

**Snyderville Basin Recreation District**  
**STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING #1**  
**Community Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2013-2017**

**Monday, April 1<sup>st</sup> 2013**  
**6:00 PM**

## NOTES

### **In Attendance**

Michael	Barille	PC RAB
Mike	Boyle	PCSD
Jay	Burke	SBSRD Board
Andy	Cusimano	SBSRD Board Liaison
Ken	Fisher	PCMC
Jason	Glidden	PCMC
Brian	Guyer	SBSRD Board
Brian	Hanton	SBSRD
Rena	Jordan	SBSRD
Catherine	Kahlow	SBSRD Board
Todd	Klarich	PCSD
David	Kottler	SBSRD Board
Scott	McClelland	SBSRD Board
Bob	Radke	SBSRD
Matt	Strader	SBSRD
Marilyn	Stinson	SBSRD Board
Meg	Steele	PC RAB
Megan	Suhadolc	SBSRD
Mike	Werner	PCSD
Mark	Vlasic	Landmark Design
Jan	Striefel	Landmark Design
Lisa	Benson	Landmark Design

### **Absent**

Andy	Beerman	PCMC City Council
Heinrich	Deters	PCMC
Maurice	Hickey	PC Board of Education
Justine	Isleib	SBSRD
Jim	Magruder	SBSRD Board
Kraig	Moyes	PC RAB
Bonnie	Park	SBSRD
VJ	Pettit	SBSRD Board Liaison
Will	Pratt	SBSRD
Patrick	Putt	SBSRD Board Liaison
Liza	Simpson	PCMC City Council
Tom	Vangorder	PC School District
Jonathan	Weidenhamer	PCMC

## **Summary:**

### Committee

Members of the Planning Team and the Committee were introduced, and the role of the Strategic Plan Committee was explained. The Committee will be guiding the direction of the Strategic Plan. The committee's knowledge of the area and facilities will be valuable in this planning process.

### Schedule

The project schedule was reviewed. There will be two public meetings – #1 (May 1, 2013) will be held in three venues at three different times of the day: Fieldhouse (am), MARC (noon), Ice Arena (evening), #2 (May 29, 2013) will be held at either the Ice Arena or the MARC in the evening. There will be three more Committee meetings on Monday evening at 6:00pm on the following dates: May 6, May 20, and June 10.

### Getting Started

Landmark Design reviewed what happened at the project kickoff meeting with staff and provided an update on the documentation of existing conditions and the process for the planning team to become familiar with the facilities. Will and Bonnie will be taking the team on a tour of the facilities, with the respective staff members at each facility to provide additional information.

### Website

A project website will be established with a domain name unique to the project. This website will serve as a clearinghouse for information related to the project, including previous studies, related reference materials, and information on meetings. Draft documents will be uploaded as they are developed further in the process. The website address will be sent to the committee as soon as it is available.

### Scoping/Comments

- Add previous plans to the project website.
- Can we get more information/feedback on trails? There were 7 or 8 questions on trails in the survey. The ZBPF study focused on recreational facilities only.
- Don't focus on dog use and trails. The issue may draw too much attention away from other issues.
- Directional/segregated uses need to be addressed from a policy perspective. Do we need separated trails, dog trails, etc.?
- Pickle ball?
- We have to ask for input on the controversial issues and address them. We don't want to orchestrate the process. It needs to unfold naturally.
- Policy vs. Facilities – this purpose of this plan is to address the planning for facilities, not to develop policy.
- Off-leash dog trails may violate the county ordinances.
- This plan will be our strategy, not our policy.
- Our role is to establish priorities.
- Consider the seasonal component. This is important for all facilities.
- Funding - Park City won't be bonding for improvements. It would have to go out for a G.O. bond. Basin Recreation will likely be bonding for facilities.
- Include Silver Creek conceptual site plan on the project website.
- Aquatic Center is looking at possible expansion of facilities at Ecker Hill.

- Demand for indoor facilities during winter is going to keep increasing. Where will they go? Silver Creek?
- Are more permanent structures better? Could the field at Quinn's have a bubble placed over it for winter? Bubbles are huge and expensive. It's better to design a facility that will be covered with a bubble with that intention from the beginning rather than come back and retrofit an existing field. It costs \$20,000/year just to put up and take down the bubble over the tennis courts at the MARC. Storage for the bubble while it's not in use is an issue. They're also not energy efficient.
- We have limited resources (\$\$) to work with and need to get the most use per dollar.
- This plan will look at the uses recommended in the two previous planning documents and develop a system of criteria which can be applied to evaluate the uses, resulting in a ranking of projects by priority.
- Were there any gaps in the community survey that need to be addressed?
- The planning team will present a draft of the evaluation criteria and the resulting project rankings at the first public meeting on May 1, 2013.
- Examples of criteria include: available land, how many seasons does it serve, distance to a trailhead, and can it be added to an existing facility or does it require a new facility.
- This Strategic Plan will back up other decisions made by PCMC, SBSRD, and other agencies.
- Are the criteria based on the results of the two previous studies? Those studies are a good starting point, but we will be looking to see whether anything was missed.
- An outdoor swimming pool came out near the top in the survey, but does it necessarily make sense for this plan? This plan will establish the priorities, and the pool may not come out near the top of the priority list once all of the evaluation criteria are established.
- Low hanging fruit vs. more expensive/complex projects – how will this plan address this? The process is very complex, but once a sensible system of criteria and analysis is established, it will help the public understand the decisions being made, and encourages public support of bonding or other public funding mechanisms.
- Will facility development costs be provided to the public at the first meeting? Yes, cost is a critical issue.
- The survey indicated that the public's tolerance for bonding is not high.
- The decision-making process should be the goal – not the priority list. The end result of this study need to be an action plan, but it will also provide the evaluation criteria/system so that unanticipated future projects can be analyzed using the same process.
- Will this plan account for changing demographics? The two previous studies took into account the changing demographics of the area, and the recommendations of those studies provide the starting point for this Strategic Plan.
- The criteria/analysis process will be refined along the way, with input from Staff, the Committee, and the general public.
- The Master Plan from the '90's was easy to read, looked at parcels and potential uses, was broad-reaching, and had no tight timeline. This plan should be flexible as well. Look at *potential* uses and avoid getting too specific.
- The plan will contain a matrix and decision-making points, and will look at parcels that are already city or district owned.
- Look at regional facilities (Kamas/Heber) and look at privately-owned facilities to see what is or what can be met.

- Seattle's Strategic Action Plan will be put on the project website. It is a great example of a plan that is easy to read and understand for the general public, and it's non-committal. They revisited it in 2012 to see what was accomplished, and are in the process of updating/developing the vision for the next planning window.
- Other examples of evaluation criteria: the Park City Walkable/Bikeable Neighborhood Study. This plan will be placed on the project website as well. Many other strategic plans are available on the internet and can be found just by searching the web. Look at other community plans.
- Economic drivers – Park City is interested in the tourism component. The Basin serves local uses. The plan needs to establish a common vision.
- SBSRD, PCMC, and the School District have established a great precedent of a successful collaboration for recreation facilities. This is expected to continue into the future, though funding may be dependent on benefit analyses.
- Look at both facilities and programs.