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Introduction

The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan provides long-range guidance for the development of parks, recreational facilities and open space for Manhattan. The plan follows a comprehensive land use planning process that saw public dialogue identify parks and open space as an important issue for the City. The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan continues the dialogue in setting a direction for parks and recreation planning for the next ten years.

The objectives of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan are to:

- Identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources;
- Identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs, provide adequate open space, and protect sensitive environmental areas;
- Identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities.

In the end the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan will address the Who, What, When, Where and How of Manhattan parks, recreation and open space.

- Who will share a responsibility in providing park, recreational and open space facilities for Manhattan?
- What type of facilities are appropriate to meet the parks and recreational needs?
- When should the facilities be provided in an equitable and cost effective way?
- Where should future facilities be located to meet both existing and long term needs?
- How much will the facilities cost and how will they be funded?

The Structure of the Plan

The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is structured in two principal sections. Section One - Inventory and Analysis identifies the needs, resources and opportunities in Manhattan related to parks development. Central to this phase has been a series of the public meetings and a random public survey that has helped to identify what is important to the people of Manhattan about parks and open space. Part One is structured into Community Inventory, which includes a summary of the public comments and surveys, as well as demographic analysis, review of land use plan recommendations and land use patterns, and open space recommendations. The Parks and Facilities Inventory includes an analysis of the existing park system, evaluation of recreational facilities and an evaluation of existing public parks.

The Inventory and Analysis provides a basis for definition of the priorities and important issues that structure Section Two. Section Two - Plan Element defines specific methods and projects to meet the identified needs. Three types of implementation strategies give the Program specific direction.

A Facilities Development Program detail the recommended facilities that make up the comprehensive park system, based on the directions and priorities for facilities development agreed upon at the end of Section One.

Financial Strategies outlines target funding levels for facilities development and possible sources funding. The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan includes Administrative Strategies outline a commitment to the Partnership Concept, which emphasizes development of future facilities and programs with related organizations and agencies to the mutual benefit of both. Such programs are intended to encourage dedication of facilities by land developers, conservation groups and philanthropic organizations.
Plan Goals and Objectives

The Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan are based on those developed in the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Land Use Plan identified integrated goals and objectives to guide community actions and accomplish community objectives. These goals and objectives have been reviewed and adapted to reflect the more specific parks and recreation conditions indicated through the Inventory and Analysis. Additions to the Land Use Plan goals and objectives are indicated with brackets [ ].
Parks and Open Space Goals

Goal:

*Promote a park and open space system that is responsive to the needs and values of the citizens of Manhattan*

Objectives:

- Establish a program to coordinate recreation and open space planning with other public agencies within the region.
- Provide recreation and open space areas which are convenient to users and which enhance the unique character and quality of such areas.
- Encourage development of neighborhood parks, larger public parks, and recreational facilities.
- Encourage the establishment of parks adjacent to and in conjunction with any new public school to make the best use of public funds to develop joint use playgrounds, gymnasiums, sports fields, and other appropriate park-school amenities.
- Coordinate and integrate pedestrian ways and bike trails with parks and open space resources.
- Provide for the preservation of open space areas whenever possible.
- Cooperate with other agencies and organizations in identifying natural areas recognized for significant scientific or educational purposes or which may be significant wildlife habitats, and work with private or public landowners on appropriate means for encouraging their protection and preservation.
- [Maintain] a comprehensive parks master plan that establishes the needs for parks and recreation facilities including indoor and outdoor spaces to meet future growth projections and service levels.

Aesthetics Goals

The goals for Aesthetics and the Environment in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan are important influences in developing parks and recreation policy. They are provided here as a related reference.

Goal:

*Enhance the aesthetic qualities of the City.*

Objectives:

- Establish land use development policies and regulations that preserve and enhance the visual qualities of existing and future gateways to the City.
- Promote intergovernmental and private cooperation to coordinate growth and aesthetic controls along major corridors outside of the City.
- Encourage the preservation of significant natural amenities that are characteristic of Manhattan.
- Promote the planting of high quality landscape materials throughout the City.
- Enhance the aesthetic quality of the City through improved sign controls.
- Encourage the preservation of significant physical amenities that are characteristic of
Manhattan, especially the older neighborhoods and commercial centers.

