



SNYDERVILLE BASIN SPECIAL RECREATION DISTRICT PARKS, TRAILS AND RECREATION CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background. The Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (“SBSRD”) was formed in February 1993 for the purpose of serving the recreational needs of Basin residents in the unincorporated area surrounding Park City (Resolution 93-2). The 2006 Parks, Trails and Recreation Capital Facilities Plan is intended to amend, restate and supersede the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District Community Parks Capital Facilities Plan adopted on April 6, 1998. This Community Parks, Recreation and Trails Capital Facilities Plan deals exclusively with *community* recreation facilities, defined as those facilities that meet the SBSRD objectives of providing large public gathering places for residents and visitors and a community-wide non-motorized trail system as set forth in the detail of the Snyderville Basin Recreation and Trails Master Plan.

A key addition to this Capital Facilities Plan is the Community Trails component. The CFP also evaluates the demands placed on facilities by not only residential development, but also increased commercial and lodging development.¹

Demand Factors. As of 2005, there are approximately 7,715 dwelling units² in the Snyderville Basin, with an estimated population of 22,374 persons.³ Within the next 15-year planning horizon, it is anticipated that there will be 12,328 dwelling units with a population of 35,754 persons.

Current non-residential (including commercial) development includes 3,345,979 square feet of retail, office, industrial and public/institutional space. Based on existing zoning, it is anticipated that non-residential development (not including lodging) will eventually reach 6,280,876 square feet. In addition, there are roughly 1,405,971 square feet of lodging in the Basin (988 lodging units), with an anticipated additional 656,708 square feet of future development, for a total of 2,062,679 square feet.

Based on existing commercial square footage (3,345,979 sf), current employment is estimated at 7,538 employees (not including lodging). This equates to roughly 444 commercial square feet per employee ($3,345,979 \div 7,538 = 444$).

Capital Facilities. In order to maintain the level of service identified in the Recreation and Trails Master Plan, and meet the demand placed on existing facilities by new development, the SBSRD has identified a need for the following parks and recreation

¹ Commercial development is defined as retail, office, industrial and miscellaneous non-institutional commercial uses. Commercial lodging is defined as single-owner non-condominium, multi-unit transient hotels and similar uses.

² Source: Summit County Unit Statistics, August 2005.

³ Average household size is 2.9 persons per household. Source: United States Census 2000, North Snyderville, South Snyderville and Summit Park CDP weighted averages of household sizes by tenure.



facilities. Future facilities may be modified from time to time in order to more accurately reflect community desires, trends in sports (i.e., rapidly-growing sports such as lacrosse), and opportunities for shared facility development with Park City.

PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES						
2005 Needs Assessment	Desired Level of Service	Current Inventory (a)	Number Needed to Meet Mtn Rec Std Currently (b)	Current Additional Need - based on current Mtn Rec Std ("Deficiency") (c) c = b - a	Future Additional Need (including current deficiency) (d)	Estimated Facilities in 2020 (desired LOS) (e) e = a + d
Indoor Field	2 per district	1	1	0	1	2
**Ice Rink	2 per district	1	1	0	1	2
**Swimming Facility	3 per district	2	2	0	1	3
Playgrounds	1 per 5,000	4	4	0	3	7
Tennis Courts – Outdoor	1 per 4,000	2	6	4	7	9
Picnic Areas	1 per 2,500	4	9	5	10	14
Sports Fields						
Soccer	1 per 2,000	6	11	5	12	18
Softball/LL	1 per 3,000	3	7	4	9	12
**Baseball	1 per 15,000	0	1	1	2	2
Lacrosse/Rugby/Football	1 per 6,000	1	4	3	5	6
**Artificial Turf Outdoor	2 per district	0	1	1	1	2
Jogging Track	1 per 10,000	1	2	1	3	4
Basketball Courts – Outdoor	1 per 2,500	2	9	7	12	14
Gymnasium Space/Indoor Basketball	1 per 5,000	0	3	3	7	7
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	1 per 3,500	2	6	4	8	10
Rock Climbing Wall	1 per district	0	1	1	1	1
Volleyball – Outdoor	1 per 3000	6	7	1	6	12
Dog Park	1 per 15,000	1	1	0	1	2
**Skateboard Park	2 per district	0	1	1	1	2
**Indicates shared facilities with Park City School/Park City Municipal						

Trail facilities will need to increase by 106 natural surface miles, six soft surface miles and 53 hard surface miles in order to complete the loop system desired by the community and to meet the demands of new growth. In addition, the SBSRD has planned for additional trailheads, bridges, boardwalks and offgrade crossings as shown on the Trails Map in Appendix A of this report.

TRAIL FACILITY NEEDS			
Trail Description	Current Miles	Trail Miles at Buildout	Increase in Trail Miles
Natural Surface Trails	71	177	106
Soft Surface Urban Trails	5.27	11.27	6



TRAIL FACILITY NEEDS			
Trail Description	Current Miles	Trail Miles at Buildout	Increase in Trail Miles
Hard Surface Trails	9.08	62.08	53

Source: SBSRD

On May 14, 2003, the Summit County Commission established the entity BOSAC for the purpose of creating a consortium of interests and agencies to review, prioritize and recommend potential recreational open space purchases utilizing land acquisition funds held by SBSRD. The Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District has allocated \$3 million of 2001 General Obligation Bond monies for the purpose of recreational open space acquisition.

Investment by Existing Community. The existing community has made a significant investment in parks, recreation and trail facilities as summarized below.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT INVESTMENT	
\$2005	
Buildings	\$8,217,900
Park Improvements	\$7,093,679
Park Land (inc. Fieldhouse land)	\$11,352,525
Ice Rink Contribution	\$2,000,000
Trails, Boardwalks & Bridges	\$3,454,229
Trail Facilities	\$1,478,802
Trails ROW	\$107,000
TOTAL	\$33,704,135

Future Estimated Capital Facility Investment. The SBSRD will need to plan for \$6.2 million in park and recreation facility costs, not including costs for indoor gyms, tracks and fields. The cost of these indoor facilities will be highly dependent on collocation with other facilities, shared uses, etc., and can best be determined as development opportunities arise. In addition, the SBSRD will need to plan for roughly \$7.5 million for park land and nearly \$22 million for trails, not including land for trails. In the past, trail land has been acquired as a condition of development approval and it is anticipated that this will continue in the future. Therefore, costs for trail land have not been included in this analysis. In addition to the roughly \$35 million in future costs outlined in this report, the SBSRD will also need to plan for the acquisition of open space (undetermined cost). With land costs escalating rapidly in the Snyderville Basin and with construction costs on the rise, the SBSRD will need to regularly review and update the costs outlined in this report.

Financing of Facilities. The Recreation District has been extremely responsible in its development of existing facilities and has pursued opportunities for shared use of facilities, public/private partnerships and grant monies whenever appropriate. In the future, the SBSRD will need to pursue a variety of financing options including, but not



limited to, impact fees, grants, bonding, public/private partnerships, shared facilities, interlocal cooperation and developer contributions.



INTRODUCTION

History of Recreation District. The Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (“SBSRD”) was formed in February 1993 for the purpose of serving the recreational needs of Basin residents in the unincorporated area surrounding Park City (Resolution 93-2). Prior to that time, from 1986 to 1993, the Park City - Snyderville Recreation Service District provided for the recreational needs of an area coterminous with the Snyderville Basin Sewer Improvement District, the Park City School District and the Park City Fire Service District. On February 1, 1993, Park City withdrew from the service district in order to relieve a double taxation situation for residents of the City. On November 29, 2001, the Summit County Commission adopted Resolution 2001-44, providing for the annexation of the Promontory Development, resulting in the present Recreation District boundaries.

This Community Parks, Recreation and Trails Capital Facilities Plan deals exclusively with *community* recreation facilities, defined as those facilities that meet the SBSRD objectives of providing large public gathering places for residents and visitors and a community-wide non-motorized trail system as set forth in the detail of the Snyderville Basin Recreation and Trails Master Plan. Community facilities meet the District’s purpose of creating a “recreation family” and fostering recreation relationships within the Snyderville Basin and the greater Park City area. These projects will be financed, operated and maintained through the SBSRD or partnered with other public or private entities as joint use facilities.

