inoperable water feature in the park would assist in creating a hazard free zone. Concrete slabs and exposed utilities could be removed or relocated for visual benefit, and to avoid hazards.

Additional restrooms, seating, shade trees, water fountains, and wayfinding signage are needed. The very popular Safety Town could have additional amenities placed within the area to accommodate young children, and the modular equipment could be modified to reflect contemporary trends. Fritz Park is an attractive park and that could further be enhanced by featuring public art by local artists.

Earlier plans called for more passive space at Fritz Park, sand volleyball courts and additional parking in the southeastern portion of the park off Oakdale Road. A public performance space or amphitheater, perhaps extending along or tied visually to the banks of Delaware Creek, is a favorite wish-list item with local users. An opportunity for a master planned Fritz Park with community buy-in would streamline the process to gain consensus on a range of “big idea” improvements. Pockets of green space exist at Fritz Park and could be used to create additional multi-use fields for tots and younger populations in general if neighboring homeowners agree to location, hours of operation, and their safety concerns are addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITIES MATRIX</th>
<th>Adequate Parking</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</th>
<th>Safety Hazards</th>
<th>Adequate Shade Trees</th>
<th>Adequate Seating</th>
<th>Adequate Foot Bridge</th>
<th>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</th>
<th>ADA Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green = Good/Fair Condition
Orange = Fair/Poor Condition
Red = Poor Condition
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Conduct a detailed Parks Master Plan that would unify a community-endorsed vision on the interior design of Fritz Park
- Following the determination of the proposed Master Plan, design scenic entrances to encourage/redirect heavier use at some locations (i.e., bike/ped encouraged to use one entrance and automobiles, maintenance trucks/other are encouraged to use different entrances)
- Add more strategic seating around park (including disc golf area)
- Resurface parking lots
- Add bike racks
- Further evaluate converting parkland off Shady Grove Road and Senter Road to parking or practice fields (currently undeveloped)
- Rehabilitate non-functional water feature along Delaware Creek
- Consider public art throughout the site (especially near playground and picnic area)
- Wayfinding signage (interior and exterior) and replace/relocate confusing signage on site
- Add protective barrier fencing near widest point of Delaware Creek (steep drop)
- Incorporate environmental education signage into the design
- Design exercise program route from Fritz leading and linking to Senter Park and back
- Identify alternative site to relocate park maintenance facility
- Add more restrooms and water fountains
- Ensure ADA access to/from activity areas and at creek crossings to expand access
- Uniform distribution of lighting on practice fields and in proximity to play areas and creek crossings
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Re-engineer stream channel at narrowest point to reduce concrete slabs and rocks and limit hazardous access
- Allow for continuous sidewalks around the entire perimeter of the park
- Consider select adjacent/adjointing property acquisition to unify park structure
- Develop flexible overflow parking areas linked with an expanded trail system
- Reconfigure and modernize playgrounds
- Add larger pavilions
- Design and construct an amphitheater
- Modernize Safety Town
- Add technology (Wi-Fi) to the park
- Improve creek crossing pedestrian bridges to ensure increased safety and ADA access and scenic benefit to the park
- Consider relocating trees if necessary to provide for more shaded gathering spaces
- Convert parkland off Shady Grove Road and Senter Road to parking or practice fields

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $3,000,000 - $3,500,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $2,000,000 - $2,500,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
Irving Soccer Complex is located in the Northwest Planning District, just minutes from DFW Airport. It sits on a 29.8-acre parcel, and was developed as a result of the 1999 bond program. The soccer complex has 21 operating soccer fields and is accessible from World Cup Way, a local street west of Belt Line Road.

The Irving Soccer Complex is observed to have maximized the space for as many fields as can operate in the space without minimizing parking and other on-site uses related to concessions, ticket sales, seating, storage, and maintenance areas. Two parking lots exist on the south side and the east side of the complex, respectively. The parking lots are designed in a rectangular configuration to maximize the number of spaces at the perimeter of the facility. Belt Line Road is east of the facility, single family residential is on the south side of the facility (along with some industrial) and industrial and heavy commercial use are on west side and floodplain and parkland (W.O Harrington Park) are located north of the site.

Of note is that the complex has just one entrance, which City fire and rescue have recommended needs to be addressed. On the site there are metal bleachers for spectator seating (unshaded), numerous pedestrian access points into the soccer complex area from the parking lots, assorted signage posted at the gate entrance on World Cup Way, and buildings that house maintenance equipment, concessions, restrooms, and ticketing are in need of repair due to structural damage caused by building materials interfacing with the unsteady clay-based soil that is common in Irving.
There is a small covered playground next to the complex buildings for young children which is in good condition. Picnic tables and bench seating are located underneath an overhang stemming from the complex building. In addition, evenly spaced trees, picnic tables and benches are located around the perimeter of soccer field playing areas next to the parking lots.

For safety reasons as well as enhancing park linkages, a placemaking enhancement would include a vehicle bridge (barrier separated for pedestrians) that would allow for emergency access to and from the Irving Soccer Complex, in addition to providing a park linkage between the complex and W.O. Harrington Park. Though it might be monetarily expensive it would offer a link that would likely increase park usage at W.O. Harrington Park.

Figure A.2 – Irving Soccer Complex Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

The Irving Soccer Complex is widely seen as a key area of opportunity. Outdoor soccer fields are limited within the City of Irving, and the public indicated that they enjoy the venue but would like to have a better visitor experience. These goals could be accomplished by adding lighting to the facility to extend the playtime, particularly during regional tournaments. Other methods to improve the visitor experience include adding shade and circulation over the metal spectator seating areas. The public commented that they would like to see improved buildings, updated and additional restrooms, more water fountains, and overflow parking options at the site.

Field observations concluded that the site could also be improved by adding Wi-Fi technology throughout the soccer complex, providing eco-friendly bathroom options near the parking lots, and adding some playground equipment or outdoor exercise equipment. The opportunity to provide a gateway into the complex is recommended. Removal and replacement of signage that is uniform in style and messaging will support establishing the gateway.

A PARD recommendation for this site includes allotting space for an interior pedestrian loop trail around this facility which would allow for exercise opportunities during and between the soccer events.
## AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green = Good/Fair Condition
Orange = Fair/Poor Condition
Red = Poor Condition*
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

• Provide shade and circulation for spectator seating on soccer fields
• Add more shade trees at perimeter and near plaza area
• Add Wi-Fi technology on-site
• Add more lighting for evening play and establish lighting schedule with DFW Airport and neighboring community
• Additional water fountains needed
• Reconstruct complex entrance into gateway and improve signage
• Improve wayfinding signage outside of the facility
• Identify permanent solution for overflow parking
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Replace on-site buildings
- Provide modernized eco-friendly bathrooms
- Design a formal trail around the perimeter of complex with fitness stations installed
- Add barrier separated vehicle entrance/exit from W.O. Harrington Park to north parking lot, or possible elevated pedestrian bridge with enlarged parking lot at W.O. Harrington Park. View W.O. Harrington as an extension of the soccer complex with monitored access and egress

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $1,750,000 - $2,000,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $1,500,000 - $2,000,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
KEELEER PARK
520 S. Rogers Road
Established 1949
4.29 Acres

DESCRIPTION
Keeler Park is a neighborhood park located in the Southwest Planning District of Irving. At 4.29 acres with very few amenities, this park represents an area where the community could be actively involved in the future design. Neighborhood parks are characterized by easy pedestrian access, community cohesion with some leisure activities, interspersed with moderate recreation. The existing park was previously the site of single family housing as indicated by evidence of old driveway access off of 6th Street, and specific placement of existing trees on the parcel. The north side of Keeler Park is along a narrow concrete and brick drainage channel that backs up to a residential neighborhood, the west side of the park is along Rogers Road, the south side is along 6th Street, and the east side of the park is behind the Kroger grocery store and parking lot. The park boundaries do not extend to the southeast and southwest corners of the parcel due to existing land owners who maintain a single family home, and fire safety equipment shop on the southeast and southwest corners of the parcel respectively.