- Preserve and continue the City's street [tree planting] program.

- Encourage pavement of alleys when adjacent to new development, especially Planned Unit Developments.

Environmental Goals

Goal:

*Encourage urban development that is compatible with the natural and built environment.*

Objectives:

- Encourage protection of environmentally sensitive natural areas including wetlands, streams, native woodlands, steep slopes and identified critical habitats.

- Encourage protection of existing water frontages as an integral and compatible element of the [Comprehensive Land Use] Plan.

- Encourage a quality urban environment including control and reduction of air, water, solid waste and noise pollution.

- Encourage a planned unit development approach or other flexible zoning to avoid disturbing environmentally sensitive areas.

- Protect flood prone areas through floodplain management and appropriate land development techniques.

- Prohibit the location of inappropriate land uses within designated noise impact areas.

- Address energy considerations in all planning and development proposals.
Section One

INVENTORY & ANALYSIS
COMMUNITY INVENTORY

The Community Inventory examines factors in Manhattan and the surrounding area that are relevant to parks and recreation planning. This section will evaluate demographic patterns of the area, land development patterns, and policies regarding land use and open space. Central to the Community Inventory is a review of opinions and preferences expressed by the public regarding parks and recreation through public meetings, written comments, and a random public survey.
Demographics

The type and character of the parks, recreation and open space facilities appropriate for Manhattan follow the character and values of the people of the community. Demographic characteristics and trends can be indicators of what facilities, activities and programs are most appropriate for Manhattan’s park and recreation system.

The demographic characteristics most applicable to park and recreation planning are overall population trends, which is an indicator of the amount of facilities necessary; population distribution, indicating the location of needed facilities; and age, which is a principal indicator of the type of facilities and activity mix appropriate for the community.

Trends in Manhattan

Population growth in Manhattan has been substantial and steady for the past thirty years. The U.S. Census of Population indicates that the city population was 22,993 in 1960, 26,897 in 1970, 32,644 in 1980 and 37,712 in 1990. The principal forces behind overall population expansion in the area are enrollments increases of Kansas State University and increased troop strengths at nearby Fort Riley Army Base. The demographic profile of Manhattan shown in Tables 1 and 2 reflect the influence and importance of these two facilities on the community. Table 1 indicates that population increases were relatively even among males and females although, uncharacteristic of most communities, males out number females. The percentage of minorities in the community has increased as the make up of the university population has diversified.

The impact of K State and Fort Riley is particularly evident in the census figures presented in Table 2. The table compares age group percentages and household group percentages with percentages from the State of Kansas as a whole. Whereas 12.9% of the population of Kansas is in the 16-24 age group, 32.8% of Manhattan’s population is in that group. Other significant differences from average Kansas profiles are:

- A lower percentage of the population 65 and older;
- A lower percentage of family households compared to total households;
- A higher percentage of multi-person non-family households (i.e. that is, single people living together);
- And higher percentage of the population in group housing (dormitories).

Population Projections

Population projections are more speculative in Manhattan than in many communities because growth is highly dependent on two economic forces - K State and Fort Riley. Lacking a broadly diversified economy, Manhattan's growth will vary with the policies of the State education system and Federal defense objectives. For the purposes of this study, a "straight-line" method of projection will be used as a basis for parks and facilities planning.

Applying the most recent ten year growth rate (1980-1990) of 1.55% per year projects a ten-year increase to approximately 43,500 in Manhattan by the year 2000.