The 2006 Parks, Trails and Recreation Capital Facilities Plan is intended to amend, restate and supersede the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District Community Parks Capital Facilities Plan adopted on April 6, 1998.

“Joint use facilities” are those community facility buildings (swimming pools, racquet clubs, ice sheets, etc.) that have large capital requirements, large annual operations and maintenance budgets, and are most likely to serve the entire community by shared participation with another service provider, such as the School District or Park City Municipal Corporation.

Recreation facilities are required by Summit County on a *neighborhood* basis for compliance with the Snyderville Basin Development Code. Due to the active lifestyle and high demand for recreation by residents and visitors to the area, facilities are also provided by commercial recreation enterprises (ski resorts, golf courses, health clubs) and non-profit advocacy groups for recreation.

A key addition to this Capital Facilities Plan is the Community Trails component. At the time the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District adopted the first Recreation and Trails Master Plan in 1997, the Community Trails Master Plan was conceptual in nature. No level of service standard had been established, nor did any level of service exist.



At that time, the District Board opted to postpone the incorporation of a trails component to the District's Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Ordinance.

Proposed master plan alignments have been constructed one trail segment at a time since 1997. The success of system development over the last eight years is due to a high level of public support and multiple funding opportunities:

- ☞ The desire for non-motorized community trails was expressed through the public hearing process in the adoption of the Recreation and Trails Master Plan in December, 1997. Constituents supported the concept. Citizens emphasized the need for the District to preserve non-motorized public trail corridors before development pressure in the Snyderville Basin extinguished the opportunity for trail system connectivity.
- ☞ The District held seed money in the amount of \$2 million of general obligation bond funds (series 1996 and 1997) for the purpose of trails construction.
- ☞ The Snyderville Basin General Plan supported the vision: "There should be recreational opportunities throughout the community – places to run and places to contemplate. There should be opportunities for all to hike through meadows, across hillsides, and over the mountains. It should be exhilarating for not only our citizens but also for visitors to our community."
- ☞ The Snyderville Basin Development Code provided the regulations, guidelines and procedures for new development. The Code recognized the District as a "service provider" to Summit County. Community Trail corridors proposed as a part of new development became subject to approval by the SBSRD, Snyderville Basin Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Trails must conform to requirements set forth in the Trails Master Plan and Community-wide Trail System Development Standards. Completed sections of the Trails Master Plan (as amended) ensure public trail access in perpetuity.
- ☞ In the Recreation District's 1999 Need Assessment survey, there was a clear mandate with 56 percent of the community-at-large surveyed in favor of the District constructing additional mountain/back country trails.
- ☞ Using the Recreation and Trails Master Plan as a tool, the District and its interested constituents successfully lobbied the Utah Department of Transportation to improve the "critical link points" in the system. As they relate to the work of UDOT, critical link points are considered the off-grade crossings of the major thoroughfares bisecting the Snyderville Basin, including Interstate 80, Highway 40, S.R. 224 and S.R. 248. As a part of the pre-Olympic "Summit County Transportation Improvement Projects" (2000), federal funds were used to construct the I-80 pedestrian overpass at Kimball



Junction, improve an existing Hwy 40 under-crossing south of Silver Creek Junction, and construct a S.R. 248 undercrossing which connects the Rail Trail to the Round Valley Open Space.

- Voters authorized additional funds in a second successful G.O. bond election in 2001, at which time the District Board allocated another \$2 million toward acquisition and construction of trails and trailheads. In 2004, constituents approved a third G.O. Bond election for the purpose of accruing recreational open space property and constructing trails and related improvements such as trailheads.
- Since 1997, the District has completed many miles of trail segments within the Community-wide system. Constituents continue to express the desire for a trails *system*. This means completing the Community Trail *connections* envisioned in the Trails Master Plan.
- Trail Development is considered an allowed use in all Zone Districts identified in the Development Code (2004). General trail corridors are shown on the Community-wide Trails Master Plan and Exhibit A of the Recreation and Trails Master Plan. At the time of development application, availability of property for a particular trail will be determined. Determination of trailheads, trail linkages, critical connection points and likely destination points will be identified. Trail width, type, usage, design and construction of Community trails will be determined by the SBSRD.

Successful trail system improvements require collaboration of public and private entities. For example, the Recreation and Trails Master Plan supports trails that are separated and removed from the road. However, in residential and commercial development areas improved prior to the adoption of the trails master plan, it is important to provide connections to create a trails *system*, rather than disconnected trail segments. In this case, the District has contributed financially to the funding of Summit County road improvement projects to provide a trails element.

Master Plan and Capital Facilities Plan Requirements. A Recreation and Trails Master Plan for the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District functions as the recreation element of the Snyderville Basin General Plan and contains the policies and standards set by the SBSRD to achieve the recreation vision for the area. Recreation element components can be found in Chapter 8, “Community Facilities and Amenities,” of the Snyderville Basin General Plan (Dec., 2004).

This Capital Facilities Plan (“CFP”) builds upon the policies and standards set forth in the Recreation and Trails Master Plan and specifically identifies and/or determines, as required by the Utah Code 11-36-201:

- (i) The demands placed upon existing public facilities by new development activity;



- (ii) The proposed means by which the SBSRD will meet those demands;
- (iii) All revenue sources, including impact fees, to finance the impacts on system improvements; and
- (iv) Whether “impact fees are necessary to achieve an equitable allocation of the costs borne in the past and to be borne in the future, in comparison to the benefits received and yet to be received” [Utah Code 11-36-201(4)].

DEMAND FOR FACILITIES

Demand for parks, trails and recreation facilities will increase as the population grows, as tourism develops and as commercial development occurs and increases the employment base in the area. The Snyderville Basin is experiencing rapid growth, increasing from a population of 11,561 in 1996⁴ to an estimated 22,374 in 2005 – an increase of 10,813 persons over the nine-year period (94 percent increase), at an average annual rate of 7.6 percent per year.

Residential Population. As of 2005, there are approximately 7,715 dwelling units⁵ in the Snyderville Basin, with an estimated population of 22,374 persons.⁶ Within the next 15-year planning horizon, it is anticipated that there will be 12,328 dwelling units with a population of 35,754 persons. These projections include all developments identified in the County’s August 2005 Unit Statistics Report, but do not include a limited amount of property that the County has identified as hillside stewardship, mountainland remote and rural residential. Projections were developed through a combined effort by multiple service providers⁷ in the Snyderville Basin and with the assistance of Summit County. Multiple meetings⁸ were held to (1) implement a system of reporting existing residential and commercial development in western Summit County in order to validate current level of service standards, and (2) create a model for projecting future growth based on previously approved projects that are not yet completely built out, with an added factor to consider impacts of future development approved under the Snyderville Basin Zone Map adopted in December, 2004. There are many variables involved with growth projections; as any of these variables change (i.e., county policies, approved densities, major landholders, availability of water, etc.), the existing projections will need to be revised and updated. It is the intention of the SBSRD to regularly update its CFP in order to reflect revised projections by the County.

⁴ Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District *Community Parks Capital Facilities Plan 1996*, p. 2.

⁵ Source: Summit County Unit Statistics, August 2005.

⁶ Average household size is 2.9 persons per household. Source: United States Census 2000, North Snyderville, South Snyderville and Summit Park CDP weighted averages of household sizes by tenure.

⁷ Partners in this project include Park City Fire Service District, Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District and Summit County Public Works (Basin Transportation Master Plan). Park City School District has also been a participant.

⁸ Meetings were held on June 2, 2005; June 16, 2005; June 30, 2005; July 14, 2005; August 11, 2005; and September 8, 2005.



Growth projections developed by Summit County as a result of this collaborative effort are summarized in the following table.

SNYDERVILLE BASIN Existing and Future Development Table 1						
Total Estimated Units by 2020	Existing Dwelling Units			Future Dwelling Units		
	Single Family Dwellings	Multi - Family Dwellings	Total Existing Dwelling Units	Vacant Single Family Dwelling Units	Vacant Multi-Family Dwelling Units	Total Vacant Units
12,328	5,115	2,600	7,715	4,062	551	4,613

Source: Summit County

The Basin is expected to grow by 4,613 residential units by approximately 2020, representing an additional 13,380 residents – an increase of 60 percent over today’s population. The pace of growth is dependent on many factors including interest rates, competitiveness of area, local policy variables, etc.; estimated *growth rates* have been provided by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget and applied to the Snyderville Basin to reach a population of nearly 36,000 sometime before 2020.⁹

PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH Snyderville Basin, 2005 – 2020 Table 2				
	2005	2010	2015	2017 - 2020
Total units	7,715	9,382	11,381	12,328
Est. population	22,374	27,208	33,005	35,754

Source: Summit County; Governor’s Office of Planning & Budget; LYRB

The growth rates used in the population projections are rapid – nearly four percent per year through approximately 2020.

PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH RATES Table 3		
	2005-2010	2010-2020
Average Annual Growth Rate (AAGR)	3.99%	3.94%*
*The growth rate for the period from 2010 – 2020 has been adjusted downward somewhat from 2015 to 2020 to reflect the fact that most planned developments will be nearing completion and the remaining properties may be considered less desirable and therefore absorbed at a slower rate.		

⁹ The estimated growth rate for the period from 2005 – 2010 is 3.99 percent; the estimated growth rate for the period 2010 – 2015 is 3.94 percent. For the period 2015 – 2020, we have slowed the growth rate somewhat to reflect the fact that most planned developments will be built out, and the remaining properties will be considered less desirable and therefore be absorbed at a slower rate. Source: Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget. <http://governor.utah.gov/dea/05BaselineCityProj.xls>



PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH RATES	
Table 3	
2005-2010	2010-2020

Source: Governor’s Office of Planning & Budget; LYRB

Commercial Growth. Commercial development will increase the number of jobs and employees in the Basin while hotel development reflects an increase in tourism demand as well as increased employment. Both tourists and employees place increased demands on the parks, trails and recreation facilities provided in the Basin. Visitor-based economic development policies rely on the attraction of area recreation facilities; field space for sports tournaments and trail system improvements that provide opportunity for passive recreation, non-motorized transportation and trail-related special events.

Current non-residential (including commercial) development includes 3,345,979 square feet of retail, office, industrial and public/institutional space. Based on current zoning, it is anticipated that non-residential development (not including lodging) will eventually reach 6,280,876 square feet. In addition, there are roughly 1,405,971 square feet of lodging in the Basin, with an anticipated additional 656,708 square feet, for a total of 2,062,679 square feet.

Based on existing commercial square footage (3,345,979 sf), current employment is estimated at 7,538 employees (not including lodging) This equates to roughly 444 commercial square feet per employee (3,345,979 ÷ 7,538 = 444).

ESTIMATED CURRENT EMPLOYEES			
	Existing sf	Avg sf per employee	Existing employees
Retail	1,622,254	400	4,056
Office	261,298	250	1,045
Industrial	398,234	600	664
Institutional	1,064,193	600	1,774
	3,345,979	NA	7,538

These employees will place increased demands on the trail system through before/after work or lunchtime use. A large percentage of the Park City area workforce commutes from Salt Lake, Wasatch and eastern Summit Counties; they enjoy the convenience of recreational opportunities provided locally.¹⁰

Growth in Competitive Sports. While participation in recreational sports has remained fairly constant, participation in competitive sports has increased substantially, thus placing increased demand on facilities. By their nature, competitive teams require substantially more practice space and time than recreational leagues. And, requests for

¹⁰ Based on the United States Census 2000, 43 percent of Wasatch County residents commute to work outside of Wasatch County. It is probable that many of these workers come to Summit County.



facilities for non-traditional sports are on the increase, including lacrosse, ultimate Frisbee, track and field, biking clubs, Nordic ski clubs, kickball and dodge ball.

Based on a memorandum provided by SBSRD staff dated October 2005, “a near critical situation has occurred in regard to field demand, field availability and field maintenance. The Recreation District is unable to provide enough well maintained and safe play fields for every group and their needs.” The memo further states that the new fields coming on line at Willow Creek and Quinn’s Junction “will barely help keep up with the demand.”¹¹

CURRENT INVENTORY OF FACILITIES

Parks, trails and recreation facilities are an integral part of the lifestyle and character of the Snyderville Basin, greatly adding to the area’s desirability as a place to live, visit and do business. According to the National Park Service, “Rivers, trails, and greenway corridors (linear open spaces connecting recreational, cultural and natural areas) are traditionally recognized for their environmental protection, recreation values, and aesthetic appearance. These corridors also have the potential to create jobs, enhance property values, expand local businesses, attract new or relocating businesses, increase local tax revenues, decrease local government expenditures, and promote a local community.”¹²

That parks, trails and open space are highly valued is evidenced by increased real property values and marketability for property located near trails and open space. According to a survey done by American Lives in 1995, 77.7 percent of all homebuyers and shoppers in the study rated natural open space as either “essential” or “very important” in planned communities.¹³

The effect on property values of a location near a park or open space has been the focus of numerous studies. While the magnitude of property value increases vary considerably among studies, partly due to the fact that it is difficult to isolate the impact of trails, parks and open space from other factors such as community economics, age of structures, etc., the results point overwhelmingly to an increase in value for those properties located in the proximity of parks and open space. For example, Correll found that property adjacent to park areas in Boulder, Colorado increased as much as 32 percent.¹⁴ From a study of property in Minneapolis, Minnesota, Anderson found that property adjacent to parks increased 20 percent.¹⁵ Hammer found that property values increased *in proportion to*

¹¹ SBSRD. “Analysis of Basin Recreation Program Growth and Changes from 2002-Present,” October 2005.

¹² National Park Service, “Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails, and Greenway Corridors,” 4th ed., 1995.

¹³ San Francisco Chronicle, January 8, 1995.

¹⁴ Correll, Lillydahl, and Singell. May 1978. “The Effects of Greenbelt on Residential Property Values: Some Findings on the Political Economy of Open Space,” *Land Economics*

¹⁵ Anderson, Soren. June 2000. “The Effect of Open Space on Single-Family, Residential Home Property Values.” *Mccalester College*.



proximity to park land. Property in Philadelphia increased between 4 and 33 percent depending on the distance from the green space. Adjacent property (0-50 ft) appreciated 33%; property between 1000-1500 feet appreciated 9%; and property 2500-3200 feet from park land appreciated 4.2%.¹⁶ Espey found that property in South Carolina appreciated 13% between 1000-1500 feet from the park area.¹⁷

Clearly, the current facilities for parks, trails and recreation add greatly to not only the property values and marketability of the Snyderville Basin, but also to the overall lifestyle, well-being and enjoyment of residents, employees and visitors. Existing park and recreation facilities are summarized in the following table. Those items marked with an asterisk denote facilities that are shared with Park City.

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITY INVENTORY				
Table 4				
Facility Type	Number of Facilities (Not Shared)	Shared** Facilities, SBSRD Investment	Shared** Facilities, No SBSRD Investment	Total Available
Indoor Field	1	0	0	1
Ice Rink	0	1	0	1
Swimming Facility	0	1	1	2
Playgrounds	4	*	*	4
Tennis Courts – Outdoor	2	0	9	11
Picnic Areas	4	*	*	4
Sports Fields				
Soccer	5	1	5	11
Softball/LL	0	2	7	9
Baseball	0	0	1	1
Lacrosse/Rugby/Football	0	1	1	2
Artificial Turf	0	0	1	1
Jogging Track	1	0	0	1
Basketball Courts – Outdoor	2	*	*	2
Gym Space/Indoor Basketball	*	*	4	4
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	2	0	0	2
Rock Climbing Wall	0	0	0	0
Volleyball – Outdoor	6	0	4	10
Roller Hockey Rink	1	0	0	1
Dog Park	1	0	0	1
Skateboard Park	0	0	1	1
*Playground, picnic facilities and basketball/gym space owned by Park City and Park City School District are excluded from the count.				
**Shared with Park City Municipal Corporation/Park City School District				

¹⁶ Hammer, Thomas R., Robert E. Coughlin and Edward T. Horn IV. July 1974. “Research Report: The Effect of a Large Park on Real Estate Value.” *Journal of the American Institute Planners*

¹⁷ Espey, Molly and Owusu-Edusei, Kwame. January 2001. “Park and Property Values in Greenville, South Carolina,” *Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics – Clemson University*



Park facilities within the District are located at Trailside Park, Ecker Hill Middle School and Willow Creek Park.

