

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
FEBRUARY 5, 2004**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the Marsac Municipal Building City Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, February 5, 2004.

AGENDA

1:00 p.m. New council member orientation – Marsac Building departments

Closed Session – Executive Office Conference Room

3:00 p.m. Personnel and property

Work Session – City Council Chambers

4:30 p.m. Neighborhood Parks Subcommittee recommendation

5:00 p.m. Recreation Complex Task Force recommendations

5:30 p.m. Legislative update

5:45 p.m. Council questions/comments

6:00 p.m. Public input

No regular meeting

A majority of City Council members may meet socially after the meeting. If so the location will be announced by the Mayor. City business will not be conducted.

Posted: 02/02/04
see: parkcity.org

Note: This future meeting schedule is TENTATIVE and subject to change.
PARK CITY COUNCIL TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

February 2004

- 12 Closed – personnel 2 hours - property
Legislative update
Award of contract for Olympic Legacy Project
Water agreement – WSD meeting
- 19 Legislative update
Public Safety – feasibility study
Grant of open space easement from Iron Mountain Associates to Park City
Municipal Corporation (also WSD)
Recommendations on City-owned buildings
Interviews – Police Complaint Review Committee
- 26 **Jan gone**
No meeting

March 2004

- 4 **Jan gone**
Appointments - Police Complaint Review Committee
LMC amendments - work and public hearing
Award of contract for upper Park Avenue reconstruction project
- 11 MFL – PC Cycling Fest
- 18
- 25

April 2004

- 1
- 8 **No meeting**
- 15
- 22
- 29

May 2004

- 6 Tentative budget - work
- 13 Budget public hearing
- 20 Budget public hearing
- 27 Budget public hearing

June 2004

- 3 Resolution adopting tentative budget
- 10 **No meeting**
- 17 Budget public hearing
Resolution adopting final budget (no tax increase)
- 24

July 2004

1
8
15
22
29

August 2004

5
12 Resolution adopting final budget (tax increase)
19
26

- Art parks - public hearing/action
- Arts Council Request – Miners Hospital (public service contract)

City Council Staff Report

Author: Ken Fisher
Subject: Prospector Neighborhood Parks
Date: January 23, 2004
Type of Item: Work Session



Recreation & Library
Department

Summary Recommendations:

Approve the recommendation made by the Recreation Advisory Board (RAB) to hire a park designer for the Prospector Park and the new park on the corner of Comstock and Sidewinder.

Description:

Topic: Development of neighborhood parks in Prospector

Background:

The RAB Neighborhood Parks Subcommittee appeared before City Council in September 2003 to receive direction on developing neighborhood parks (see Attachment 1: Staff Report on City & Neighborhood Parks). The RAB received direction from Council on what methods the RAB should use to notify the public about the development of the parks. The goal of the public input was to determine what amenities the neighborhood would like to have considered for their parks. Council also gave direction to the RAB to begin the process with the existing Prospector Park as well as the city owned lot on the corner of Comstock and Sidewinder. Council and the RAB agreed that Prospector was the best place to begin the development of neighborhood parks because of the ease of doing improvements to the existing park and because of the city owned vacant lot on the corner of Comstock & Sidewinder.

The methods used to inform the residents and gather the input are outlined below:

- Created a flyer that was mailed to all members of the Prospector Home Owners Association. The flyer gave the date, time, location and the reason for the public input meeting as well as informed them that input could be given through the recreation website.
- Public Service Announcements on KPCW and TV8 announcing the date, time, location and the reason for the public input meeting.
- Appearances on KPCW news shows and TV 8 to talk about the excitement of developing these parks and that the neighborhood will have the opportunity to decide what amenities go into each park.
- Use the Recreation website to publicize the meeting as well as to take input from those unable to attend.

- Hold the public input meeting in the prospector neighborhood. The input would last from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. to cover residents that work in the evening as well as those that work during the day.
- To determine resident's priority for the neighborhood park amenities, RAB developed a survey that had a list of items that the residents can allocate points to. For example each household would have 100 points to allocate to park amenities. How they allocated the money is up to them. They could spend \$100 on one item or \$5 on 20 items.
- All information was in Spanish and English.