Implications for Parks and Recreation Planning

The high percentage of young adults in Manhattan suggests there is provision of active recreational facilities is a priority for the park and recreation system. The high number of non-family households suggests that possibly a greater number of people in Manhattan will seek activities outside the home than in other Kansas communities, resulting in an increased overall demand for city recreational activities. However, the make up of the Manhattan is diverse and eclectic. The most definitive pattern evident from the demographic information is the prospect of continued moderate population expansion and consequently the need for more services.
Table 1
Manhattan Demographic Profile
1980–1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>% Change 1980–90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>37,712</td>
<td>32,644</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19,464</td>
<td>16,783</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18,248</td>
<td>15,861</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>29,964</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census of Population
Analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare
Table 2  
Comparison of Age Group & Households  
Manhattan and Kansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Manhattan 1990</th>
<th>Manhattan 1980</th>
<th>Change % of Total</th>
<th>Kansas 1990 % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>37,712</td>
<td>32,644</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>2,477,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>12,376</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>143.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; Over</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>283.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manhattan 1990</th>
<th>Manhattan 1980</th>
<th>Change % of Total</th>
<th>Kansas 1990 % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,689</td>
<td>12,821</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>944,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>7,902</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>658,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple</td>
<td>6,614</td>
<td>6,229</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>552,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>81,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>6,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>286,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; Older</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>82,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census of Population  
Analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare
Land Development Patterns

Recent land development trends in Manhattan indicate substantial growth along the western and northern areas of the City, particularly west of Seth Child Road and north of Kimball Avenue. Projections identified in the 1991 Land Use Element and the Water and Sewer Elements of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan indicate that future growth will continue in these areas.

Table 3, Projected Land Development 1989-2010, identifies the amount of developed land that is expected to be developed in each of twelve planning areas, as defined in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. (Map 1 defined planning area boundaries.) These figures show that most of the land expected to be developed over the next twenty years is the Eureka Valley/Airport area, the Little Kitten Watershed corridor and the Kimball Road corridor from Northview to Scenic Road. Further analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare indicates the intensity of development expected in these areas. Fifty seven percent of the total land area in the Little Kitten Creek planning area is anticipated to be developed during that period. More than twenty percent of the land is expected to be developed in both the Kimball corridor planning area and the planning area along the ridge lines between Wildcat Creek and the Eureka Valley. Only minimal growth is expected for areas to the east, southeast and south of the City.

Implications for Parks and Recreation Planning

Identifying the location of future land development is particularly important in projecting the location of neighborhood parks and recreational facilities that address sub-communities needs. The Parks and Facilities Inventory that follows provides the numbers of parks and recreational facilities that will be needed to meet the needs of the expanding population, as well as make up current deficits. Projected land development patterns suggest areas where new parks and recreational facilities should be considered to meet the expanding population. During the Ten-Year Planning Period, it is anticipated that two additional Neighborhood Level Parks will be needed to meet the expanding population (above those constructed to meet current deficiencies). Location of these Neighborhood Level Parks should be in the Stagg Hill area (Planning Area No. 2), Little Kitten Creek area (Planning Area No. 4) and north of Kimball Road and west of K State (Planning Area No. 6). An additional Neighborhood Park in the Eureka Valley area may also be necessary should residential areas develop faster than the northwestern areas. An additional Community Park in the northeast sector of Manhattan would meet both existing deficit needs and that of the expanding population. To meet the needs for these facilities, it is particularly important to encourage land developer dedication and contribution as a method of providing facilities and open space.

Location of land for additional natural area parks is typically more dependent upon the qualities present on suitable property than the specific result expansion of nearby residential development. However, sensitive natural areas that may come under development pressure should be identified and protection mechanisms and/or acquisition schedules should be determined to insure adequate protection in advance of the development pressure. Areas along Little Kitten Creek and the bluffs along the Eureka Valley are areas that will require particular attention. Other environmentally sensitive areas, as identified in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, are also areas that may be appropriate for use as parks and open space. A specific listing of areas recommended for park and open space development is provided in Section Two, under Greenspace and Natural Area development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Eureka Valley, Airport</td>
<td>6,351</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>105.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Between Eureka V. &amp; Wiklca</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>108.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Northwest of Little Kitten</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>262.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Little Kitten Creek Watershed</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>308.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Far North Central</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kimball Corridor</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sunset/Anderson Bluffs</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 City Core</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 East U.S. 24</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>166.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Far Southeast, Zaendale</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>126.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Near Southeast</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hunter's Island</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>110.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41,066</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>14,644</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1991 Manhattan Comprehensive Plan
Analysis by Oehsner Hare & Hare
Land Use Plan Recommendations