Trailside Park. Trailside Park encompasses 63 acres of park land. It is located west of Highway 40 and the Silver Summit Subdivision, adjacent to Trailside Elementary School. The park includes two soccer fields, two playgrounds, two pavilions, one outdoor basketball court, two volleyball courts, one roller hockey rink, one dog park, a bicycle skills park, parking, restrooms and administrative support space. Trailside Park land and related water shares, without improvements, were acquired in 1996 at a cost of \$1,658,442.30, or \$26,324 per acre.

The park plan includes 7.5 acres of active recreation areas (sports fields primarily programmed for soccer), 5 acres of improved passive recreation areas, 8.9 acres of irrigated turf, and various trail networks, which have the ability to link to future developments. The park master plan contemplates a total of 21.4 acres of developed parkland, and 41.6 acres of undeveloped land.

Interlocal cooperation with Park City School District provides for shared use and programming of a youth soccer field and little league field located at Trailside elementary.

Ecker Hill Middle School. The SBSRD leases 18.43 acres of land at Ecker Hill Middle School from the Park City School District (30-year lease, with 20-year option to renew) at a cost of \$1 per year pursuant to a 1996 Interlocal Agreement with the School District whereby the SBSRD paid \$1,327,000 for School District field development and enhancements to an indoor community pool. Development at Ecker Hill Middle School includes four multi-use fields. For purposes of categorizing sport field inventory, these multi-use fields are presently categorized as one soccer field, two little league fields and one lacrosse/football field. Support facilities include one pavilion, restrooms and maintenance/storage space. Approximately 11.7 acres of Ecker Hill Middle School are developed.

Willow Creek Park. The SBSRD received an 86-acre land dedication at the time of the Willow Creek Estates Development Approval. Approximately 20 acres were approved for active park development, with 66 acres passive recreational open space that supports a non-motorized trails component. Construction of Willow Creek Park was substantially completed in October 2005.

A summary of park facilities by location is summarized in the following table.

INVENTORY OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES			
Table 5			
	Trailside Park	Ecker Hill Middle School	Willow Creek Park
Field Facilities			



INVENTORY OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES			
Table 5			
	Trailside Park	Ecker Hill Middle School	Willow Creek Park
Soccer	2	1	3
Little League	0	2	0
Lacrosse/Football	0	1	0
Playgrounds	2	0	2
Pavilions	2	1	1
Basketball	1	0	1
Volleyball	4	0	2
Roller Hockey Rink	1	0	0
Tennis	0	0	2
Dog Park	1	0	0
Park Support Space			
Administration Office	1	0	0
Maintenance	1	1	1
Meetings Room	3	0	0
Recreation Storage	1	1	0
Restrooms	2	1	2

Source: SBSRD

Total acreage at each of the three parks is summarized as follows:

PARK ACREAGE			
Table 6			
	Developed Acres	Undeveloped Acres	Total Acres
Trailside	21.4	41.6	63
Ecker Hill	11.7	6.7	18.4
Willow Creek	20	66	86
TOTAL	53.1	114.3	167.4

At the present time, with a current population of 22,374 persons, the SBSRD has a de facto park standard of 2.37 developed community park acres per 1,000 population and 5.11 undeveloped park acres per 1000 population.

$$53.1 \text{ developed acres} / (22,374/1000) = 2.37 \text{ developed park acres per 1000 population}$$

$$114.3 \text{ undeveloped acres} / (22,374/1000) = 5.11 \text{ undeveloped park acres per 1000 population}$$

Park City Municipal Corporation. The SBSRD made a capital contribution in the amount of \$73,610 for field improvements made by Park City Municipal Corporation in the early 1990's. The contribution was the remaining responsibility of Summit County, based on a 1987 "Western Summit County Youth Sports Program" agreement between the City and County to provide quality recreation programs for residents of their respective jurisdictions. The County placed the responsibility for this payment on the SBSRD. Since that time, Park City and the SBSRD have completed a joint study to assess options



for recreation services and to determine how facilities and services might best be shared between the two jurisdictions.

Shared Facilities. The SBSRD has made arrangements for shared use of many facilities within Park City, thus maximizing the use of existing facilities and limited funds available to the Recreation District for capital investment. In return, Park City residents use many of the SBSRD's facilities. All recreation program and user fee differentials between the jurisdictions have been eliminated in recent years.

Ice Rink. The Park City Ice Arena is a public indoor ice rink that was funded in part by funds from the Recreation District's 2001 General Obligation Bond through an Interlocal Agreement with Park City Municipal Corporation (PCMC) dated August, 2004. The Agreement provided for a \$2 million contribution from the District for the purpose of constructing and equipping an ice rink. Bond funds were paid to the City in March, 2005. The Interlocal Agreement contemplates an "expansion fund" consisting of monies set aside to fund future Ice Facility expansion (second sheet) which may include but is not limited to future contributions by the District, Park City and/or other grants and gifts. Under the terms of the Agreement, given the contribution of land by the City and the nature of the larger recreation complex proposed by the City, the Ice Arena is considered to be an asset of the City and the District holds no ownership interest.

Swimming Facilities: Public pool access is provided through the Recreation District's joint use agreements with Park City School District and Park City Municipal Corporation.

Ecker Hill International Middle School Community Pool: The Ecker Hill pool is an indoor facility that was funded in part by funds from the Recreation District's 1996 General Obligation Bond through an Interlocal and Joint Use Agreement with Park City School District (PCSD), dated December 10, 1996. The pool is owned, operated and maintained by PCSD; however, public access to the pool is provided for a minimum numbers of hours each week when public swim sessions do not conflict with use by the PCSD for educational purposes.

Park City Racquet Club Pool: The Park City Racquet Club is an outdoor facility with one lap pool and one leisure pool. Through a memorandum of understanding between the District and City, District residents are entitled to use the Racquet Club swim facilities at the public rate established for City residents.

Fieldhouse Pool Expansion: The approved master plan for the Basin Recreation Fieldhouse at Newpark includes land and an approved use (up to an additional 64,000 square feet of buildable area) to accommodate a future pool facility and climbing wall.



Tennis Courts. The Park City Racquet Club provides indoor and outdoor tennis courts for use by District residents. Through a memorandum of understanding between the District and City, District residents are entitled to use the Racquet Club tennis facilities and participate in programs at the public rate established for City residents.

Fields:

Sports Fields. Agreements between the Recreation District, Park City Municipal Corporation and Park City School District provide for shared use of athletic fields in western Summit County. The active community profile dictates a higher level of service standard for fields. Fields that could be considered multi-use at one time no longer function as such. For example, growth trends in competitive sports programs require more practice time and multi-season scheduling, so a field that once served spring lacrosse and fall soccer no longer meets the demand for both sports spring, summer and fall.

Artificial Field. City residents are entitled to use the indoor artificial field at the Basin Recreation Fieldhouse at the public rate established for District residents. The City has completed installation of an outdoor multi-use artificial field for softball, soccer & lacrosse at the Quinn's Recreation Complex. Due to the high elevation and short growing season, incorporation of artificial turf into the field inventory is viewed as one method to manage field overuse.

Baseball. Park City School District provides the only full sized competitive baseball field in western Summit County. This field is included in the field space inventory for programming high school, recreational leagues, and competitive baseball programs.

Public Golf. Park City Municipal Golf Course eliminated the greens fee differential for District residents in 2005. According to the District's Needs Assessments conducted in 2000 and 2003, public golf is not a high priority of District residents. This may be due to the fact that there are a number of public courses (Mountain Dell, Wasatch Mountain State Park and Soldier Hollow) in close proximity to the Snyderville Basin, in addition to a growing number of privately held courses in the greater Park City area. A resort golf course is also planned as a part of the recreational offerings at The Canyons.

Gymnasium Space/Basketball Courts – Indoor. Indoor gym space/basketball courts for recreation programs are primarily offered through shared use agreements with the Park City School District at Ecker Hill International Middle School, Trailside Elementary School and Treasure Mountain International School.



The Park City Racquet Club provides indoor basketball for use by District residents. Through a memorandum of understanding between the District and City, District residents are entitled to use the Racquet Club basketball facilities at the public rate established for City residents.

BMX Track and Skateboard Park. In the interest of building facilities to grow with recreation industry trends, Park City has constructed a world-class skateboard park and is currently assessing local user interest in a prototype BMX track. At the same time, the District has focused its efforts on Bicycle Skills and “Free Ride” terrain parks. All of these facilities fall into the shared facility category since they serve the needs of western Summit County residents and broaden the public recreation opportunities.