Public input was held on January 5, 2004 at the Prospector Marriott from 4 to 7 p.m. Citizens that could not attend the meeting could complete a survey online thru January 18.

Analysis

The RAB Neighborhood Park Subcommittee had 36 surveys completed by Prospector residents. Of the 36, 21 attended the public input and the rest were completed online. Below are the ranking of the amenities for each park based on the allocation of the 100 points. See Attachment 2 for complete survey results.

<u>Prospector Park</u>	Points	<u>New Park</u>	
Points			
Open Grass Area	425	Open Grass Area	330
Playground Equipment	360	Playground Equipment	310
Shade Pavilion	325	Dog Park	250
Restrooms	298	Shade Trees	230
Shade Trees	275	Xeriscaping	224
Basketball Hoop	275	Restrooms	195
Climbing Boulders	245	Basketball Hoops	190
Picnic Tables	228	Community Gardens	180
Volleyball	165	Shade Pavilion	165
Swings	145	Climbing Boulders	150
Drinking Fountain	139	Horseshoe Pits	
125			
Dog Park	125	Drinking Fountain	107
Horseshoe Pits	70	Picnic Tables	105
Xeriscaping	70	Volleyball	80
Community Gardens	60	Swings	55
Tetherball	45	BBQ Pits	55
BBQ Pits	45	Hard Surface Game Ct.	55
Hard Surface Game Ct.	35	Tetherball	35

The RAB will use the above results to help determine what amenities are developed at each park. The RAB would like Council direction on the following questions:

- Restrooms ranked very high on the Prospector Park survey and somewhat high for the New Park. **Would Council like to see restrooms developed at Prospector Park?** The RAB believes it would be appropriate to have permanent restrooms at the Prospector Park since they would serve park and rail trail users. The size of the lot for the New Park may prohibit the development of restrooms and a portable toilet may be the best option.
- At the New Park, the development of a Dog Park ranked just below playground equipment and open grass area on the priority list. **Does Council want to pursue the development of a dog park at this location?** The RAB believes that given the size and location of the park that a dog park would be best developed elsewhere. The RAB envisions this park being for more passive activities than the existing Prospector Park.
- **Is Council comfortable having staff move forward with the hiring of a Park Designer for the two parks?** The next step for the development of the neighborhood parks is to hire a design firm to work with the RAB neighborhood park subcommittee and staff to see what amenities are appropriate at each location and how they would be designed. Staff estimates that the design contract for conceptual design will not exceed \$10,000 and therefore formal Council approval will not be needed. Council will, however, need to pass a Reimbursement Resolution before any bond proceed funds can be spent (see **Significant Impacts** section below). If Council is comfortable moving forward with the hiring of a park designer the RAB will take the completed conceptual design back to the neighborhood for comments and input. Once this is complete it will be taken to the Planning Commission for approval. Jim Barth, a member of the Planning Commission attended the last RAB neighborhood park subcommittee meeting on January 20, 2004. Jim will keep the Planning Commission informed on the park planning process so that any issues they have can be addressed before seeking their approval on the two parks.
- **Does Council want to set a tentative budget for the overall Prospector Park improvements prior to design?** It is estimated by staff to cost approximately \$250,000 to build restrooms, shade pavilion, half court basketball and replace the playground equipment at the existing Prospector Park. Staff estimates that the new park could be developed with open grass, shade trees, climbing boulders and benches for \$150,000.
- The RAB would like to continue with the development of neighborhood parks in the community. Other locations that have been identified by the RAB are at the Racquet Club, The Wisniewski/Coleman parcel on the top of Main Street and the old sewer treatment site. These are listed from least to most complex in developing. **Is Council comfortable with the RAB pursuing public input on the Racquet Club site?** Park Meadows currently does not

have a neighborhood park and the area to the north of the Racquet Club parking lot could be developed into a small neighborhood park.

Department Review: The City Manager, Recreation & Library Department, RAB, Budget & Grants and the City's Park Planner have reviewed this report.

Alternatives:

Approve the Request:

Voters approved a \$4 million bond in 2001 for Ice, Park improvements and Neighborhood Parks. By approving the recommendations made by the RAB on hiring a park designer it will allow for the redevelopment of Prospector Park along with the development of new park facilities on the corner of Comstock & Sidewinder.