Vehicle access to the park is provided through a small parking lot off of Rogers Road. Parking is not permitted along the 6th Street side of Keeler Park. Just off the parking lot is a pedestrian path leading to a small pavilion with picnic tables and a grilling area; both are in fairly good condition. Playground equipment is located on the east side of the picnic pavilion with new ground cover. Bench seating is distributed around the pavilion, much of it outside of the shade provided by tree canopy nearby. A few mature trees line the northeast border of the park property separated from the residences by black iron fencing. The remainder of the site is open for future park development and programming. Portions of concrete slabs still occupy grassy areas of the park and some exposed utilities signal that the parcel was used for residential use in the past. Overhead lighting is limited at the park.
Active recreation, noise, and security appear to be concern for the adjacent neighborhood as evidenced by existing signage limiting park usage from dusk to 5AM, prohibiting soccer at the park, and parking on the grass on the 6th Street side. Therefore, solutions for this park should be responsive to this concern.

Figure A.3 - Keeler Park Amenities
PLACEMAKING PARK OPPORTUNITIES

Keeler Park is strategically located in a neighborhood area that lacks public greenspace nearby. Revitalizing and rehabilitating Keeler Park opens up new ideas for community involvement and engagement to shape the future of this park for passive use. Understanding the surrounding community’s desires and reaching consensus at the beginning will help discern where and to focus activities for the highest level of enjoyment. A first step would be to remove evidence of its history as a residential parcel by removing excess concrete from grassy areas and removing the numerous access ramps interspersed through the sidewalk on 6th Street, as well as exposed utilities. As part of the redevelopment of this site, there are opportunities to open up the park spatially by relocating and replanting shade trees on the site.

Opening up the site by engaging in long-term negotiations with the business and residential owners who occupy the southern corners of the property along 6th Street would be an action worth considering if expanding the park boundary is desired and future parking is provided on 6th Street. PARD could engage college students and local park and landscaping designers in a design competition for the site to look at a variety of options for the area while bringing the community together. If the site continues to serve as a passive gathering spot, increasing the size of the picnic facilities and playground area, adding water fountains, and addressing security concerns through implementing CPTED strategies, and adding public art would aid in the placemaking at this park. Many concerns at this signature park could be addressed through improvements that can be implemented in the near term as funds become available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITIES MATRIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green = Good/Fair Condition
Orange = Fair/Poor Condition
Red = Poor Condition
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Begin discussions with adjacent neighborhood about future passive uses of the park
- Engage in community design competition to master plan Keeler Park
- Remove excess concrete from Keeler Park and remove or relocate exposed utilities on the site
- Remove remnants of driveway ramps still existing along the sidewalk on 6th Street
- Investigate green solutions for providing additional buffer between the park and the neighborhood to the north of the site
- Redesign prohibitive signage placed along 6th Street
- Reseed turf in damaged areas

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Implement master plan with CPTED strategies to address blind spots along the east side of the park as well as the northeast corner of the property behind residential area
- Develop quarterly family-centered programming to model the type of activities permitted at the park
- Provide additional safety measures for the drainage channel that would ensure safety for park users and increase visual benefit.
- Seek opportunities to expand park space through acquiring adjacent land along 6th Street

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $400,000 - $450,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $1,250,000 - $1,500,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
LEE PARK
3000 Pamela Drive
Established 1965
8.16 Acres

DESCRIPTION
Lee Park is a 8.16-acre park located in the Central Park Planning District. This park is a cherished park to the adjacent community due to its proximity and accessibility to the neighborhood, the amenities provided on-site in the form of an outdoor community pool and the over 23,500 square foot Lee Recreation Center. The park is bordered by Pamela Avenue and Lee Park Drive on the west side, Anderson Street to the south and has a canal drainage system bordering the north and east sides which lies behind single-family residential homes. This park has a small footprint, but has a high use rate mostly due to the heavily programmed recreation center. A portion of Lee Park extends across the street west of Pamela Drive, and currently is an open space, not currently connected to the main park parcel.

Lee Park has a modest sized outdoor pool, multi-use green space to the west and north of the recreation facility, and two sizable parking lots off of Anderson Street, with a smaller parking lot located off of Lee Park Drive. Plenty of bike racks line the front of the recreation center with landscaped areas which surround a prominent public art piece off of the entrance across from Lee Park Drive.

The site has excellent ADA access in the interior of the park via sidewalks. Some uneven turf exists in the multi-use field area which may be a safety concern. In addition, there are some exposed utilities on the site that could either be hidden or relocated to avoid injury or tampering. There are a few blind spots in the back of the recreation center where additional security monitoring may be needed. Tree cover in the form of shade trees is somewhat limited at this site because the space is reserved for amenities. A small picnic pavilion exists on the property with a small playground area for younger children. Bench seating exists at various locations at Lee Park.
Figure A.5 – Lee Park Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

The Irving PARD is already undertaking several improvements to Lee Park. The improvements are mostly centered around modifying the drainage channel which surrounds the park due to heavy volumes of stormwater which passes through this location, improving lighting around the parking lot, and improving ADA access across the small footbridge which crosses over the canal.

The parcel across the street which is included as part of the park could either be sold or swapped, converted to a mini-dog park, or utilized as a heavily landscaped area with additional public art for the neighborhood residents and park users to enjoy as they approach the park entrance. Seating and shade trees could also be provided for leisurely enjoyment. If opportunities to lease land from the ISD in the vicinity of this park exist for potential programming purposes, PARD should actively pursue that option to expand the capacity of this neighborhood asset.

There are opportunities to improve entryway signs from the street so that they are more prominent to interested visitors. Shade tree canopy is needed at this site to accompany the bench seating that is already present. Some trees were observed to be experiencing drought or dying. Space is limited at this heavily utilized site, but the park could benefit from a larger covered playground area with associated shaded seating, and perhaps additional picnic tables near Lee Park Drive and Anderson Street. PARD may wish to consider constructing an interior loop walking trail in the park after consulting with the heaviest users of the park.

Overall, enjoyment of this park is heightened through preservation of existing programs on the site, and renovation.
## AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grills</th>
<th>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Field</td>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Adequate Foot Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center/Youth Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green = Good/Fair Condition*

*Orange = Fair/Poor Condition*

*Red = Poor Condition*
**RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS**

**SHORT-TERM GOALS**
- Remove/repair/relocate outdoor utilities
- Repair uneven turf
- Enhance/redesign neighborhood footbridge connection over canal for improved ADA access and capacity, safety, and aesthetics
- Improve entrance signage as gateways into the park
- Develop a plan for the disconnected parcel west of Pamela Drive
- Remove, relocate, or plant trees to maximize space, and shading (select appropriate trees for the location which are drought tolerant)
- Re-seed to shade resistant turf where shade trees have prevented turf from growing

*Figure A.6 – Lee Park Land Acquisition Opportunities*
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

• Add playground equipment and additional seating
• Consider “greening” the canal for aesthetic purposes
• Upgrade pool restroom and outdoor water fountain
• Design loop trail after determining if neighborhood favors such a proposal
• Replace aging pool with more modern aquatic amenities

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $550,000 - $600,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $3,000,000 - $3,500,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
“NATURAL SYSTEM RESILIENCE: Youth & Beauty, Restore & Rehab

Herein lies the opportunity to envision the park as characterized by something other than its concrete channel, to diminish its negative visual effect by elevating and exemplifying the “bridging” concept in ways that focus the user’s experience on the connection, rather than the division.
The park site has varying topography with some sensitive areas showing ground shifting and evidence of stabilization efforts that have taken place. There are several youth-oriented venues including Lively Pointe Youth Center, a large baseball diamond with seating, a gated skate park, an all-ages swimming pool, a half basketball court, a small playground, and small pavilions with seating. The northwest corner of Lively Park consists of a wooded natural area (mostly undisturbed) located west of the baseball diamond and extending along a neighborhood of single-family residences. South of Delaware Creek and across a pedestrian bridge over the channel, an interior loop exercise trail exists with outdoor exercise equipment and signage. The loop trail is well-suited for walking or running. The trail meanders into a natural area with heavy overhead foliage giving off a “forest-like” feel, and then winds through a green open space on the westernmost side of the park.

Currently, only one pedestrian crossing exists at Lively Park to carry visitors from north to south. The crossing shows evidence of cracking and separating due to the clay soil, which is prone to shifting, and significant wear in the metal components. When repairs are made to the crossing, ADA standards need to be met.

Opportunities exist to provide clarity in prohibitive signage on the site in terms of messaging and placement.
PLACEMAKING PARK OPPORTUNITIES

Placemaking opportunities at Lively Park present some exciting opportunities to provide beautification and unity to both sides of the park.