Trail Facilities. Trail facilities are classified by type of trail (hard surface, natural surface and soft surface), trailheads, boardwalks and other structures. A trails map showing current and future facilities has been included in Appendix A and a detailed listing of existing trail facilities by trail segment is found in Appendix B. The trails and trail facilities shown in the following table are all part of the trail system of the Snyderville Basin.

TRAILS INVENTORY 2005
Table 7
Hard Surface Trails – 9.08 miles
Natural Surface Trails – 70.91 miles
Soft Surface Urban Trails – 5.27 miles
Hard Surface in County ROW – 2.17 miles*
Boardwalk – 1,595 ft.
Pre-fab Bridges – 4 bridges
Trailheads
Spring Creek
Silver Spring
Structures/Off-Grade Crossings
1-80 pedestrian overpass*
Spring Creek underpass*
Highway 40 underpass*
Highway 248 underpass*
I-80 Silver Creek underpass**

*Not owned by SBSRD, but considered critical linkpoints of trails system

** Funded by SBSRD; owned by UDOT (due to highway ownership regulations)

Open Space. The Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District allocated \$3 million of 2001 General Obligation Bond monies for the purpose of recreational open space acquisition.

On April 9, 2003, Summit County received \$1 million of recreational open space funds from SBSRD in exchange for a parcel of land and an approved 112,000 s.f. of development rights in the Newpark project, as described in an Assignment of Transferred Density Rights dated April 9, 2003. The funds, including all interest accrued thereon, are



held by the Summit County Treasurer and are restricted for the sole and exclusive purpose of acquiring public open space located within the SBSRD jurisdictional boundaries.

On May 14, 2003, the Summit County Commission established the entity BOSAC for the purpose of creating a consortium of interests and agencies to review, prioritize and recommend potential recreational open space purchases utilizing land acquisition funds held by SBSRD.

Use of the remaining \$2 million voter authorized GO bonds was used for cost of issuance of bonds in the amount of \$29,794, and trailhead land acquisition at both Spring Creek and Silver Springs. Following those transactions, \$1,716,741 remained in recreational open space funds held by the SBSRD.

The following properties were acquired in 2004:

UOL Holistic Ranchland Program for Hi-Ute Ranch conservation easement	(\$677,000.00)
Rasmussen Parcel (149.72 acres)	(\$920,000.00)
Rasmussen Option Parcel (70.04 acres)	(\$100,140.00)
Rasmussen property tax adjustment	(\$ 1,006.59)

CAPITAL FACILITY INVESTMENT

The SBSRD’s current investment in capital facilities is summarized below for buildings, parks, land, joint ventures with Park City, open space, trails and trail-related structures/facilities.

The investment in buildings reaches \$8.2 million in \$2005.

BUILDING INVESTMENT			
Table 8			
	Year	Construction Cost	Construction Cost in \$2005*
Basin Recreation Center	2004	\$5,176,749	\$5,232,291
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(181,819)	
Other Recreation Center Costs	2004	\$801,276	\$809,873
Trailside Building Expansion	2003	\$966,725	\$1,024,100
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(72,380)	
Trailside Original Building	1999	\$971,205	\$1,151,636
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(173,183)	
TOTAL BUILDINGS			\$8,217,900

Source: Insee Cost of Construction Index; SBSRD; LYRB

Development costs for Trailside, Willow Creek and Ecker Hill are summarized in the table below, exclusive of land costs. Although the Ecker Hill property is leased, the



Recreation District has invested funds to provide support buildings for the field complex, including restrooms, storage, maintenance garage, backstops, bleachers and a pavilion. The Ecker Hill improvements, made in 1997, have been updated to \$2005.

PARK CAPITAL FACILITIES (not including land) Table 9	
Park	Construction Cost in \$2005
Trailside	\$2,083,720
Willow Creek	\$2,602,582
Ecker Hill	\$2,407,377
TOTAL	\$7,093,679

Source: SBSRD; LYRB

In addition to park development costs, land has been acquired at Willow Creek, Trailside and at the site of the Basin Recreation Center. Land costs have been escalating rapidly in the Snyderville Basin and future land acquisition will be very costly for the Recreation District. The current land price for raw land purchased in large-acreage amounts (i.e., 20 acres or more) is roughly \$75,000 an acre.¹⁸ With 63 acres at Trailside and 86 acres at Willow Creek, the District’s current investment in parkland totals \$11,175,000. In addition, the District acquired 2.367 acres at the Fieldhouse site, with a year 2005 value of an estimated \$177,525, bringing the overall total (exclusive of trail facilities) to \$11,352,525.

The District has contributed \$2 million for the construction of an ice rink in Park City. The contribution was made in March 2005 and is designed to be a shared-use facility between the District and Park City.

Trails are summarized in the following two tables; the first showing trails by surface type and the second table detailing trail structures and other facilities such as fencing. Land costs for trails have not been included because the land is generally obtained through developer contributions as a condition of development approval. However, land is required for trailheads and trailhead parking.

TRAILS INVENTORY Table 10		
Trail Description	Miles/Feet	Replacement Cost
Natural Surface Trails (\$1.65lf/Historical Cost or \$1.85lf/Replacement)	71 miles	\$693,528
Soft Surface Urban Trails (\$10.00lf/Historical Cost or \$12.00lf/Replacement)	5.27 miles	\$333,907
Hard Surface Trails (\$25.00lf/Historical Cost or \$40.00lf/Replacement)	9.08 miles	\$1,917,696

¹⁸ Summit County Assessor’s Office. This estimate was verified in November 2005 with information from a private appraiser who suggested that prices for raw land were in the neighborhood of \$77,000 an acre.



TRAILS INVENTORY			
Table 10			
Trail Description		Miles/Feet	Replacement Cost
Boardwalk (\$25.00sf; 8' width)		1,595 feet	\$319,000
Bridges	1999-2002	\$174,292	\$190,098
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(40,170)	
TOTAL TRAILS			\$3,454,229

TRAIL FACILITIES INVENTORY			
Table 11			
	Year	Original Cost	Cost in \$2005*
Fencing	2001-2	\$13,998	\$15,267
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(3,431)	
East 224 Swaner Preserve	2005	\$22,455	\$22,455
I-80 Trail Crossing	2003	\$972,756	\$1,030,488
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(64,850)	
Trailhead Landscaping	2003	\$17,006	\$18,015
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(1,134)	
Trailhead Parking	2002	\$4,073	\$4,441
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(611)	
Spring Creek Trailhead Pavilions	2002	\$105,222	\$114,765
Less: Accumulated Depreciation		\$(194)	
Subtotal Construction			\$1,205,431
Silver Springs Trailhead – land only	2003	\$98,366	\$104,204
Spring Creek Trailhead -- land only	2002	\$155,100	\$169,167
TOTAL			\$1,478,802

*Updated to \$2005 with the Insee Cost-of-Construction Index

Source: SBSRD; Insee Cost-of-Construction Index

In addition to the above costs, the SBSRD has also contributed to trails in the right-of-way for Summit County. These contributions include \$75,000 for Old Ranch Road, \$20,000 for the Highland Drive Extension, and \$12,000 for Bitner Road to I-80 Overpass at Kimball Junction.

A summary of current investment is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CURRENT INVESTMENT	
\$2005	
Table 12	
Buildings	\$8,217,900
Park Improvements	\$7,093,679
Park Land (inc. Fieldhouse land)	\$11,352,525
Ice Rink Contribution	\$2,000,000
Trails, Boardwalks & Bridges	\$3,454,229
Trail Facilities	\$1,478,802
Trails ROW	\$107,000
TOTAL	\$33,704,135



RECREATION LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Desired levels of service (LOS) for park, recreation and trail facilities have been established for the SBSRD based on several resources, including a Needs Assessment conducted in 2003, research of standards at other comparable locations,¹⁹ and input from SBSRD board and staff regarding current usage levels and community needs.

Park and Recreation Facilities. Park and recreation facilities are listed in the table below, roughly in the order of importance reflected in the 2003 Needs Assessment. Again, note that shared facilities are marked with asterisks.