Deny the Request:

Send the RAB back to reevaluate part or all of their recommendations on neighborhood parks.

Continue the Item:

Ask for more information from the RAB before forwarding any recommendations on neighborhood parks.

Do Nothing:

Take no action, which would mean all facilities stay status quo.

Significant Impacts:

Voters passed a \$4 million bond in 2001 for the development of ice, neighborhood parks and park improvements. To date, no bond proceeds have been spent and the RAB wants to move forward with developing neighborhood parks in the community. However, before the City can expend any bond proceeds, City Council will need to pass a Reimbursement Resolution. The resolution will authorize the City to encumber and subsequently reimburse future bond proceeds. With Council approval, the Budget, Debt, and Grants Department will present a resolution to be considered in the next few weeks.

The RAB has completed taking public input on the development of neighborhood parks in prospector and is eager to take the next step of designing the park and facilities. By RAB taking the next step of hiring a park designer, the Prospector neighborhood will see a redeveloped Prospector Park as well as the development of a new park that would meet the needs of the neighborhood.

Consequences of not taking the recommended action:

Further delay the opportunity to develop neighborhood parks.

Recommendation:

Approve the recommendations made by the Recreation Advisory Board (RAB) to hire a park designer for the Prospector Park and the park on the corner of Comstock and Sidewinder.

City Council Staff Report

Author: Ken Fisher
Subject: City Park & Neighborhood Parks
Date: September 30, 2003
Type of Item: Work Session



Recreation & Library
Department

Summary Recommendations: Provide direction on the recommendations made by the Recreation Advisory Board (RAB) on the project priority list for City Park as well as provide direction on the RAB ideas for receiving public input on neighborhood parks.

Description:

A. Topic: Provide direction on the recommendations made by the RAB on City Park and neighborhood parks.

B. Background:

The RAB City Park & Neighborhood Parks Subcommittee appeared before City Council during questions and comments on September 11, 2003 to receive feedback and further direction on City Park & neighborhood parks. Council asked the RAB to come back with a project priority list for City Park as well as a cost estimate for each phase. For neighborhood parks, RAB was asked to come up with a plan for receiving public input on what items might go in each neighborhood park as well as a priority list for neighborhood park development.

C. Analysis: City Park

The RAB City Park Subcommittee met on September 22, 2003 and came up with the following project priority list for City Park. The priority list was based on both the ease of the project as well as the greatest need.

1. Expand and replace playground equipment in City Park: The current playground equipment in the tot lot dates back to the early 80's when the park was first constructed. The present equipment does not meet current safety regulations for playground equipment. For example the swings and tire swing are too close together and the bars on top of the slide are too far apart. The new playground equipment would target ages 3 to 12. The height of the equipment could be increased from 6 to 8 feet if the sand is replaced with wood chips. This would make the park more appealing to a wider range of kids. The cost to upgrade the equipment and replace the sand surface with wood chips would be approximately \$39,600.

Through Great Western Park & Playground, Park City Recreation has applied for a Budget Extension Grant for City Park in the amount \$17,529. If awarded the grant, Park City would have 45 days to accept or decline the offer. The grant would lower

the price to approximately \$22,029. This does not include the cost of expanding the fence, tot lot, removing the old equipment or installing the new playground equipment. The cost to do so is estimated to be \$12,000.

Targeted Project Completion: Fall 2003/Spring 2004

2. Expand the current skate park: Due to the success of the current skate park and the need to enlarge the current street course to alleviate overcrowding the RAB recommends expanding the skateboard park to include the vacant area to the north of the skate park. There has been discussion on creating a beginner skate area but the RAB would prefer to engage the community in public input before deciding what amenities the additional skate area would have. The expansion would include a shade area, as currently there is no shade at the facility. The cost to add approximately 8,000 square feet of skating would be \$240,000 assuming the same quality and surface as the current park. This includes the fencing, burming and landscaping of the area. Before any work is done on the skate park expansion the status and or a new location for the mucking and drilling event will be determined. The basketball court that was originally proposed to go in this location will remain in its current location behind the Recreation Building. The site is not large enough to build a full size court. Staff would like to research other possible locations in the community or park to develop an outdoor basketball facility. **Targeted Project Completion: Summer 2004**

3. Curb & Gutter the north end of City Park: The RAB recommends completing the curb and gutter along the west side of the north end of the park per the 1999 City Park Master Plan. The estimated total cost would be \$205,000. **Targeted Project Completion: Fall 2004**

Currently there is \$474,500 in the City Park Phase 2 account that would be used to fund the recommended improvements. The current project list comes to approximately \$496,600 without figuring in the playground equipment grant. If Council is comfortable proceeding, staff will solicit proposals and return to Council for formal contract approval.