The park sits strategically near a high school and an elementary school further to the southwest. Opportunities exist to improve surface linkages particularly between the park and Lorenzo Middle School to provide monitored access and egress to Lively. Currently, access appears limited likely due to safety concerns between a public school and public park. Shade trees and seating opportunities exist in the northeastern section of the park as well as on the easternmost side of the park.

As mentioned, there is one pedestrian crossing existing at Lively Park that would allow a visitor to travel from north to south across Delaware Creek. Opportunities exist to create another crossing further north across the creek as well as make the crossing more of a visual amenity which could be a standalone attraction offering views of the park and of the channel. The stormwater conveyance through Lively Park is important to the City of Irving because of the heavy volumes of water traveling through the area. The City approved an additional $14 million for additional channel modifications at Lively Park so that the channel can carry more stormwater that results from overland flow from various activities around the city. The design will use stamped concrete to add visual relief to the project. PARD would encourage the use of any additional materials and best management practices that could be implemented that would also provide visual benefit for the park due to the overwhelming appearance of the existing concrete channel.

A maintenance route for vehicles serving the channel has been established at the park. This may change due to the proposed improvements taking place within the channel. Signage to delineate the route more clearly for pedestrians would benefit the side of the park used for active sports. In addition, a bridge that would allow only maintenance vehicles to access both sides of Delaware Creek is recommended.

Seating at the skate park is limited and could be expanded to allow for spectators. In addition, for safety purposes, an additional exit gate from the skate park near the back is desired for those who would like to leave the venue and access the rest of the park.

Additional measures to stabilize the ground at Lively Park are recommended. Observations showed leaning retaining walls as well as slippage of previously repaired ground areas. Fencing at various locations is in need of repair and replacement. Prominent signage identifying the park would be useful for passersby trying to locate the park and understand that the park is located behind the Lively Point Youth Center.

Trees, seating and picnic areas should be interspersed on the northeast side of Lively Park.
## AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Adequate Foot Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (seasonal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Youth Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Exercise Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green = Good/Fair Condition**  
**Orange = Fair/Poor Condition**  
**Red = Poor Condition**
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Plant more varieties of trees
- Opportunities for public art in addition to concrete inlays at skate park
- Implement additional structural precautions to stabilize slopes on northeast side
- Add outdoor seating
- Add additional bike racks
- Add exit from skate park to greenspace to the west
- Rejuvenate worn grass resulting from maintenance vehicles
- Increase safety lighting and evaluate a natural buffer between back fence line of homes and natural area behind the ballfields
- Conduct outreach with nearby neighborhoods regarding proposed improvements to Lively Park resulting from this plan.
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

• Consider adding connection from the Lorenzo Zavala Middle School to the south
• Explore trail opportunity north of Blaylock parallel to Delaware Creek to loop back to North MacArthur Blvd.
• Support the development and access to this park with on-street bike routes
• Expand and replace the footbridge with high profile signature pedestrian platform to add a focal point crossing across the canal system
• Consider additional pedestrian crossing north of existing crossing
• Construct a separate creek crossing for maintenance vehicles only
• Replace aging pool with more modern aquatic amenity after system-wide recreation/aquatics feasibility study

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $500,000 - $550,000
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $900,000 - $950,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
“SOLACE AND ESCAPE”

A second trail system (the Delaware Creek Trail) connects through Mountain Creek Preserve from a location northeast of the tree farm and the park. The Delaware Creek Trail system travels through various Irving parks from south to north along Delaware Creek, and finally meanders into downtown Irving. The Mountain Creek Preserve section of the Delaware Creek Trail is located along South Nursery Road continuing in a southeasterly direction, narrowing toward an unpaved portion of South Nursery Road, which also serves as a private utility service road northeast of the actual park.
Less than a quarter mile west of the Mountain Creek Preserve is the Hunter Ferrell Land Fill operated by the City of Irving’s Solid Waste Department. Currently, there is only one public vehicle entrance to the park which also serves as an exit to get back on East Hunter Ferrell and South Nursery Roads. A visitor must either head east on East Hunter Ferrell Road, then turn south into the park’s gated entrance, or access the park heading south directly from South Nursery Road which eventually turns into a 0.3-mile, two-way paved entrance to the park. As one accesses the L-shaped entrance to the interior of the park, a visitor would observe the landfill west of the park road entrance, and the tree farm on the east side of the park’s entrance. Once vehicles have entered the park, they can follow what converts to a gravel park road to access parking before the road dead-ends at the east side of the park.

The park is equipped with two multi-use fields, one which is a greenspace typically used to play cricket, a sport that is growing in popularity in Irving. The greenspace is heavily programmed for cricket matches (Lone Star Cricket Grounds), and though the space is not the official regulation size for the sport, the City of Irving mows the cricket pitch to maintain it for visitors to enjoy competitive play. Mountain Creek Preserve also permits access by equestrians who would like to use the Campion Trails at this location, and there is an existing canoe launch south of the park at the river bank of West Fork Trinity River. The greenbelt park has one playground with three playground units (for ages 5-12), a half-basketball court, one pavilion with nine picnic tables and grilling equipment surrounded by mature shade trees at the park’s perimeter. Nicely appointed fencing borders the northern perimeter of the park’s greenspace. The park also permits fishing along the river’s edge. The park is programmed for special events such as 5K’s and other special events.

Figure A.8 – Mountain Creek Preserve Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

Mountain Creek Preserve presents numerous opportunities for improved placemaking at this location. As the southern gateway into Irving, there are marketing opportunities to promote its quiet location and its importance as a connector to other city amenities.

Since this park serves as an anchor greenbelt for the southern perimeter of the city and is somewhat secluded from residential and other populated areas, resolving security concerns would be a great benefit for the park. The tree farm, landfill, and narrow entranceway to the park make it non-visible from both Hunter Ferrell Road and Nursery Road. Mature trees in curvilinear patterns present blind spots along the interior park road, and could be reconfigured, or moved to different areas of the park to provide a line of sight for park users. The City of Irving’s PARD has responded to some security concerns by inserting security lighting and limiting the park’s hours from dawn to dusk, and adding a gate to protect non-vehicles from driving too close to the river. By continuing to improve security at this park and enforcing park rules for prohibited activities, the public will feel an added sense of security.

A full basketball court could be installed to add to the athletic options at the park in addition to outdoor, permanent exercise equipment that can withstand flood events. Imagining a public art signature piece at the entrance of the park would call attention to the site and add to the gateway nature of the park. Maintaining access for equestrians would continue to provide options for the residents who own horses in the vicinity of the preserve. An exploration of the future size and scope of the existing tree farm may result in identifying additional surplus land that could be utilized for multi-use fields, or gathering spaces (such as a nature center, or other public facility.) Fortifying the park during flood events and prioritizing responses to this park when floodwaters subside would help maintain the investments made at this location. Rebuilding the canoe launch is suggested due to damage caused from a previous storm event.

Adding more water fountains and shaded seating for spectators of the cricket matches would allow park visitors to stay longer and enjoy the experience of games which are often lengthy. Shading would be beneficial near existing bench seating at the southwest perimeter of the park where the Campion Trail forks in three directions. Adding a pavilion and additional picnic tables would accommodate the public at day-long events.

Rethinking bathroom facilities that are easily maintained, perhaps mobile, and designed to withstand high rain events would be something for PARD to explore at this location.