PARK AND RECREATION FACILITY NEEDS				
Table 13				
2005 Needs Assessment	Desired Level of Service	Current Inventory	Number Needed to Meet Mtn Rec Std Currently	Current Additional Need - based on current Mtn Rec Std
Indoor Field	2 per district	1	1	0
**Ice Rink	2 per district	1	1	0
**Swimming Facility	3 per district	2	2	0
Playgrounds	1 per 5,000	4	4	0
Tennis Courts – Outdoor	1 per 4,000	2	6	4
Picnic Areas	1 per 2,500	4	9	5
Sports Fields				
Soccer	1 per 2,000	6	11	5
Softball/LL	1 per 3,000	3	7	4
**Baseball	1 per 15,000	0	1	1
Lacrosse/Rugby/Football	1 per 6,000	1	4	3
**Artificial Turf Outdoor	2 per district	0	1	1
Jogging Track	1 per 10,000	1	2	1
Basketball Courts – Outdoor	1 per 2,500	2	9	7
Gymnasium Space/Indoor Basketball	1 per 5,000	0	3	3
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	1 per 3,500	2	6	4
Rock Climbing Wall	1 per district	0	1	1
Volleyball – Outdoor	1 per 3000	6	7	1
Dog Park	1 per 15,000	1	1	0
**Skateboard Park	2 per district	0	1	1
**Indicates shared facilities with Park City School/Park City Municipal				

¹⁹ Comparable locations researched include Sun Valley, Idaho; Jackson Hole, Wyoming; and the following cities and towns in Colorado: Durango, Colorado Springs, Englewood, Boulder, Glenwood, Montrose, Cortez, Telluride, Aspen, Breckenridge, Frisco, Silverthorne and Dillon.



Based on the desired levels of service outlined above, the Recreation District is currently deficient in several facilities: 4 outdoor tennis courts; 5 picnic areas; 5 soccer fields; 4 softball/little league fields; 1 baseball field; 3 lacrosse/rugby/football fields; 1 jogging track; 7 outdoor basketball courts; 4 bicycle skill/terrain parks; 1 rock climbing wall; 1 outdoor volleyball court; 1 artificial turf field; and 1 skateboard park.

Trail System. Highlighted below are key findings from the District’s 2003 Needs Assessment supporting the desire for continued trail system improvements:

- ☞ When asked to rate the importance of adding recreation facilities to the current offerings of Basin Recreation, “*More Trails*” was ranked number one.
- ☞ Enhancements to trailheads were ranked fourth in order of priority.
- ☞ Added mileage will require identification of a trailhead location that will serve the trail segment, or consideration of the need to develop a new trailhead.
- ☞ Increased usage due to overall economic and population growth in the general area and specific area of each trail will support the conversion of soft to hard surface trails over time.
- ☞ The creation of additional loop trails will provide growth in the system to accommodate additional users.
- ☞ Growth may demand trail evolution from one use to another over time, including separation of user groups.
- ☞ Increasing trail user traffic volume may dictate a need for the widening of transportation trails to support expansion of an integrated transportation system. Well designed transportation trails support an active community where non-motorized transportation is a viable alternative. Reduced traffic congestion and improved air quality are benefits.

At buildout, natural surface trails will increase by roughly 106 miles, soft surface trails will increase by 6 miles and hard surface trails will increase by nearly 53 miles. See Appendix A for a map of planned trail improvements.

TRAIL FACILITY NEEDS			
Table 14			
Trail Description	Current Miles	Trail Miles at Buildout	Increase in Trail Miles
Natural Surface Trails	71	177	106
Soft Surface Urban Trails	5.27	11.27	6
Hard Surface Trails	9.08	62.08	53

Source: SBSRD



In addition to the trail miles outlined above, additional trails are included as an element of the Western Snyderville Basin Transportation Master Plan (2005), developed for Summit County. Transportation trails are intended to connect residential and commercial areas of the Basin. Timing and construction of these trails are subject to land dedications, design and engineering challenges and funding constraints under the direction of Summit County and, in some cases, Utah Department of Transportation.

Specific guidelines for trail development are as follows, with an assumed 20' easement required for all trails:

Natural Surface Back Country: Mountain/backcountry trails will be 4' wide natural dirt, or other soft surface material as approved by the Recreation District.

Soft Surface Urban: Urban trails are 8' - 10' wide; soft surface materials to be specified by the Recreation District.

Hard Surface Transportation Trails: Transportation trail standard is 10' wide hard surface (asphalt), with a 4' soft surface to the side.

Trailheads. Trailheads are an important component of community trail system improvements. Trailheads need to be added at the established standard in order to disperse users throughout the system. The District will identify the trailhead location that will serve each new trail segment, or consider the need for development of a new trailhead. One operational aspect of trailhead development is to reduce concentrated trail use, thereby maximizing user experience, minimizing user conflict, and reducing tread wear.

Plans for future trailhead development include:

- ☞ District trailheads future: Aspen Highlands, Allred redevelopment, Jeremy PP50
- ☞ Shared use with other Recreation District sites: Trailside, Willow Creek, Fieldhouse
- ☞ Shared use ROW: Sun Peak, East Canyon, Old Ranch Road (Round Valley)
- ☞ Shared use w/institutional ~ Rail Trail at Promontory, St. Mary's Church, Park City Community Church, Ecker Hill Middle School
- ☞ Shared use commercial: Gorgoza Tubing Park, Canyons Resort Area

Open Space. SBSRD has a close relationship with Summit County and BOSAC in matters of recreational open space acquisition. The revised Snyderville Basin General Plan (2004) acknowledges that the preservation of open space is the "central premise" of the amended Plan. The General Plan makes a distinction between "active" open space and "passive" open space. Active open space falls under the parks and recreation facilities designation, while passive open space is designed for less intensive uses but



may require public health and safety related improvements such as trailhead parking, signage and restroom facilities.

SBSRD funds for recreational open space have been and will be invested in the future with the intent to invite public trail access and to educate users on recreational land use, rather than solely to preserve environmentally sensitive areas and view corridors.



FUTURE CAPITAL FACILITY DEMAND

Future capital facility needs have been estimated based on the desired service levels set forth in this Capital Facilities Plan. Future capital facility needs are based on anticipated needs by the year 2020, with a population of 35,754 persons and 6,289,480 square feet of nonresidential development, plus lodging units.

FUTURE CAPITAL FACILITY DEVELOPMENT			
Table 15			
	Desired Level of Service	Future Additional Need (including current deficiency)	Estimated Facilities in 2020 (desired LOS)
Indoor Field	2 per district	1	2
**Ice Rink	2 per district	1	2
**Swimming Facility	3 per district	1	3
Playgrounds	1 per 5,000	3	7
Tennis Courts – Outdoor	1 per 4,000	7	9
Picnic Areas	1 per 2,500	10	14
Sports Fields			
Soccer	1 per 2,000	12	18
Softball/LL	1 per 3,000	9	12
**Baseball	1 per 15,000	2	2
Lacrosse/Rugby/Football	1 per 6,000	5	6
**Artificial Turf Outdoor	2 per district	1	2
Jogging Track	1 per 10,000	3	4
Basketball Courts – Outdoor	1 per 2,500	12	14
Gym Space/Indoor Basketball	1 per 5,000	7	7
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	1 per 3,500	8	10
Rock Climbing Wall	1 per district	1	1
Volleyball – Outdoor	1 per 3000	6	12
Dog Park	2 per district	1	2
**Skateboard Park	2 per district	1	2
**Indicates facilities shared with Park City Municipal Corporation or Park City School District.			

The District will need to obtain sufficient acreage in order to support the growth in facilities outlined above. Many of these facilities consume a great deal of space – nearly two acres apiece – as shown in the table below.

SQUARE FEET REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR FIELD TYPES
Table 16



Type of Facility	Space Needed (SF)
Baseball – Little League	90,000 SF
Baseball – Adult	90,000 SF
Softball	62,500 SF
Soccer	86,400 SF

Source: Sno.engineering, Inc.

The following table shows number of facilities currently needed for major field types and the accompanying square footage requirements.