Neighborhood Parks

The RAB Neighborhood Park Subcommittee met on September 22, 2003 and came up with the following ideas for receiving public input on what should go into each neighborhood park. The RAB recommends the following:

- Create a door hangtag that would go to each house in the neighborhood. The hangtag would give the date, time, location and the reason for the public input meeting.
- Public Service Announcements with local media outlets (KPCW, The Park Record and TV8) announcing the date, time, location and the reason for the public input meeting.
- Appearances on KPCW & TV 8 news shows to talk about the exciting opportunity for members of neighborhoods to take part in choosing amenities and developing their local parks.

- Use the City and Recreation website to publicize the meeting as well as to take input from those unable to attend.
- Hold the public input meeting in each neighborhood if possible. The input would last from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. to cover residents that work in the evening as well as those that work during the day. If residents are unable to attend they could still give input through the city website and at city buildings.
- To determine resident's priorities for the neighborhood park amenities, RAB recommends having a list of items that the residents can allocate money to. For example each household would have \$100 to spend on park amenities. How they allocate the money is up to them. They could spend \$100 on one item or \$5 on 20 items. The various amenities would be displayed so residents would know what they are buying with the \$100. The list would include items from the 5 features to be considered for each park (play area, grass, seating, landscaping and art). A list of these items would be playgrounds, horseshoe pits, tetherball, climbing boulders, basketball, volleyball, water feature, tennis, grass area for activities, benches, tables, BBQ pit, picnic pavilion, xeriscaping, trees for shade, gardening area and passive as well as interactive art (you can climb on it).
- All information would be in Spanish and English.

The RAB recommends that the first neighborhood for public input would be Prospector because of the ease of doing improvements at the existing Prospector Park as well as the potential to develop a park on the vacant lot the city owns on Sidewinder Drive. Once the public input process is complete, the RAB and staff would create a proposal and take it back to the neighborhood.

Department Review: The City Manager, Recreation & Library Department, RAB, and the City's Parks Planner have reviewed this report.

Alternatives:

A. Approve the Request:

Providing positive direction regarding the recommendations made by the RAB on the project priority list for City Park as well as the ideas for gathering public input on neighborhood parks, the redevelopment of City Park could occur along with the development of new neighborhood parks in the community.

B. Deny the Request:

Send the RAB back to reevaluate part or all of their recommendations on City & neighborhood parks.

C. Continue the Item:

Ask for more information from the RAB before forwarding any recommendations on City & neighborhood parks.

D. Do Nothing:

Take no action, which would mean all facilities stay status quo.

Significant Impacts:

By moving forward with the recommendations on City Park, the playground equipment would be brought up to current code and ADA access standards along with improving the playground experience for the youth of the community. Expanding the current skate park facility would meet the current demand for a larger facility as well as complete an area in the middle of the park that has been an “eye sore” since the skate park was constructed. Completing the curb & gutter along the northwest boundary of the park will finish this section of the park and allow the City Park RAB Subcommittee to focus on other areas of the park. All these projects could be funded through the City Park Phase 2 account. If Council wanted to move forward with this account, the City Park Master Plan should be formally revised so it is clear that these funds will be used to expand the skate park, replace and expand the playground and finish the curb & gutter along the north end of the park.

Voters passed a \$2 million bond in 2001 for the development of neighborhood parks and park improvements. To date no funds have been spent from the 2001 bond proceeds for park improvements, and the RAB wants to move forward with developing neighborhood parks in the community as per Council’s direction. The 2001 Bond language requires that funds be used for park improvements on existing City land rather than for acquisition. Please see attached table. RAB has outlined a plan for taking public input as well as which neighborhood they would first like to engage in the process. By allowing RAB to take the next step, the Prospector neighborhood would see a redeveloped Prospector Park along with the development of a new Park that would meet the needs of the neighborhood.