Wayfinding signage to the park from East Hunter Ferrell Road and South Nursery Road would assist in locating this edge park. Improving roadway safety access is essential at the park entrance with Hunter Ferrell and Nursery Roads. A recommendation would be to remove the dangerous curve at the three-way intersection of these two local roads with the park entrance road and install stoplights or a three-way stop signs in each direction. Repaving the main vehicle entrance would enhance the entrance overall and would minimize vehicle damage. On the east side of the park, there is an opportunity to provide gateway signage and revamp the location where the interior park road dead ends to vehicles as the Campion Trail and Delaware Creek Trail diverge to exit Mountain Creek Preserve Park. Installation of permanent trail wayfinding signage positioned just prior to the bike/pedestrian bridge exiting the park would be helpful and would solidify that the greenbelt is part of a larger system extending from south to north Irving.
## AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Trails</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Field</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Field</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green = Good/Fair Condition
Orange = Fair/Poor Condition
Red = Poor Condition*
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Engage with users to discuss options for broadening programming of cricket fields
- Provide three-way stop and other traffic calming at entrance
- Repave vehicle entrance from South Nursery Road and East Hunter Ferrell Road
- Redesign gate entrance and consider public art for the site
- Add branded wayfinding signage to Hunter Farrell and Nursery Road
- Add shade trees and additional spectator seating
- Add additional lighting and remove park blind spots by recontouring and/or thinning the park’s tree areas

- Add security first aid stations and cell phone charging stations at locations on Campion Trail
- Provide gateway trail signage to Delaware Creek Trails and Campion Trail
- Enforce park rules and design consistent informational signs
- Stripe South Nursery Road and East Hunter Ferrell Road to allow for designated external bike lanes
- Utilize CPTED strategies to enhance safety in and around the park
- Maintain equestrian access to park
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

• Add or expand pavilion and add additional playground equipment
• Establish long-term maintenance plan to fortify park before and after major storm events
• Develop long-term plan for any tree farm surplus areas for potential park buildings or additional practice fields
• Add modular bathrooms and additional water fountains
• Create hard edge to park from interior roads or develop a separate vehicle exit on the northeast side toward Nursery Road

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $1,250,000 - $1,500,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $1,750,000 - $2,000,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
MUSTANG PARK
2223 Kinwest Parkway
Established 1991
10 Acres

DESCRIPTION
Directly across the street from Los Colinas Elementary School, the 10-acre Mustang Park is uniquely situated in the Northern Planning District, and surrounded by a major interstate to the north (Interstate Highway 635), single family residential with a direct access path to the park to the east, a minor arterial road to the south (Kinwest Parkway), and a minor arterial road on the west (Regent Boulevard). Mustang Park is considered an equity enclave because there are no other public park spaces for several miles south of IH 635 and because of its broader surroundings which include gated communities, a private golf course, business parks, commercial and retail, and DFW Airport. If not for Mustang Park and Recreation Center, Irving citizens living outside of these spaces would have fewer green spaces and affordable and accessible recreation options in this sector of the city.

Amenities at Mustang Park include the heavily programmed recreation center located in the center of the parcel, a tennis court and sand volleyball court on the north side of the park, two small covered pavilions with some playground equipment suitable for younger children with a few park benches, a swing set and jungle gyms, a third pavilion covers two small picnic tables, and additional park benches arranged around a radial-designed focal point in the center of the space with prominent public art sculptures displayed. The landscape design throughout the parcel consists of colorful slate inlays and large rock slabs arranged around the perimeter of the playground area with a retaining wall constructed from the same materials.
Vehicle access to the linear parking lot for Mustang Park is provided from Regent Boulevard (opposite the main entrance). The park is surrounded on the south and west by wide, ADA accessible sidewalks and paths with a crosswalk leading to and from the elementary school across Kinwest Parkway. A limited number of wide interior circulation paths are present throughout the park property. A small multi-use practice field with backstop is present on the west side of the park while an open space area with some tree canopy is on the east side of the park.

A portion of Mustang Park is noticeably sloped, which is evident at the playground area. A concrete retaining wall is used to buttress some areas of the park playground from a concrete water feature designed for water flow to a detention area. The water feature occupies a sizable portion of the park parcel and is encircled by landscaping with large rock formations situated along the edges.
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

Mustang Park is an important park for this area of Irving and could be enhanced to provide additional amenities and access while addressing some safety concerns. Some of these placemaking enhancements will look at long-term options such as purchasing additional land between the park’s northern boundary and IH 635 to expand the park’s footprint and address the need for additional parking access and egress. Irving’s PARD is eager to address some security concerns due to blind spots existing behind the recreation center near the tennis court, parking lot, and along portions of the interior trail on northeastern section of the park. By engaging in CPTED design strategies PARD could provide measures that appeal to the following key principles as described in a publication by the American Planning Association.

- **Natural Surveillance:** The design and placement of physical features to maximize visibility and surveillance. Key strategies include the design, placement, and lighting of doors, windows, walkways, gathering areas, roadways, and structures. The objectives are to eliminate hiding places and increase the perception of human presence and supervision.

- **Natural Access Management:** The physical guidance of people and vehicles. Key strategies include the use of real or perceived barriers such as fencing or plantings, and other wayfinding elements such as lighting, signage, and artwork. The objectives are to provide orientation and a pedestrian-friendly environment and to discourage would-be offenders by making noncompliance obvious.

- **Territorial Reinforcement:** The use of physical attributes to delineate space and express a positive sense of ownership. Key strategies include the use of art, signs, landscaping, and boundary treatments as well as the orientation and strategic placement of buildings. The objectives are to define borders, express ownership, and communicate that a space is cared for and protected.

- **Physical Maintenance:** The repair, replacement, and general upkeep of a space, building, or area. Key strategies include the use of low-maintenance landscaping and architectural materials, trash collection and removal, and other programs to maintain a clean and orderly environment. The objective is to allow for the continued use of a space for its intended purpose.

Implementing CPTED principles at this site would contribute to an improved park experience and would be an important aspect of reimagining Mustang Park as a whole. Removal, redesign, or relocation of the water detention feature bordering the southern portion of the park would eliminate a potential safety hazard for children tempted to climb in or around the rocky structure, and would provide more developable space in the park. The recreation center is regularly used by elementary school children for after school care, therefore, flashing yellow light signage at the crosswalk would boost pedestrian safety in front of the park.

Other placemaking opportunities at Mustang Park would include adding another tennis court as well as aquatics to the site in the form of an indoor or outdoor pool or spray park to provide an additional recreational amenities. Mustang Park’s recreation center is at maximum programming capacity with increasing demand such that expansion and possible relocation of the recreation center be considered in addition to providing additional automobile and bicycle parking access to the park. Currently, the only vehicle access to the park is provided on Regent Road with only right-turn access. When exiting the facility no left-turns are allowed which requires users to turn right on Regent Road and make a u-turn to access Kinwest Parkway.

Expanding the recreation center would require an initial trade-off in the open space available for a small practice field, however priorities must be weighed to assess whether its preferable for most of the remaining space allotment to be focused on expanding playground and picnicking capabilities on this site.

As part of any proposed master plan for Mustang Park, PARD can lead discussions on opportunities for earthwork ground stabilization, and regrading and leveling the sloped areas in the central portion of the park. Proposed drainage solutions may include strategies for below ground construction.

Source: American Planning Association – Planning Advisory Service (PAS) - QuickNotes #42 – by Sherry Carter and Al Zelinka - PAS QuickNotes(ISSN 2169-1940) is a publication of the American Planning Association’s Planning Advisory Service (PAS). © 2013 https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/document/PAS-QuickNotes-42.pdf
### AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Field</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center/Youth Center</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Green** = Good/Fair Condition
- **Orange** = Fair/Poor Condition
- **Red** = Poor Condition
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS
- Prioritize this park for master planning with a CPTED analysis
- Remove large rocks used for landscape design and other hazards around playground areas
- Budget for the removal, relocation, or redesign of the water detention feature at the front of the site
- Provide pedestrian crossing enhancements (i.e., flashing yellow lights) from Los Colinas Elementary School to the park
- Add shaded seating around the sand volleyball court
- Install additional water fountain
- Improve outdoor identifying signage
- Improve lines of sight and security surveillance for all areas north of the recreation center
- Replace playground surface material

Figure A.10 – Mustang Park Land Acquisition Opportunities
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Following master planning efforts, the Recreation Center on site may be replaced with a larger multi-generational center (included in Chapter 5 estimates)
- Invest in earthwork efforts to regrade the site (particularly at the center of the site)
- Add tennis court amenity to the park
- Remove, relocate, or redesign water detention feature on the south border of the park
- Expand and update playground areas with contemporary equipment
- Expand or relocate picnic pavilion area at the park
- Establish a vehicle access entrance off of Kinwest Parkway
- Consider a negotiated purchase or land lease of land north of park to expand park boundaries

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $350,000 - $400,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $750,000 - $800,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
**ACTIVE OASIS**: A place for both active and passive recreation for all ages.

