The Lake Worth Greenprint: Objectives

1. Develop a long-term vision for a Lake Worth open space network, and involve stakeholders in the decision-making process.

2. Build upon plans already complete or underway.

3. Identify lands most important for lake water quality, as well as other related community-driven open space/conservation goals.

4. Help the city and stakeholders evaluate the relative importance of undeveloped land in the watershed.

5. Evaluate tools that can be used to protect Lake Worth’s water quality.

6. Provide education about voluntary conservation easements.
# The Lake Worth Greenprint: The Report
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Community Engagement & Goal Setting
Interviews

Darrell Andrews, Tarrant Regional Water District
Michael Barnard, North Lake Worth Neighborhood Association
Paul Bounds, Fort Worth Water Department
Tom Burrell, Our Lands and Water Foundation
Larry Colvin, Fort Worth Mountain Bikers Association
George Conley, Parker County Commissioner
Fernando Costa, Fort Worth Assistant City Manager
David Creek, Fort Worth Parks & Rec
Gale Cupp, Neighborhood Association on South Lake Worth
Michael Dallas, Scenic Shores Neighborhood Association
Clair Davis, Fort Worth Flood Plain Administrator
Kenneth Davis, Cassco Land Co.
Mark Dawson, Sasaki Associates
Mark Ernst, Tarrant Regional Water District
Jim Finley, Finley Resources
Rodney Franklin, Texas Parks and Wildlife
James Frisinger, US Army Corps of Engineers
Tom Huffhines, Greater Fort Worth Real Estate Council
Patricia Hyer, East Lake Worth Neighborhood Association
Ken Johnson, Tarrant County Extension
Ken Klaveness, Trinity Waters

Robert Manthei, XTO Energy Inc.
Brett McGuire, Lake Worth City Manager
Laura Miller, Tarrant County Extension
Lee Nicol, Harris Nicol & Welborn Development Partners
Mike Petter, Texas Agricultural Land Trust
Jason Pierce, Upper Trinity Conservation Trust
Eric Seebock, Fort Worth Parks & Rec
Rick Shepherd, Friends of Fort Worth Nature Center & Refuge
Dennis Shingleton, Fort Worth Council member
Nikki Sopchack, Fort Worth Parks & Rec
Mark Steinbach, Texas Land Conservancy
Dana Tarter, Tarrant County Extension
RJ Taylor, Connemara Conservancy
Steve Townsend, Tarrant County
Suzanne Tuttle, Fort Worth Nature Center
Joe Waller, Lake Worth Alliance
Randy Whiteman, Lakeside Town Administrator
Rachel Wiggins, NAS Joint Reserve Base
Doug Woodson, Hickman Investments
Valerie Yoakam Jay, Streams and Valleys
Richard Zavala, Fort Worth Parks & Rec

THE TRUST for Our LAND
Public Polling Results

Public Opinion Strategies completed a statistically significant poll in June, 2013 of 335 residents throughout the City of Fort Worth and areas near Lake Worth. The overall sample has a margin of error of + 5.35%.
Lake Worth is relatively undiscovered, as nearly half of residents have never visited the lake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few years</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you personally go to Lake Worth, the lake, not the town...?
Opinions on the area water quality are mixed, with the exception of Eagle Mountain Lake.

Thinking specifically about water in some local lakes and rivers. For each one please indicate how you would rate the overall health of the water in that particular river or lake. Would you grade it an A, B, C, D, or F, with an A grade being excellent and F being poor?
Despite rarely visiting the lake, voters see it as important to the community and a great place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Total Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get to</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important to people in my community</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great place for recreation and relaxation</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A source of drinking water</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to thinking about Lake Worth, the lake, not the town – I'm going to read you a list of words and phrases. After you hear each one, please tell me how well you think it describes Lake Worth - very well, somewhat well, not very well or not at all well.
Voters would like to see protected natural areas, trails, and public parks around Lake Worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected natural areas with some public access</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails and public parks, like at White Rock Lake in Dallas</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family neighborhoods</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town squares like Granbury's historic downtown square</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More walkable, compact districts like Fort Worth's West Seventh Urban Village</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants on the lakeshore</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centers like Southlake Town Square in Southlake</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use neighborhoods with a variety of buildings and activities</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, lodges, resorts and retreats</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to read you some descriptions of some different types of development and different features that could be in the area around Lake Worth. After I read each one, please tell me if you would support or oppose that particular feature being included in the plans for the area around Lake Worth.
Maintaining and protecting the quality of the area’s drinking water is seen as extremely important.

- Maintaining the quality of our drinking water: 65% Extremely Important, 98% Very Important
- Protecting drinking water sources and water quality: 61% Extremely Important, 98% Very Important
In fact, four-in-five city residents say they would support funding to acquire lands to protect water.