Consequences of not taking the recommended action:

Further delay the opportunity to develop neighborhood parks and delay any redevelopment of City Park.

Recommendation:

Provide further direction on the recommendations made by the Recreation Advisory Board (RAB) on the project priority list for City Park as well as provide direction on the RAB ideas for receiving public input on neighborhood parks.

Attachment 2: Prospector Neighborhood Survey Results

Do you currently use the developed "Prospector Park"? Yes – 32 No – 4

If Yes, how many times per week do you use the Park? Less than 2 times – 17
More than 3 times – 14

Do you have or care for children that will use the Parks? Yes – 24 No – 12

What are the ages of your children?

Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	15
Count	4	7	2	2	9	2	1	1	5	2	2	2	1

Prospector Park Points

Open Grass Area	425
Playground Equipment	360
Shade Pavilion	325
Restrooms	298
Shade Trees	275
Basketball Hoops	275
Climbing Boulders	245
Picnic Tables	228
Volleyball	165
Swings	145
Drinking Fountain	139

New Park

	Points
Open Grass Area	330
Playground Equipment	310
Dog Park	250
Xeriscaping	224
Shade Trees	230
Restrooms	195
Basketball Hoops	190
Community Gardens	180
Shade Pavilion	165
Climbing Boulders	150
Horseshoe Pits	125

Dog Park	125	Drinking Fountain	107
Horseshoe Pits	70	Picnic Tables	105
Xeriscaping	70	Volleyball	80
Community Gardens	60	Swings	55
Tetherball	45	BBQ Pits	55
BBQ Pits	45	Hard Surface Game Crt.	55
Hard Surface Game Crt.	35	Tetherball	35

Other Items of Interest

Dog Wash

Lawn Bowling

Bike Rack

Hose

Benches

Football/Soccer Goals

Comments

Any dog park is a waste of money until the Park City Police Department commits to controlling free roaming dogs. Please see Trailside Park as an example. The dog run goes empty; leash-less dogs run loose on the playground and defecate everywhere.

The single most child-friendly improvement Park City Municipal has implemented is the fence around City Park. It keeps the dogs out and the kids in. Could something similar be done in Prospector?

City Council Staff Report



Author: Colin Hilton
Subject: Review of recommendations of the
Task Force for a Outdoor Recreation
Complex at Quinn's Junction

Economic Development &
Capital Projects

Date: 2-5-04

Type of Item: Informational Update & Request for direction on Proposed
Next Steps

Summary Recommendation:

Review the findings of the 2003-2004 Task Force for an Outdoor Recreation Complex and provide Staff direction to proceed on the following:

- 1) Further pursue a wetland study and property survey in order to better prepare for future design steps.
- 2) Prepare a design RFP for the outdoor recreation complex. Have it ready to be sent out once the broader issues of the Quinn's Junction planning process become more clearly defined.
- 3) Begin preparation of an estimated operating and maintenance budget
- 4) Consider any budget allocations or amendments as a part of Spring 2004 City Budget Review.

Description:

Topic: Review of recommendations of the outdoor recreation complex

Background:

Beginning in November of 2003, a City Council sponsored task force was assembled to discuss the potential recreational use of City property located near the National Ability Center (NAC). A recently completed Quinn's Junction Master Planning effort began an effort to highlight this area with recreational uses.

City Staff and Council put together the following list of questions/items for the task force to respond to:

1. What sports & recreation components should go into this complex?
2. How many and of what type of recreation elements?
3. List of recommendations on how the complex should be managed and programmed. (To include a discussion on determining the right balance of meeting the needs of local users and that of hosting revenue producing tournaments.)

4. Produce a listing of suggested design features / general parameters before moving into a design stage.

The hope was that this task force would assist the City leadership in determining the initial scope and operating parameters of this concept. Through future design steps, more detailed input sessions would be set-up for additional interested individuals and organizations to have input.

The Task Force met four times over the course of 3 months to discuss & itemize a list of recommendations.