The park has varying topography with its highest point closest to the pond. A narrow walking trail circles the pond and loosely follows the drainage canal to the south before crossing and looping to the north in a switchback near a large picnic pavilion adjacent to two playground areas, one covered and the other uncovered. As part of the trail system, there are five pedestrian bridges in the park, including across the main pond spillway. At the spillway there is an overlook with a defunct and deteriorating stone cascade feature. The park has been recently equipped with a new basketball court and a small picnic pavilion adjacent to the splash pad, and tennis courts are located at the southern end of the park next to Hanes Elementary School. Northwest Park is easily walkable from the surrounding neighborhood, and vehicular parking is located parallel to Cheyenne Street. The park is used for some outdoor programming associated with the Northwest Recreation Center.
Figure A.11 – Northwest Park Amenities
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Scale: 0, 500, 1,000 feet
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

This park’s greatest asset is its diversity of experiential opportunities, from active play areas and sports courts to extensive walking trails and views of open water. But its single greatest liability is a lack of shade as both respite from the heat and visual amenity, particularly given the park’s size and generally pastoral character.

The plaza area conveys a stark character in terms of materials, and contributes to a notable heat-island effect on sunny days. In keeping with much of the city’s historical approach to stormwater management, approaches that offer the potential to soften the sensory impact of the park’s structures would be advantageous. In addition to improving shade conditions, an additional primary goal for this park should be to provide uniform ADA-compliant access and amenity along the trails, canal crossings, and perimeter sidewalks.

Given its centrally accessible location, Northwest Park is a generally popular place for walking, and maintaining and improving the concrete trails throughout the park should remain a priority. Consistency in signage and trail widths throughout the park are crucial aspects of equity, accessibility and quality of user experiences. Using design to help distinguish and meet the differing needs of runners and walkers can enhance the overall equity of user experiences on the trails.

Additional seating opportunities are evident around the perimeter of the pond and at the spray pad and playground areas. The playground area should be carefully evaluated for potential resurfacing, and for expansion and upgrades to the equipment.

There is a clear opportunity to enhance the walking trails that extend northward along the linear drainage channel. These enhancements could be simple enough as strategic planting of shade trees and installation of benches at functional intervals, and should serve to draw users to the trail and encourage visits to the park. The trail crossing at Cheyenne Street should be completed and effectively marked for safety and branding purposes.

Northwest Park has the immense potential to expand the safety aspects of the park by looking at surfaces of unshaded outdoor exercise equipment from heat injury. There is an opportunity to monitor and improve areas surrounding the water body and water conveyance systems that flow through the park. Managing utility exposure throughout the park would separate unsightly or potentially dangerous occurrences that may develop.

Removal of hazards such as unprotected falls around the cascade feature should be a priority for this park. Beautification of the pond edge, naturalization of the concrete drainage channel, and repair and stabilization of the overlook area over the retention pond area should also be considered high priorities. Other beautification efforts could include supplement upland plantings to help buffer heavy sheetflow, providing filtration and erosion protection at the water’s edge.
### AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Adequate Foot Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Park</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Green = Good/Fair Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Orange = Fair/Poor Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>Red = Poor Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Youth Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Exercise Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

• Remove, renovate, or redesign the unused stone cascade water feature
• Coordinate relocation or rehabilitation of overhead power lines to improve function, aesthetics, and safety
• Repair/upgrade foot bridges
• Develop signature signage for park wayfinding and signage for any cautions and prohibitions
• Update the Northwest Park entry sign on Cheyenne Street
• Add bike racks at recreation center
• Evaluate existing tree species for appropriateness to site conditions, and relocate or remove as needed

• Add shade trees and benches to the linear extension to the north of park; incentivize pruning of existing trees to remove blind spots and improve safety
• Improve ADA access throughout the park
• Install heat resistant benches and shade trees near overlook terrace
• Add more shading and seating around spray park
• Add additional drinking fountains in northern section of park
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS
- Identify appropriate public art
- Consider public art feature in middle of the pond and elsewhere along linear trail
- Reconfigure and modernize playgrounds
- Re-engineer canals to allow green planting (beautification)
- Plantings along the edge of pond
- Adult exercise equipment should convert to heat resistant material
- Plan for interior bike and skate circulation separate from pedestrian traffic

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*
SHORT-TERM GOALS: $4,000,000 - $4,500,000
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $400,000 - $450,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
**THOMAS JEFFERSON PARK**

1201 Hidden Ridge Road  
Established 1991  
18.52 Acres

**DESCRIPTION**

Thomas Jefferson Park is a special and unique community park approximately 18.52 acres in size. The linear park is located south of State Highway (SH) 114 and is in a high density area surrounded on three sides with multifamily housing. Hidden Ridge is a six-lane divided minor collector roadway that borders the southern and western side of the oblong-shaped park, and transitions to Meadow Creek Drive from the west to the north side of the park. MacArthur Boulevard defines the eastern boundary of the park. Thomas Jefferson Park is centered around a detention pond which is a focal point of the park. Dallas County Utility & Reclamation District (DCURD) previously owned the park land before donating it to the City of Irving. DCURD still manages the detention area in the middle of the park structures as well as numerous flood control and drainage, recreation and open space, transportation, and land reclamation projects in Las Colinas.

Users of this park are racially and ethnically diverse, as well as multi-generational. Park users are mostly residents from the nearby multifamily housing units. Typically, a visitor might observe at any time of day populations speaking various languages; meeting in small groups to converse underneath one of the two picnic pavilions; people walking or jogging on the interior concrete trails; playing a pick-up game of cricket or soccer; walking dogs; sitting at various benches along the perimeter of the pond; watching children play at the three partially shaded playground areas; observing the turtles swimming in the detention pond; playing on the half-basketball court, or sitting under the landscaped beautification area at the corner of MacArthur Boulevard and Meadow Creek Drive. Due to these multiple uses of the park and the volume of park visitors, PARD has found it advantageous to have the park minimally programmed so that the public can experience the park without frequent event interruptions.
A focal point of the Thomas Jefferson Park is the seven-foot tall Mahatma Gandhi Memorial of North Texas, located on the northwest side of the park near Meadow Creek Drive. Construction of the memorial began in 2014 and was entirely funded and maintained by the Indian Association of North Texas and the Indian American Friendship Council. The PARD has a maintenance agreement with these non-profit associations to maintain the quality of the area around the memorial. An area for quiet reflection, the memorial is sometimes the site for groups to gather together for peaceful political protests.

PARD mows and maintains the grassy areas and trees just outside of the detention pond, while DCURD maintains the water quality treatment and flow of the detention pond. The park is best accessed via walking and biking, though sidewalks are discontinuous around the park perimeter and no formal mid-block crossings exist on Meadow Creek Drive and Hidden Ridge. Parking is allowed along the perimeter streets.

The park is heavily sloped as one walks to the interior of the park. Evidence of ground destabilization is present from clay-laden soils as can be observed by the separating and cracked ground, earthen sliding, uneven cracked interior sidewalks and paths which present hazards for the public. Several utilities are exposed above the grassy areas. A concrete pedestrian bridge crossing over the pond (located at the park’s midpoint) is in need of reconstruction due to steep approaching slopes, and general wear and tear. The park has some technical innovation such as solar powered lights near play areas and pavilions on the property. In recent years, Irving’s PARD worked with the Texas Tree Foundation to plant various trees throughout the park which requires an advanced irrigation system to maintain them so they can flourish. The ultimate vision for the site includes a heavily-vegetated tree-lined pond perimeter, with shade trees spread throughout the park property.

Figure A.12 – Thomas Jefferson Park Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

Thomas Jefferson Park’s most prominent use is social gathering and can be supported by enhancing those amenities that provide quality social experiences for the neighboring public. The park is fortunate to have many users which means there will always be eyes on the park. This provides increased security for users at most times of day. The park location nearest to the overpass at MacArthur Boulevard is the only noticeable blind spot at the park. Lighting and vegetation pruning near the gate leading to additional multifamily homes on the east side of MacArthur Boulevard will provide safer passage to and from Thomas Jefferson Park. **Standardizing signage** throughout the park will provide consistency in messaging from one side of the park to the other, and installing Wi-Fi, or other technology in the park would be well received by the visiting public.

Structurally, the park would benefit from several capital investments which would provide a perceptible return on investment. Discussions with DCURD to provide some colorful flood tolerant plantings at the water’s edge of the pond may help with absorption, would aid in ground stabilization and would add to visual quality of the area. While mowing seems to be preferred, introducing the concept of perimeter plantings is worthy of further consideration. **Additional tree canopy** with an improved irrigation system would save the newer trees that are experiencing drought conditions.

An investment in slope and overall ground stabilization is needed at Thomas Jefferson Park to fortify existing and future trails, and minimize uneven turf which could cause injury to recreational users. Adding shaded seating throughout the park would provide more social activity areas. Installing bike racks would aid in park accessibility. PARD and the City of Irving may need to reintroduce solutions to address permanent versus temporary bathrooms, and newer concepts of composting restrooms at Thomas Jefferson Park and elsewhere. Solutions that will reduce the burden on the PARD maintenance department should be prioritized.