SPACE NEEDS FOR MAJOR FIELD TYPES FOR CURRENT POPULATION (22,374)			
Table 17			
Type of Facility	Number of Facilities Currently Needed to Meet Mountain Recreation LOS	SF Requirements	Acreage Requirements
Baseball – Little League	7	630,000	14.46
Baseball – Adult	1	90,000	2.07
Soccer/Lacrosse/Rugby/ Football	15	1,296,000	29.75
Total	NA	2,016,000	46.28

Source: Sno engineering, Inc.; LYRB

The requirement of 46.28 acres set forth above represents the minimum acreage for field development only (for currently desired levels of development) and does not include appropriate support spaces such as restrooms, picnic areas, parking, etc. With current development of 53.1 developed acres, and the current need for 46.28 acres of field space, only 6.82 acres are available for support spaces and other types of field development. Given the existing deficiencies in many field types as discussed above, it is apparent that additional acreage is needed in the near term for current field demands, as well as in the future to serve the needs of new development.

The question arises of how to calculate support spaces for future field development since initial field development at a given site generally requires a higher percentage of support space than does subsequent development. For example, an additional soccer field does not necessarily require the construction of an extra restroom. In general, however, we feel that current ratios can be projected into the future and that at least 2.37 acres of



developed parkland and 5.11 acres of undeveloped parkland per 1,000 residents will be necessary to accommodate future development at existing service levels.

FUNDING OF EXISTING FACILITIES

In September, 1995, District residents approved a \$7.5 million General Obligation Bond to fund community parks and recreation in the Snyderville Basin. In 1996, policies supporting the development of community parks and trails were incorporated into the Snyderville Basin General Plan. These policies were further defined and adopted in the Recreation District's Recreation and Trails Master Plan. This represented the first opportunity for new development to contribute toward recreational needs in the Snyderville Basin. The Recreation and Trails Master Plan was adopted by the Summit County Commission on December 1, 1997.

Initial expenditures funded (1) funded land acquisition and improvements at Trailside Park; (2) allocated \$2 million to begin the implementation of the community-wide trail system master plan, and; (3) provided financial assistance in the construction of an enhanced community swimming pool and four playing fields at Ecker Hill Middle School. A facilities Lease and Joint Use Agreement, signed in December of 1996, demonstrated the SBSRD commitment to a long-term relationship with the Park City School District in providing physical fitness and recreation opportunities for all area residents.

In November, 2001, voters in the District authorized another \$11 million dollar General Obligation Bond with these uses: (1) recreational open space (\$3 million); (2) additional trails (\$2 million) and; (3) capital facility improvements including an indoor sports center (\$4 million), and (4) a contribution toward an ice rink to be built in partnership with Park City (\$2 million).

In November 2004, voters in the District authorized \$10 million for passive recreational open space land acquisition, including trails and trailheads. This initiative was placed on the ballot at the request of the Basin Open Space Advisory Committee (BOSAC) whose purpose it to advise and provide input to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) regarding the creation, preservation and identification of open space within the Snyderville Basin. Following the approval of the open space bond the BCC adopted Summit County Ordinance No. 520, the Revised General Plan for the Snyderville Basin, in which the preservation of open space is the "central premise" of the Plan.

Over the course of ten years, residents of the Recreation District funded \$28.5 million through General Obligation Bonds to be repaid through property tax levies over the twenty-year life of each bond.



BOND ISSUES					
Table 18					
Date of Authorization	Total Bond Amount	Parks Amount	Open Space Amount	Trails Amount	Other
1996	\$5,000,000	\$3,500,000		\$1,500,000	
1997	\$2,500,000	\$2,000,000		\$500,000	
Nov 2001	\$11,000,000		\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,000,000
Nov 2004	\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000		
TOTAL	\$28,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$13,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000

FUTURE CAPITAL FACILITY COSTS

The cost to maintain the current service levels, as well as the levels of service desired by Recreation District residents, is significant. Escalating land prices are playing a major role in the higher costs, as well as increased costs of construction. In addition, new demands will place significant capital costs on the District, if current levels of service are to be maintained and desired levels are to be achieved. Note that in the following table the estimated amount to new development is merely an estimate of new facilities required. In addition, new development should be required to pay for its proportionate share of demand placed on existing facilities that serve the needs of new development.

ESTIMATED PARK CAPITAL FACILITY COSTS						
Table 19						
	Additional Facilities Needed in 2005 to Meet LOS	Additional Facilities Needed by 2020	Cost per Unit	Cost Estimate for Additional Facilities Needed in 2005	Cost Estimate \$2005 for Additional Facilities by 2020	Estimated Amount Attributable to New Development
Indoor Field	0	1	NA*	NA	NA	NA
**Ice Rink	0	1				
**Swimming Facility	0	1	200,000	0	200,000	200,000
Playgrounds	0	3	20,000	0	60,000	60,000
Tennis Courts – Outdoor	4	7	45,000	180,000	315,000	135,000
Picnic Areas	5	10	2,500	12,500	25,000	12,500
Sports Fields						
Soccer	5	12	95,000	475,000	1,140,000	665,000
Softball/LL	4	9	90,000	360,000	810,000	450,000
**Baseball	1	2	100,000	200,000	200,000	100,000
**Artificial Turf	1	1	700,000	700,000	700,000	Na
Lacrosse/Rugby/Football	3	5	95,000	285,000	475,000	190,000
Jogging Track	1	3	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basketball Courts – Outdoor	7	12	30,000	210,000	360,000	150,000
Gym Space/Indoor Basketball	4	7	NA	NA	NA	NA



ESTIMATED PARK CAPITAL FACILITY COSTS						
Table 19						
	Additional Facilities Needed in 2005 to Meet LOS	Additional Facilities Needed by 2020	Cost per Unit	Cost Estimate for Additional Facilities Needed in 2005	Cost Estimate \$2005 for Additional Facilities by 2020	Estimated Amount Attributable to New Development
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	4	8	25,000	100,000	200,000	100,000
Rock Climbing Wall	1	1	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	Buy-In
Volleyball - Outdoor	1	6	18,000	18,000	108,000	90,000
**Skateboard Park	1	1	150,000	150,000	150,000	Buy-In
Dog Park	0	1	500,000	0	500,000	500,000
TOTAL				NA	6,243,000	NA

Source: SBSRD; LYRB

*Costs for a jogging track, indoor field and ice rink have not been included as they are very dependent on the type of facility desired and whether the facility is desired in conjunction with other recreational facilities.

Clearly, a large portion of the cost of future recreation facilities required in order to meet the Mountain Recreation Service Standard is created by the demand incurred by new development.

Land costs are estimated at \$75,000 per acre (\$2005) and should be updated regularly to account for the rapidly increasing land prices in the Basin. In order to maintain current levels of service, the Basin will need to acquire 2.4 developed park acres per 1,000 population and 5.1 acres of undeveloped park acres, for a total land requirement of 7.5 acres per 1,000 population. With anticipated population growth of 13,380 persons by roughly 2020, additional land is expected to cost \$7.5 million (\$2005) just to keep current service levels constant.

ESTIMATED FUTURE COSTS FOR PARK LAND	
Table 20	
Developed park acres per 1000	2.4 acres
Undeveloped park acres per 1000	5.1 acres
Total land acres per 1000 population	7.5 acres
Land required by population growth	100.4 acres
Cost per acre	\$75,000
Cost of additional land	\$7,526,250

Costs will also be incurred to expand the existing trail system in order to develop the system as planned and in order to keep up with the demands of new residential and commercial development. Land costs for trails could be substantial if the District is required to purchase this land. In the past, easements have been obtained as a condition of development approval and it is the intention of the District to pursue this policy in the future when acquiring land for trails.



**ESTIMATED FUTURE COSTS FOR TRAILS
(not including land)
Table 21**

Trail Description	Current Miles/Feet/Structures	Trail Miles/Feet/Structures at Buildout	Increase in Trail Miles/Feet/Structures	Estimated Additional Trail Expenditures
Natural Surface Trails	71 miles	177 miles	106 miles	\$1,035,408
Soft Surface Urban Trails	5.27 miles	11.27 miles	6 miles	\$380,160
Hard Surface Trails	9.08 miles	62.08 miles	53 miles	\$11,193,600
Bridges	4 bridges	27	23	\$388,700
Boardwalks	1,595 feet	9,837 ft ²⁰	8,242 ft	\$1,648,400
Trailheads	2 trailheads	12	10	*
Offgrade Crossings	5 crossings	10 crossings	5 (As shown on CFP Appendix A)	\$7,000,000
Total				\$21,646,268

*Trailhead costs have not been included as they are very dependent of trailhead facility desired and whether trailheads are developed in partnership.