Analysis:

The full findings of the task force are outlined in the attached report.

During last year's CIP reprioritization, a total of \$428,571 was allocated to this project (\$128,571 of this from RAP tax funds). The overall project costs are estimated to be in the range of 5 to 7 million dollars, depending on the components selected through a more detailed design process.

The property deed from Florence Gillmor identifies the following "Acceptable Use" language:

"Recreation. To provide for limited recreational uses for the public, such as walking, biking, cross country skiing, horseback riding and other such activities as are consistent with the preservation and protection in perpetuity of the natural open space and conservation values (collectively the "Natural Values") of Parcel B: provided however, no portion of Parcel B shall be used for: (i) golfing; (ii) hunting, trapping, fishing or other taking of animal life, except in accordance with generally accepted conservation practices....."

"Agriculture"

"Public Access"

"Education. To promote and provide education to the public, and various educational groups or other segments of the public, especially in the areas of nature and science, and to promote and provide for scenic enjoyment, gathering and special community events"

"Resource Protection"

"Limited Additional Recreational Uses. To construct, develop, operate and maintain activities and facilities open or available to the public, or segments thereof, that would generally be considered recreational or athletic, including by way of illustration and not limitation, ice skating rinks and sheets, swimming pools, baseball, softball, football, and soccer fields, parks, playgrounds, and similar uses (but not including amusement parks, carnivals, and similar recreational activities involving significant development, machinery or mechanical devices), and buildings, structures, recreation centers, utilities, concession stands, incidental shops or stores

carrying primarily articles related to such activities, parking lots, restroom facilities, and other improvements”

The property identified by the task force encompasses approximately 60-80 usable acres, after wetland and elevation challenges are taken into consideration.

Department Review: This report has been reviewed by the City Manager’s office, Recreation Department, Planning Department, Special Events & Facilities Department, Budget Department., Legal Department and Public Works Department.

Alternatives:

Approve Staff’s recommendation

Modify in some way the suggested Staff recommendation

Deny approval to proceed with Staff’s recommendation

Significant Impacts / Consequences of not taking the recommended action:

If no action is taken, a further increase in field congestion for softball, soccer, and other field sports would be seen. Additionally, the City’s ability to further attract revenue producing tournaments and sporting events would be diminished or delayed.

Recommendation:

Review the findings of the 2003-2004 Task Force for an Outdoor Recreation Complex and provide Staff direction to proceed on the following:

- 1) Further pursue a wetland study and property survey in order to better prepare for future design steps.
- 2) Prepare a design RFP for the outdoor recreation complex. Have it ready to be sent out once the broader issues of the Quinn’s Junction planning process become more clearly defined.
- 3) Begin preparation of an estimated operating and maintenance budget
- 4) Consider any budget allocations or amendments as a part of Spring 2004 City Budget Review.

Attachment:

- a. Task Force Report

Recommendations of the Task Force for an Outdoor Recreation Complex at Quinn's Junction

Membership:

Kay Calvert
Jim Hier
Dave Staley
Rich Miller
Mike Guetschow
Meeche White
Bonnie Park
Shawn Casella
Jonathan Weidenhamer
Karen Yocum
Ken Fisher
Matt Twombly
Colin Hilton

Report written by Colin Hilton

Date: February 5, 2004

Recommendations of the 2003/2004 Task Force for an Outdoor Recreation Complex at Quinn's Junction

February 5, 2004

I. Summary of Task Force Purpose

The purpose of the task force was to assemble a representative group to discuss the potential recreational use of City property located near the National Ability Center (NAC). A recently completed Quinn's Junction Master Planning exercise began an effort to highlight this area with recreational uses.

City Council authorized staff to organize this task force to begin efforts to formally prepare a concept of what this complex might look like.

City Staff and Council put together the following list of questions/items for the task force to respond to:

1. What sports & recreation components should go into this complex?
2. How many and of what type of recreation elements?
3. List of recommendations on how the complex should be managed and programmed. (To include a discussion on determining the right balance of meeting the needs of local users and that of hosting revenue producing tournaments.)
4. Produce a listing of suggested design features / general parameters before moving into a design stage.