Central to placemaking at Thomas Jefferson Park is the need to **rebuild and reinforce structures** such as interior and exterior pathways at the park. Wider paths that can accommodate walkers, joggers, roller bladers, and baby strollers would increase the enjoyment of the diverse users of the park. Improving the pedestrian overpass is a clear need for the site as is reinforcing the retaining walls approaching the pedestrian bridge. Perimeter sidewalks around the park and working with city transportation engineers to explore possible lane reductions (road diet alternatives) is warranted around the park to enable curb-in parking, provide safer passage to and from residential areas, or add bike lanes around the park perimeter.
## AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITY</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Hazards</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Green** = Good/Fair Condition
- **Orange** = Fair/Poor Condition
- **Red** = Poor Condition
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Expand basketball court to a full court size
- Provide mid-block pedestrian safety traffic calming across Hidden Ridge, Meadow Creek, and improve pedestrian safety at MacArthur Boulevard
- Conduct cybersecurity assessment to determine if Wi-Fi and/or other technology would be feasible at this location
- Reseed turf areas that require attention
- Provide additional views to increase safety at park entrance/exit under MacArthur Boulevard bridge
- Provide additional protections for the safe passage of visitors using the metal pedestrian platform to exit/enter Thomas Jefferson Park under MacArthur Boulevard bridge
- Conduct traffic analysis with engineering department to determine if implementing a “road diet” would be feasible to allow for formal bike lanes and curb-in parking along the perimeter of Hidden Ridge and Meadow Creek Drive
- Develop a lighting plan and install additional lighting in the park at strategic locations
- Consult with DCURD about installing flood-tolerant plants along the water’s edge, and discuss options for management of nutrient overload plumes that develop during the warmer months
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Replace existing pedestrian overpass at east end of park with an ADA signature structure
- Design and construct an additional pedestrian overpass near the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial as a matching ADA signature structure
- Repair and reduce hazardous slopes around park pedestrian crossing
- Construct a well-connected interior trail system-wide enough to handle walkers, roller-blades, joggers, and strollers using sustainable materials resistant to heat island affect and tolerant to Texas soils
- Develop a ground stabilization plan to address sliding/separating earth on existing slopes and other locations in the park
- Install an enhanced irrigation system at Thomas Jefferson Park to protect the investment made in numerous tree plantings
- Develop and implement plan to bury utilities underground
- Install more seating with shade trees along pathways
- Add bike racks on park perimeter
- Enlarge all pavilions and playgrounds
- Increase ADA access throughout the park

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $1,500,000 - $2,000,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $4,000,000 - $4,500,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
TOWNE LAKE PARK
800 Esters Road
22.44 Acres

DESCRIPTION
Towne Lake Park is a neighborhood park measuring 22.44 acres located in the West Planning District. It serves a primarily residential neighborhood population living within ½ mile radius. Towne Lake is located less than a mile east of State Highway 161, approximately a half-mile northeast of Bear Creek, and less than ¼ mile north of the Trinity Railway Express (TRE) rail station. The uniquely shaped Towne Lake Park is bounded by three roads that intersect to encircle the park. These roads include Esters Road bordering the west side of the park and intersects with Conflans Road at the northwest corner of the park, and Olde Towne Drive at the southwest corner of the park. Conflans Road borders the north and east sides of the park and intersects with Olde Towne Drive on the northeast corner of the park. Olde Towne Drive occupies most of the eastern side of the park. The small parking lot for Towne Lake Park can be accessed from Esters Road. Floodplain exists between SH 161 and northbound lanes of Esters Road.

Towne Lake has .67 miles of curvilinear, ADA accessible concrete trails that border the edges of the park, paralleling the surrounding roadways and connecting to sidewalks at the major intersections. The trails are of varying widths and branch off to the interior of the park to surround an existing pond on the property. Towne Lake Park shows evidence of worn grassy areas where paths have been created by users through frequent use. Brick retaining walls are interspersed where heavier slopes exist on the east side of the park paralleling Old Towne Drive. The north side of the park slopes down from Conflans Road and a retaining wall exists adjacent to the pedestrian path.

Shade trees are located in the center of the park nearest to two small playground areas and one picnic shelter that are in fair condition. Some bench seating is located in the vicinity of the centralized shade trees. Additional tree canopy shade for the park is located along the eastern side of the park which parallels Old Towne Drive.
The on-site pond provides a nice visual amenity with two water fountains offering a visual display for onlookers. Ducks and other waterfowl can be observed in and around the pond, adding to the aesthetic quality. A nicely constructed gazebo on an octagonal overlook to the pond is located at the northern end of the park. Two pedestrian bridges cross over the pond at north and south locations, respectively. Both pedestrian bridges (made of wood, iron, and brick) are in need of repair.

Towne Lake Park is currently used for passive recreation activities, and there are no formal practice fields on site. Established neighborhood residents adjacent to Towne Lake Park are heavily invested in any recommended improvements that could build upon current park amenities which support passive recreation. Bench seating exists at various locations at Towne Lake Park.

Figure A.13 – Towne Lake Park Amenities
PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES

Anticipated population growth from new residential communities will increase use of Towne Lake Park. A residential development was recently completed east of SH 161 and Conflans, and there are plans for a new subdivision south of Esters Road. Future placemaking will have to plan for the gradual increase in park usage and social interaction, yet support leisure activities that maintain its tranquil character for individuals and families.

Lengthening the trail network in and around the park would benefit users looking for a longer and more challenging recreational experience. As mentioned, park users are traveling on and off the internal pathways outside of the system as evidenced by areas worn by heavy foot traffic. A plan to include bicycle trails, as well as pedestrian paths with outdoor exercise equipment would support passive recreation at Towne Lake Park.

A wide-ranging tree-planting strategy would add to a more pleasant park experience at Towne Lake Park. Currently, the park is surrounded on all sides by paved roads with few natural buffers. During warmer months, exposed roadway pavement and interior trails exacerbate the heat island effect. Currently, trees are sparse on this property and are appropriate along pathways throughout the park to provide much needed shade and aesthetic value. Trees and other vegetation would also better define the edges of Towne Lake Park on the northern and western sides which extend to the Conflans and Esters intersections. Actively planting trees at the street level along eastbound Conflans Road would serve multiple purposes including improving the existing streetscape, defining the outer edge of the park, and providing a line of shade which could work in tandem with potential shade trees along interior trails to cool down the park’s northern boundary during warmer months.

Proposed tree-planting goals should be combined with an evaluation of where new seating could be distributed throughout the park to accommodate existing and future visitors. Additional seating is needed near playgrounds, and there is ample room to install a larger pavilion with more picnic tables for group gatherings. Park visitors stated their desire for more seating throughout the park, therefore there are opportunities to incorporate innovative seating design.

Towne Lake Park’s proximity to Bear Creek indicate that high volumes of water flow through the park into the pond and drainage channels on site. According to PARD, the pond at Towne Lake is prone to swells during heavy rain events which results in build-up of silt and other debris. Planting flood tolerant vegetation in a tiered fashion would help with absorption around the pond and would provide an additional buffer to discourage activity immediately adjacent to the pond. Addressing these concerns would be a good investment that would benefit park usage in the long run. Maintenance of the park grounds at this location following high rain events should be highlighted as a priority.

Safe and easy pedestrian and bike access to the park from adjoining neighborhoods is a topic for further exploration. Future traffic volumes may dictate whether the installation of traffic lights and formal cross-walks is necessary at the three intersections enclosing the park. A potential option would be High-Intensity Activated crosswalk (HAWK) beacon signals where pedestrians/bicyclists could activate the walk sign which would control vehicle traffic as necessary.

Because the park is located along a bus line (and not far from a TRE station) visitors traveling to the park from further distances can use bus or rail transit with a short walk to Towne Lake Park’s interior. Visitors can park at the existing lot off of Esters Road or parallel park on Old Towne Drive or Esters Road. Installing gateway signage near the intersections of Conflans Road and Esters Road would provide an aesthetically pleasing entrance to the park traveling east from SH 161. Likewise, wayfinding signage in all directions would call attention to this neighborhood amenity.
Aesthetic and structural improvements to the gazebo and pedestrian bridges will prepare them for heavier use. **Burying utilities** that are exposed throughout the park would provide visual relief and minimize tampering and vandalism. Security and enforcement of park rules would assist in making the transition from a lower use to a higher use park more smooth. Site planning efforts for Towne Lake Park should include CPTED considerations developed through a public engagement process with the surrounding neighborhoods.