The off-grade crossings are estimated to cost roughly \$3,000,000 for the Jeremy overpass and \$1,000,000 for each of the other four planned off-grade crossings, for a total investment of \$7,000,000 in off-grade crossings.²¹

The cost of acquiring open space is estimated at \$75,000 an acre. No set standards regarding the amount of open space have been established by the District. Therefore, it is anticipated that future open space will be funded through bonding rather than through impact fees.

Total future capital facility investment for parks, recreation and trail facilities is difficult to determine precisely for several reasons. First, the degree to which *future* capital facilities (i.e., ice rink, swimming facility, BMX track, etc.) are jointly built and/or operated with Park City Municipal Corporation in the future will impact the amount of investment required by the SBSRD. Second, if *existing* shared facilities should become unavailable or overcrowded in the future, the SBSRD may find itself deficient in several areas in which it now shares facilities (i.e., tennis courts, playing fields, swimming pool, etc.). This change in current arrangements would result in increased costs just to maintain existing service levels for the current population. Finally, the acquisition of future land for trails is assumed to be a condition of development approval. Should this practice change, trail development costs would escalate significantly.

²⁰ Calculated as the same ratio of current boardwalk length to current hard surface length: $(1,595 * 56) / 9.08 = 9,837$

²¹ Source: Based on historical costs of offgrade crossings by UDOT and SBSRD.



At a minimum, the SBSRD will need to plan for \$6.2 million in park and recreation facility costs, roughly \$7.5 million for park land and nearly \$22 million for trails for a total of over \$35 million (\$2005) plus costs of trailheads and open space.

ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL REVENUE SOURCES FOR PARK DEVELOPMENT

Various financing options for parks development include general obligation bonds, impact fees, development exactions, private and public partnerships, joint development, grants and state and local funding.

The **general obligation bond** is often a good approach when large sums are needed because it allows the payments to be spread over a longer time period. The bonds are repaid through revenues received by the local body -- generally through the property tax. As shown in the previous section, the SBSRD has made extensive use of this funding mechanism.

An **impact fee** is a tool that allows cities or special districts to make new development “pay its own way.” Development impact fees tie costs to responsible parties. Before 1995, impact fees were governed by case law — much of it established by Utah courts. After 1995, the state legislature limited the types of impact fees that cities could impose and established specific procedures. The guiding principle is that there must be a reasonable relationship between fees imposed on development and the needs generated by the new development. Impact fees may be used for construction of new or expanded capital facilities, but are not allowed to make up deficiencies or pay for operations and maintenance. In order to meet the requirements of law, a written analysis is required for each impact fee that clearly sets forth each of the following:

- ☞ Direct impacts on park, trail and recreation improvements of new development;
- ☞ Relationship between needed system improvements and development activity;
- ☞ Estimated proportionate share of costs (per lot, per unit); and
- ☞ Calculation of fee (with methodology clearly identified).

In addition, in order to collect impact fees, a Capital Facilities Plan must be in place as required by the Impact Fees Act: “before imposing impact fees, each local political subdivision shall prepare a capital facilities plan” [11-36-201 (2) (a)]. The statute also provides the following guidelines for adoption of the plan before impact fees may be imposed:

If a local political subdivision prepares an independent capital facilities plan rather than including a capital facilities element in the general plan, the local political subdivision shall, before adopting the capital facilities plan, give public notice of the plan according to this subsection, make a copy of the plan available



to the public at least 14 days before the date of the public hearing, and hold a public hearing to hear public comment on the plan [11-36-201 (d) (I)].

All local governments and special improvement districts that charge impact fees were required to meet the new standards by July 1, 1997 or to delay charging impact fees until the provisions of the act are met. Because of the large amount of new growth projected in the Snyderville Basin and the accompanying increased demands that will be placed upon the existing facilities, impact fees should be considered as a funding mechanism to mitigate these impacts. They cannot, however, be used to cure the present deficiencies in recreation facilities.

As a condition of development approval, **development exactions** require that the developer give something to the local governing body for the development of public facilities. An exaction is often a land dedication for public improvement. The governing body can either require the dedication or, in the case of large-scale development, offer density bonuses. Because development exaction will be used to fund neighborhood parks, they are not considered to be a likely means of funding community park facilities. However, it is possible that circumstances may arise where a developer will be granted some sort of density bonus in exchange for a community park facility.

In some instances, it is possible to form **private and public partnerships** for park development. In general, these partnerships are more successful and private fundraising is facilitated when a high-profile facility, such as a recreation center or cultural arts center, is involved. Experience indicates that it is difficult, if not impossible, to use private fundraising to develop community parks. Therefore, this method of financing should be used to fund major recreation facilities such as a swimming pool or racquet club, and is not considered to be a means of financing community facilities.

An extension of the private/public partnership concept is that of **joint development**. Larger commercial sites are sometimes willing to allow some of their property (which eliminates capital expenditures for land acquisition) to be developed with park facilities. Maintenance generally becomes the responsibility of the local governing body.

Trail system development has experienced historical success with **local and state grants**. Local sales tax initiatives such as the Restaurant Tax program have supported trail improvements based on their direct tie with tourism promotion, but typically matching funds are needed to complete any project funded in part with Restaurant Tax. The State Trails grant program provided capital construction funds for several years in succession, but the volume of grant requests statewide, in combination with reductions in legislative funding of this program, has diminished the likelihood of substantial support from this source in the future.

At the same time, federal funding, including the Safe Routes to Schools program may open up new grant opportunities to the District. The Western Snyderville Basin Transportation Plan also supports a non-motorized transportation program, which may provide for cost savings in development of trails constructed in combination with future transportation improvements, including the possibility of federal grants.



The following table shows some specific ways in which future capital needs could be funded.

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	
Table 22	
2005 Needs Assessment²²	Possible Capital Funding Sources
Trails <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Back Country Natural Surface ▣ Soft Surface Urban ▣ Hard Surface Transportation ▣ Board Walk 	Impact fees Grant requests Bond Interlocal cooperation Developer contribution
Trailheads	Impact fees Grant requests Bond Interlocal cooperation Developer contribution
Trails Off Grade Crossings	Impact fees Grant requests Interlocal cooperation Developer contribution
Indoor Practice Field	Bond – Grants
Ice Rink	Bond -- Public/Private – Interlocal cooperation -- Grant requests
Swimming Facility	Interlocal cooperation -- Bond
Playgrounds	Bond/Impact fees
Tennis Courts	Interlocal cooperation – Park City Racquet Club
Picnic Areas	Bond/Impact fees
Sports Fields ²³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Soccer ▣ Softball/LL ▣ Baseball ▣ Lacrosse/ Rugby/Football ▣ Artificial Turf 	Impact fees Interlocal cooperation Grant requests – Land dedications
Public Golf Course	Promote public access on private courses.
Jogging Track	Bond/Impact fees
Basketball Courts	Bond/Impact fees
Skateboard Park	Bond
Bicycle Skills/Terrain Park	Bond/Impact fees
Dog Parks	Bond/Impact fees
Skateboard Park	Bond
Rock Climbing Wall	Bond
Open Space	Bond/Grant requests

²² Based on SBSRD Needs Assessment Rank-ordered “Top plus Medium Priority Spending” of high propensity voters.

²³ Possible sports field sites: Quinn’s Junction cooperative with PCMC (Gillmor property), Kimball Junction (PRI) cooperative with Park City School District.



NECESSITY OF CONSIDERATION OF IMPACT FEES

With projected expenditures of roughly \$6.2 million for community recreation facilities, \$7.5 million for park land (plus current deficiencies in meeting desired levels of service), \$22 million for trails (not including land or trail structure costs), and \$75,000 (\$2005) an acre for open space, the Recreation District will need to use a variety of means (as it has in the past) for capital projects. It is clear that the SBSRD must consider all financing mechanisms in order to eliminate the existing deficiencies (based on desired LOS) and to keep pace with the rapid rate of new development. Impact fees are a logical source to mitigate the demands placed on the park, recreation and trails systems by new development. Impact fees will result in a more equitable allocation of costs borne in the past by existing property owners and those costs to be encountered in the future and will ensure fair participation by all parties receiving the benefits of the designated recreation standards.



APPENDIX A



APPENDIX B