The hope was that this task force would assist the City leadership in determining the initial scope and operating parameters of this concept. Through future design steps, more detailed input sessions would be set-up for additional interested individuals and organizations to have input.

The Task Force met four times over the course of 3 months to discuss and itemize a list of recommendations. The following report reflects the discussions and recommendations given.

II. Meeting Topics / Ideas Generated

A. What Sports and Recreation Elements?

The task force first addressed what “sports and recreation” facilities should be placed in this facility. A suggestion was made to create a matrix that provided a summary existing sports fields/facilities in the City/Basin area; population standards by sport, reflecting the typical ratio’s of # of fields/facilities per current and future population projections.

Consistent with Council’s goal of regional collaboration, Park City and the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (SBSRD) jointly contracted with the

Existing Fields				Future Demand ²						
Facility Type	SBSRD [@]	Park City ¹	Combined		Total Needed ³ (existing+future demand)		SBSRD ³ (alone)	Park City ³ (alone)	Total ³ (alone)	Total New Demand ³ (w/combined effort)
Soccer, lax, rugby	6	3	9		23		10	7	17	14
Baseball / Softball	3	6	9		23		12	6	18	14
Volleyball (sand)	4	4	8		16		0	8	8	8
Tennis	0	13	13		20		6	9	15	7
Basketball(outdoor)	1	1	2		8		3	3	6	6
Ice Rink	0	0	0		1		1	1	2	1
Indoor Rec Center	0	0	0		1		1	1	2	1

Wikstrom Group in 2002 to address regional recreation facility needs. Using data from this independent report, current facilities and facility demand projections are as follows:

* All info based on Options for Recreation Facilities & Services – Wikstrom Economic & Planning Consultants, Inc. 2002

@ SBSRD – Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District

1. School District fields are also counted in the Park City numbers
2. Future demands are for the year 2010. They are based on Mountain Resort Level of Service Standards (see below), future population estimates of 12,000 for Park City and 33,000 for the Basin, and available information on actual usage and demand.
3. Based on future demands, if SBSRD and Park City work independently to meet demands, they will each have to build more facilities than if they combine their efforts. Total New Demand indicates total needed community wide with a combined effort - ie, only one ice rink is necessary for the whole community.

Standards for Level of Service	Mountain Resort Level	National Level
Soccer fields	1 field/ 2000 residents	1/10000
Baseball	1/15000	1/15000
Softball	1/3000	1/5000
Tennis	1/1500	1/2000
Lax/Rugby	1/6000	1/6000
Basketball	1/2000	1/2000

Analysis of the Wikstrom Data

Membership in the task force was a bit perplexed at some of the service standard ratios and subsequent “New Demand” figures. It was felt that the baseball/softball population demand ratio seemed a bit high for what is really being “felt” in the current league happenings. The sentiment is that the soccer/lacrosse/rugby demand is on-target, but that there is not a crushing demand for the baseball/softball facilities as the Wikstrom data suggests. The data also does not take into account tournament and event needs.

Additionally, a few new facilities were added since the report was compiled. A new softball field was added at Treasure Mountain Middle School and at SBSRD’s Willow Creek Complex (3) soccer fields, (2) volleyball courts, (2) tennis, and (1) basketball court are soon coming online.

Our projections and analysis show a demand for (11) more soccer/lacrosse/rugby fields plus (5) additional softball fields for the entire region.

B. Discussion on Sports to go into this facility:

The task force had the following thoughts:

- Softball – developing 2-3 additional fields to satisfy local resident use is projected to meet current demand. Building a total of 3-5 fields in this facility would also address tournament use from the growing demands of events like the Triple Crown Sports World Series.
- Multi-purpose field space for soccer, lacrosse, rugby, etc. – build as many as the space allows. Perhaps as many as 4-5 dependent on space availability and field sizes.
- A discussion was had about whether this facility should either
 1. Try to do a whole lot of different recreation and sport elements in this one location or
 2. Concentrate on a few sports and do them really well.The latter was the group’s preference.
- Beyond outdoor field needs, the group discussed other uses of the facility. Discussion was had on whether the following should be incorporated into the new facility:
 - playground
 - trailhead parking / trail connections
 - use of the parking areas for a PC park-n-ride lot for large City events
 - BMX or Bike park (approx. 2-5 acres)
 - Frisbee golf