In anticipation of more park visitors, consideration for additional lighting, water fountains, and restrooms may be warranted. Currently, water fountains are centered near the playgrounds, and porta-potty units are stationed near the existing parking lot on Esters Road.

### AMENITIES MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITIES</th>
<th>Internal Park Pedestrian Access/Circulation Patterns</th>
<th>ADA Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters with Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Porta Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond or Canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Paths at Perimeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Shade Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Foot Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green** = Good/Fair Condition  
**Orange** = Fair/Poor Condition  
**Red** = Poor Condition
RECOMMENDED PARK IMPROVEMENTS

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Begin meeting with neighboring communities to discuss projected increased in visitor use at Towne Lake Park and the need to fast-track a site plan to include the expansion of interior and exterior trails
- Develop tree planting strategy and irrigation plan
- Add wayfinding signage to park from major streets
- Add gateway signage at Conflans Road and Esters Road
- Reseed turf areas that require attention
- Improve ADA access where appropriate at the perimeter along Esters Road

- Develop plans for ensuring safe passage at pedestrian crossings
- Plant shade trees along Conflans Road and Esters Road to give the park a defined edge
- Add vegetation along retaining wall adjacent to Conflans Road to soften interior edge of park
- Bury utilities to avoid tampering and vandalism
- Add additional benches in shade areas
MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS

- Expand parking lot on Esters Road
- Install additional shaded playground equipment
- Add lighting
- Add water fountains
- Add permanent or modular bathrooms on-site
- Expand playground areas, picnic areas and other amenities
- Add pavilion and picnic areas
- Construct sidewalks around perimeter at Esters and Conflans Road
- Consider additional entrance and parking lot off of Conflans Road
- Consider corner seated and shaded beautification area on Olde Towne Drive at the intersection with Esters Road near residential properties

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ESTIMATES*

SHORT-TERM GOALS: $725,000 - $750,000

MID TO LONG-TERM GOALS: $2,000,000 - $2,250,000

*Represents a planning-level cost estimate based upon 2019 costs. Costs may change with additional planning & design and should be updated based upon actual timeframe of work.
COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS

A community survey consisting on 22 questions focusing on various aspects of Irving’s parks and recreation facilities was conducted from June to September 2018.

Q1 In what area of Irving do you live?

Answered: 1,440  Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>10.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>22.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not live in Irving</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 How long have you lived in Irving?
Answered: 1,438  Skipped: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>15.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>13.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 years</td>
<td>22.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>36.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not live in Irving</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of parks and recreation Irving?

Answered: 1,298  Skipped: 146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>59.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>20.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 In the past 12 months have you or anyone in your household done the following? (check all that apply)

Answered: 1,222  Skipped: 222

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited or used a City of Irving park</td>
<td>88.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited or used a City of Irving athletic field</td>
<td>27.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited or used a City of Irving recreation center</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a City of Irving hike and bike trail</td>
<td>48.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a City of Irving youth athletic league</td>
<td>9.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a City of Irving adult athletic league</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a class or program offered by the Irving Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>17.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a City of Irving parks and recreation facility for a meeting</td>
<td>14.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Thinking about your current recreation activities and those in which you might wish to participate, choose the responses to show what you or members of your household would like to get out of those activities? (check all that apply)

Answered: 1,283  Skipped: 161

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have fun</td>
<td>83.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the outdoors</td>
<td>82.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new skills</td>
<td>39.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help others</td>
<td>29.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve health/fitness</td>
<td>80.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve specific skills</td>
<td>23.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact with friends</td>
<td>49.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in organized...</td>
<td>31.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet new people</td>
<td>42.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find activity in which to...</td>
<td>17.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in competitions</td>
<td>18.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience being part of a team activity</td>
<td>21.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 1,283
Q7 How frequently do you visit a park, recreation facility, aquatic facility, or trail in Irving?

Answered: 1,289  Skipped: 155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER WEEK</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER MONTH</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER YEAR</th>
<th>ONCE A YEAR OR LESS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
<td>33.84%</td>
<td>26.74%</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Facility</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
<td>18.57%</td>
<td>30.27%</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
<td>29.64%</td>
<td>49.59%</td>
<td>1,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER WEEK</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER MONTH</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES PER YEAR</th>
<th>ONCE A YEAR OR LESS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>24.56%</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
<td>28.77%</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 When the Parks Master Plan is completed, the plan will make recommendations for additional facilities and recreational activities. The items listed below focus on facilities that address non-competitive activities that are typically enjoyed outdoors. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...
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Q8 When the Parks Master Plan is completed, the plan will make recommendations for additional facilities and recreational activities. The items listed below focus on facilities that address non-competitive activities that are typically enjoyed outdoors. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...

Answered: 1,253  Skipped: 191

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>VERY UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>35.76%</td>
<td>39.85%</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s water spray parks</td>
<td>35.75%</td>
<td>39.41%</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian trails</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
<td>22.80%</td>
<td>26.71%</td>
<td>20.63%</td>
<td>21.71%</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise stations along trails</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>45.34%</td>
<td>21.03%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family picnic areas</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use trails</td>
<td>38.95%</td>
<td>47.71%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural habitat/nature areas</td>
<td>49.63%</td>
<td>39.33%</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road biking trails</td>
<td>20.44%</td>
<td>38.84%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>14.64%</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor festival area</td>
<td>31.07%</td>
<td>43.11%</td>
<td>13.36%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor performance amphitheaters</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
<td>39.64%</td>
<td>21.22%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td>37.12%</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td>47.17%</td>
<td>11.79%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>55.72%</td>
<td>32.61%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page left blank on purpose
Q9 The items listed below focus on outdoor athletic or sports fields. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...
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Q9 The items listed below focus on outdoor athletic or sports fields. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...

Answered: 1,229  Skipped: 215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badminton courts</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
<td>27.12%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>24.94%</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields (adult)</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
<td>36.41%</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields (youth)</td>
<td>20.73%</td>
<td>39.85%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX parks</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
<td>27.87%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket fields</td>
<td>18.74%</td>
<td>18.91%</td>
<td>22.09%</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
<td>24.94%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf parks</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>27.88%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>12.56%</td>
<td>24.53%</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme fitness training areas</td>
<td>12.64%</td>
<td>35.37%</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
<td>19.42%</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag football fields</td>
<td>7.38%</td>
<td>34.22%</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
<td>9.61%</td>
<td>25.21%</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football fields (youth)</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
<td>39.31%</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-line hockey rinks</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>21.89%</td>
<td>29.07%</td>
<td>14.36%</td>
<td>30.10%</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-line skating rinks</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>31.99%</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
<td>11.15%</td>
<td>24.61%</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickball fields</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>26.49%</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
<td>28.14%</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse fields</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>31.95%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>31.52%</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
<td>12.09%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>16.68%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
<td>36.61%</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby fields</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
<td>30.99%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>34.90%</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand volleyball courts</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
<td>44.31%</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate parks</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
<td>36.38%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
<td>21.38%</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields (adult)</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>20.70%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields (youth)</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>16.65%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball fields (adult)</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
<td>34.70%</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
<td>8.72%</td>
<td>23.37%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball fields (youth)</td>
<td>20.09%</td>
<td>34.55%</td>
<td>16.19%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash courts</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>28.65%</td>
<td>13.63%</td>
<td>34.64%</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>24.03%</td>
<td>40.36%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 The items listed below focus on facilities that address indoor recreation needs. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...
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Q10 The items listed below focus on facilities that address indoor recreation needs. How important or unimportant do you think it would be for the City of Irving to build additional...