Total Favor 82%
Total Oppose 14%

Strongly Favor 49%
Somewhat Favor 33%
Don't Know 5%
Strongly Oppose 5%
Somewhat Oppose 8%

* Asked only in City of Fort Worth (N = 311)

As you may know, from time to time, the city issues general obligation bonds to fund a variety of needs. Would you favor or oppose a general obligation bond where the funds would be used to acquire lands to protect drinking water sources and water quality?
Priority Lands Analysis: Greenprint Mapping
Technical Advisory Teams

**TAT 1: Improve Water Quality and Quantity**
- Brett McGuire – City of Lake Worth
- Clair Davis – Fort Worth, Flood Plains
- Eric Fladager – Fort Worth, Planning
- Ranjan Muttiah – Fort Worth, Stormwater
- Paul Bounds – Fort Worth, Water
- Rachel Wiggins – NAS Joint Reserve Base
- Tracy Michel – NCTCOG
- Kyle Wright – NRCS
- George Conley – Parker County
- Alice Moore – Tarrant County
- Mark Ernst – Tarrant Regional Water District
- Tina Hendon – Tarrant Regional Water District
- Bill Fox – Texas AgriLife
- Ken Klaveness – Trinity Waters
- Lou Brewer – Tarrant County Public Health

**TAT 2: Provide Recreation**
- Randy Whiteman – City of Lakeside
- Brett McGuire – City of Lake Worth
- Clair Davis – Fort Worth, Flood Plains
- Nikki Sopchak – Fort Worth, Parks & Community Services
- Eric Seebock – Fort Worth, Parks & Community Services
- Paul Bounds – Fort Worth, Water
- Suzanne Tuttle – Fort Worth Nature Center
- Rachel Wiggins – NAS Joint Reserve Base
- Kyle Wright – NRCS
- Tracy Michel – NCTCOG
- Alice Moore – Tarrant County
- Lou Brewer – Tarrant County Public Health
Relative Weighting by Function

Nutrient uptake
- Riparian vegetation: 20%
- Wetlands: 13%

Erosion prevention
- Steep Stream banks: 11%
- Erodible Soils: 11%
- Steep slopes: 11%

Multiple Benefits
- Canopy Cover: 15%
- Native Vegetation: 4%
- Floodplains and Buffers: 15%

Wetlands: 13%

Multiple Benefits
- Canopy Cover: 15%
- Native Vegetation: 4%
- Floodplains and Buffers: 15%
Stewardship Opportunities

Stewardship Opportunities for Agricultural Land Uses

Stewardship Opportunities Existing and Future Development
Relative Weighting based on Outdoor Recreation Preferences Survey
June 2013

- Gaps in Pedestrian-Accessible Lakeshore: 14%
- Fitness Zone Priority Neighborhoods: 14%
- Wildlife Viewing: 12%
- Opportunities for Shoreline Fishing: 12%
- Scenic Views from Lake Worth Parks: 12%
- Suitable Locations for Camping: 9%
- Recreation Opportunities Close to Lake Worth: 8%
- Opportunities for Lakeshore Non-Motorized Boat Access: 7%
- Gaps in Lakeshore Motorized Boat Access: 7%
- Planned Parking Improvements: 2%
- Planned Playground Improvements: 2%
Connectivity Needs and Opportunities

Connectivity Needs (40%)
- Population density
- Planned developments
- % Children under age of 19
- % Low income households
- Connections to schools
- Connections to bus stops
- Connections to residential areas
- Connections to places of worship

Connectivity Opportunities (60%)
- Existing parks
- Vacant lands
- Undeveloped riparian corridors
- Floodplains
- East / west road corridors
Strategic Implementation and Action Plan Ideas
Action Plan Categories

- Raise funds to support action plan steps.
- Start a voluntary open space preservation program.
- Gather more information to understand and address water quality problems.
- Develop or enhance local government programs/activities.
- Provide education and publicity.
- Create landowner incentives.
- Undertake additional planning and evaluation.
- Regulate for improved water quality outcomes.
Fiscal Impact and Conservation Finance Studies
Fiscal Impact Study Findings

- Market value premium for parks is 5%. Marginal increase in market value attributable to parks: Lake Worth Greenprint Study Area: $6.95 million (City of Fort Worth: $260 million).
- Additional property tax revenue attributable to parks annually. Lake Worth Greenprint Study Area: $144,000 (City of Fort Worth: $5.82 million)
- Direct recreational use by residents: Many residents visit parks or public open spaces at least once a year: 6.23 million visits annually. $16.1 million in value
- Improved health of area residents: Health costs savings of $329 to $658 for those who exercise regularly. Health care cost savings: $13.9 million
Funding Mechanisms

Local Public Finance Options in Texas for Watershed Protection & Parks

- Bonds (90 of the 99 measures)
- Sales Tax (9 measures)
- Property Tax
- Parkland Dedication / In-Lieu Fees
- User Fees / Utility Rates
- Oil & Gas Lease Revenue
- Tax Increment Financing
- State Conservation Programs
- Federal Funding

THE TRUST for Our LAND
Potential Bond Issue

### Fort Worth Bond Financing Costs

Assumes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.  
2014 Net Taxable Value = $41,442,385,142

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Cost/Ave. Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>$2,407,278</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>$4,012,129</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>$5,616,931</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>$8,024,259</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>$12,036,536</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $95,559.

### Lake Worth Bond Financing Costs

Assumes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.  
2014 Net Taxable Value = $348,043,641

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Cost/Ave. Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$80,243</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>$160,486</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>$240,728</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$401,213</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>$561,698</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $57,005.

### Lakeside Bond Financing Costs

Assumes a 20-year bond issue at 5.0% interest rate.  
2014 Net Taxable Value = $100,200,066

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Issue</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Tax Increase</th>
<th>Cost/Ave. Household*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$80,243</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$160,486</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$240,728</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$401,213</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$802,433</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on average taxable value of single-family residence of $154,832.
Property Tax

- Can be used both for acquisition and maintenance purposes
- Funding level may be altered or eliminated based on annual budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Current M &amp; O Rate</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity</th>
<th>Maximum @ $20/Avg Home Tax Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>0.6759</td>
<td>0.1241</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>$8,702,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>0.14804</td>
<td>0.65196</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$125,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>0.37926</td>
<td>0.42074</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>$13,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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