- Tennis courts
- Basketball courts
- Volleyball courts

Only the playground, trailhead parking, possible bike park and use of the facility parking for in-town park-n-ride purpose were desired to be added to softball and rectangular field space sports. As the group pondered the best course of action of the varying “other needs,” questions arose regarding the possibility of property at “Richardson Flats” being available. Richardson Flats could certainly accommodate a much larger footprint of recreational needs, but much is unknown as to the issues of availability (this is not City property), timing (could discussions about this site reach agreements within 3-5 years?), and soils concerns. The group was intrigued as to the possibilities of Richardson Flats, but was soon in agreement that the cumulative recreational field needs were so great that perhaps both locations would someday be developed with recreational purposes. Given the fact that the City currently owns property on the northwest quadrant of Quinn’s Junction and is desiring to develop it as a recreation complex, made the group suggest that the prudent move was develop this site with earnest. What the group didn’t recommend was trying to cram everything into this location.

Other comments about the site specific conditions of the City-owned property include a suggestion that a non-lighted “buffer” field or function be placed adjacent to the NAC property. Additionally, use of synthetic field turf should go on at least one, perhaps two rectangular fields. This added feature would allow extended use periods in early spring and late fall.

Additionally, the group felt that a “bike park” could and should be looked at in the uneven and rolling terrain of the identified city-owned property.

C. Tournament Use of the Facility

The task force felt that any tournament plans would not adversely affect the local residents regular use of the facility. The timing of soccer tournaments and softball events typically would not conflict with the busy times of the local residents use. Therefore, the task force viewed the tournament impacts as a very positive introduction of facility design features that wouldn’t necessarily be introduced if the sole focus was for locals resident use.

D. Summary of suggested design features / general parameters

- a. Suggested Sports & Number of fields:
 - Softball
 - 3-5 fields
 - Rectangular Field Sports (Soccer / Lacrosse / rugby)
 - As many as space allows (minimum of 4 full size)
- b. Other amenities: playground, possible bike park, trailhead parking, park-n-ride lot

- c. Fencing – limited interior; suggested permanent surrounding facility perimeter.
- d. Lighting – Minimum of 2 softball fields, 2 rectangular fields – create usage policy
- e. Concessions – per traditional needs
- f. Restrooms – sized to serve all areas (regular use)
- g. Maintenance Facilities – provide adequate space for equipment & personnel needs

III. Summary of Recommendations

1. Develop the City property as a recreation complex with the following components:
 - a. 3-5 softball fields & minimally 4 full size rectangular fields plus several youth sized as space permits
 - b. Provide for appropriate support facilities: Maintenance / Equipment building, appropriate office space for those functions running and maintaining the facility, concession stands, restrooms, etc.
 - c. Design space for a playground, possible bike park, trailhead parking, and parking lots that could double as park-n-ride lots for in-town events.
 - d. Design the softball fields in a way that allows for their combined outfields to have the occasional rectangular field use. If possible, have at least two of the home plate areas originating from the same area allowing for mingling by four teams in that area.
 - e. Create a consistent lighting policy that allows this complex to be used in the evenings – but under a regulated system that finds the right balance of desires and concerns of the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - f. Provide synthetic turf for up to 2 rectangular fields to allow for expanded seasonal use.
 - g. Orientate a main rectangular field for accommodating 3,000-5,000 spectators
 - h. Permanently fence around the perimeter to counteract vandalism and field damage. Do very little internal permanent fencing to allow for increased flexibility in green space usage.
2. Design the facility with more than local resident use in mind. Create design elements that promote use of the facility as a tournament and community-oriented event site.
3. Don't "crowd" the facility with too many desired recreational elements. Concentrate on providing a really good amenity for a few sport needs rather than trying to put all known long term needs into this complex.
4. Coordinate the design in such a way that recognizes and complements both current and future anticipated development in the area.

5. Promote additional public interest and involvement in the subsequent detailed design and planning process.

If the current City Council also concurs on the appropriateness of the concepts put forward, it is strongly recommended by the task force members that these be acted upon in a swift, action-oriented way.