Answered: 1,193  Skipped: 251

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Adult Center</td>
<td>43.31%</td>
<td>40.55%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics rooms</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>45.05%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance instruction rooms</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futsal (synthetic turf play surface)</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>26.73%</td>
<td>22.35%</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>29.36%</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game rooms (i.e. pool, foosball)</td>
<td>19.24%</td>
<td>38.99%</td>
<td>18.72%</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium/indoor basketball courts</td>
<td>30.76%</td>
<td>45.87%</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics rooms</td>
<td>20.07%</td>
<td>37.59%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>19.28%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor cardio/weight training areas</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
<td>45.22%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming facilities</td>
<td>49.57%</td>
<td>35.89%</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor volleyball courts</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>39.42%</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor walking/jogging tracks</td>
<td>39.98%</td>
<td>36.96%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts areas</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>33.36%</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media rooms</td>
<td>10.21%</td>
<td>25.22%</td>
<td>27.53%</td>
<td>14.83%</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball courts</td>
<td>13.54%</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center</td>
<td>30.83%</td>
<td>38.25%</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 Regarding bicycle and trail opportunities, please rank the following (1 being most important to 11 being least important) in terms of what you think the priorities of the city should be.
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Q12 Regarding bicycle and trail opportunities, please rank the following (1 being most important to 11 being least important) in terms of what you think the priorities of the city should be.

Answered: 1,077  Skipped: 367

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect to schools</td>
<td>36.89%</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to universities</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
<td>23.24%</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>10.37%</td>
<td>6.95%</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Irving Heritage District</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to Las Colinas Urban Center</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
<td>20.76%</td>
<td>11.57%</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to other retail centers or business centers</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>7.18%</td>
<td>10.77%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to existing trails</td>
<td>20.82%</td>
<td>11.28%</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>24.31%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to neighboring cities</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
<td>26.31%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to DART/TRE stations</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>26.33%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist trail/bike facility crossings of major roads</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>29.52%</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes on low-volume roadways throughout the city (ex: Rochelle Blvd.)</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
<td>33.47%</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected bike lanes on higher-volume roads throughout the city (ex: MacArthur Blvd.)</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>36.43%</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 The city is establishing a series of priorities to direct future Parks and Recreation Department actions. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements: I think Irving should...
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Q13 The city is establishing a series of priorities to direct future Parks and Recreation Department actions. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements: I think Irving should...

Answered: 1,090  Skipped: 354

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for future park and open space development</td>
<td>53.55%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make improvements to existing parks</td>
<td>64.11%</td>
<td>31.27%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the city's trail system</td>
<td>47.33%</td>
<td>34.68%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land to preserve environmentally sensitive areas such as natural creek corridors</td>
<td>53.02%</td>
<td>31.38%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant more trees in the city</td>
<td>58.18%</td>
<td>31.13%</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place art in parks and other public places</td>
<td>28.01%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Would you support an increase in taxes to be used for additional or improved amenities?

Answered: 1,090  Skipped: 354

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>61.28%</td>
<td>21.91%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>42.96%</td>
<td>22.42%</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Centers</td>
<td>47.89%</td>
<td>30.61%</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>45.39%</td>
<td>34.77%</td>
<td>19.83%</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>53.77%</td>
<td>28.42%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 Do you or someone in your family participate in a sports association or league in the City of Irving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.13% 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.87% 824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Are you male or female?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.25% 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.75% 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18 How old are you?
Answered: 1,088  Skipped: 356

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>28.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 Do you have children under the age of 18 living at home? If yes, how old are they? (check all that apply)

Answered: 1,085  Skipped: 359

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>26.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>23.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 1,085
PUBLIC MEETING INPUT BOARDS

Two series of public meetings were held during this planning process. This section presents the input results from both series of public meetings.

STATION 1
What are your top 3 preferred amenities for Irving parks?

MEETING #1
Technology: 10
Public Art: 4
Walking Trails: 13
Shade Trees: 18
Amphitheater: 7
Playgrounds: 14
Food Amenities: 6
Fitness Stations: 12
Splash Pads: 7
Gathering Spaces: 11
Skate Park: 3

MEETING #2
Technology: 9
Public Art: 9
Walking Trails: 18
Shade Trees: 4
Amphitheater: 26
Playgrounds: 13
Food Amenities: 5
Fitness Stations: 8
Splash Pads: 7
Gathering Spaces: 4
Skate Park: 3

MEETING #3
Technology: 4
Public Art: 0
Walking Trails: 6
Shade Trees: 7
Amphitheater: 1
Playgrounds: 1
Food Amenities: 4
Fitness Stations: 1
Splash Pads: 1
Gathering Spaces: 4
Skate Park: 1
STATION 2
What are your top 3 preferred open space & natural area amenities for Irving?

MEETING #1
- Access to Creeks: 6
- Access to Open Space Amenities: 6
- Nature Preserves: 9
- Fishing: 10
- Paddle Sports: 9
- Campsites: 5
- Floodplain Protection: 6
- Native Habitat Restoration: 14
- Environmental Education: 8
- Nature Viewing Areas: 9
- Nature Center: 14

MEETING #2
- Access to Creeks: 6
- Access to Open Space Amenities: 9
- Nature Preserves: 12
- Fishing: 9
- Paddle Sports: 13
- Campsites: 9
- Floodplain Protection: 9
- Native Habitat Restoration: 19
- Environmental Education: 4
- Nature Viewing Areas: 17
- Nature Center: 7

MEETING #3
- Access to Creeks: 6
- Access to Open Space Amenities: 1
- Nature Preserves: 3
- Fishing: 3
- Paddle Sports: 7
- Campsites: 4
- Floodplain Protection: 3
- Native Habitat Restoration: 5
- Environmental Education: 2
- Nature Viewing Areas: 3
- Nature Center: 3
STATION 3
What are your top 3 preferred sports and athletic field amenities for Irving parks?

MEETING #1
- Baseball: 3
- Softball: 4
- Soccer: 4
- Cricket: 2
- Tennis: 3
- Disc Golf: 2
- Basketball: 4
- Football: 3
- Multi-Use Courts: 5
- Volleyball: 5

MEETING #2
- Baseball: 2
- Softball: 4
- Soccer: 14
- Cricket: 6
- Tennis: 9
- Disc Golf: 6
- Basketball: 4
- Football: 3
- Multi-Use Courts: 18
- Volleyball: 10

MEETING #3
- Baseball: 5
- Softball: 4
- Soccer: 7
- Cricket: 4
- Tennis: 1
- Disc Golf: 3
- Basketball: 6
- Football: 1
- Lacrosse/Rugby: 3
- Multi-Use Courts: 6
- Volleyball: 4
STATION 4

What are your top 3 preferred indoor recreation and aquatic amenities and programming for Irving?

**MEETING #1**

Cardio/Weight Room: 12
Game Room: 4
Indoor Pool: 13
Meeting Rooms: 7
Outdoor Fitness: 5
Teen Activities: 8
Fitness Classes: 7
Indoor Courts: 13
Outdoor Pool: 7
Senior Activities: 7
Indoor Turf Field: 11

**MEETING #2**

Cardio/Weight Room: 6
Game Room: 2
Indoor Pool: 26
Meeting Rooms: 2
Outdoor Fitness: 2
Teen Activities: 3
Fitness Classes: 9
Indoor Courts: 13
Outdoor Pool: 12
Senior Activities: 10
Indoor Turf Field: 9

**MEETING #3**

Cardio/Weight Room: 4
Game Room: 3
Indoor Pool: 3
Meeting Rooms: 3
Outdoor Fitness: 0
Teen Activities: 3
Fitness Classes: 8
Indoor Courts: 0
Outdoor Pool: 6
Senior Activities: 1
Indoor Turf Field: 2
STATION 5
What are your top 3 preferred trail and bikeway facilities for Irving?

MEETING #1
- Off Street Trails: 10
- Bike Lanes: 10
- 1 Signed Bike Routes
- Nature/Soft Surface Trails: 12
- BMX Trails: 8
- Sidewalks: 16
- Signed Bike Routes: 1
- Off Street Trails: 10
- Bike Lanes: 10
- 2 Signed Bike Routes
- Nature/Soft Surface Trails: 18
- BMX Trails: 3
- Sidewalks: 11
- 1 Shared Lane Markings
- Sidewalks: 11
- BMX Trails: 3
- Intersection Safety Treatment: 11

MEETING #3
- Off Street Trails: 7
- Bike Lanes: 5
- 2 Signed Bike Routes
- Nature/Soft Surface Trails: 5
- BMX Trails: 0
- Sidewalks: 7
- 1 Shared Lane Markings
- Signed Bike Routes: 1
- Off Street Trails: 7
- Bike Lanes: 5
- 2 Signed Bike Routes
- BMX Trails: 0
- Sidewalks: 7
- 1 Shared Lane Markings
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