The Land Use Plan sets policy and direction for land use relationships for the City and urban area. The 1991 Land Use Plan outlines the projected role for parks, recreation and open space in overall land development in Manhattan 1989-2010. The following excerpts from several sections of the Plan are provided for reference and as a basis for evaluation:

Land Use Principals and Criteria

"Parks serve a four-fold purpose: they provide facilities that promote and enhance social interaction within the community, they provide facilities for outdoor recreation, they enable historic and scenic values in the community to be preserved, and they permit property poorly adapted for urban purposes, by virtue of its steepness or poor drainage, to be protected from a harmful private use. The first of these purposes is the most widely accepted. All types of people of all ages have different recreational demands. For the toddler, the backyard is adequate; for small children, the elementary school and neighborhood park provide a large measure of needed recreational facilities. Young people in junior and senior high school are interested in a wide range of recreational activities often requiring large areas for such games as baseball, basketball, football, soccer and tennis." For adults, a diversified recreational program is necessary consisting of both organized and unorganized programs with small and large space required. [An accompanying] table indicates the planning standards under which a municipal park system should be developed in order to serve the recreational desires of all these age groups."

"Small parks containing one or two acres can be valuable assets in more heavily populated sections of the city, however, such areas serve mainly an ornamental function and should be landscaped and maintained accordingly. The number of small parks should be relatively low since their value is in their location and appearance rather than in their use - and maintenance cost is high." [The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan differs with the Land Use Plan on this point. See discussion below]

"Neighborhood or community parks generally provided passive and active recreational facilities for all ages. Where possible, it is desirable that park sites of this nature be adjacent to public school grounds so that there can be some sharing of common facilities. This is particularly true if there is an opportunity to incorporate the school building into a comprehensive program of providing year-round indoor and outdoor recreation activities."

"With increasing interest in competitive games and sports, there is a growing need for playfields where the entire area can be intensively utilized for competitive games. In most instances this type of activity occupies a portion of the community or regional park, though they can be free-standing facilities as well. Adequate parking and spectator seating must be provided to accommodate people who travel greater than walking distances to participate in, or watch these activities."

"In addition to the types of recreational facilities mentioned above, there is a need for citywide or regional parks which serve the entire community. These areas are normally 100 acres or more in size and are selected because of their topographic and physical advantage such as being adjacent to rivers and lakes or containing rugged topography and heavily wooded sections. Some of these larger parks might be improved with public golf courses, municipal swimming pools, zoos, outdoor theaters, or other special purpose functions intended to serve the entire community. Where topography and existing vegetation are significant, these areas should be maintained in their natural state to afford opportunities for picnicking, walking, riding and other types of more passive recreational activity."

"The Parks and Recreation land use classification in the Land Use Plan is self-explanatory and
the projected acreage related directly to the function intended. For the most part, these facilities will be provided by public agencies (city, county, state or federal), however other recreational facilities are included in this category as well. This includes commercial or privately operated golf courses, marinas, fishing camps, etc., as well as recreational areas maintained by neighborhood associations and large scale land development projects. River banks, floodplains and other restricted areas contribute to the recreational needs of the community if these areas remain undeveloped and are accessible to the general public for hiking, fishing or other passive recreational pursuits. To this extent, some areas designated as "open space" on the land use plan can be considered as serving a dual purpose, especially along the banks of Wildcat Creek and the Kansas and Big Blue Rivers. This is particularly true in reference to the city's Linear Park [Trail] which follows the levee for a good portion of its length around the south and east sides of the community."

Implementation & Overview - Current City Plan

"Though the present planning study did not include an extensive assessment of parks and recreational needs, there have been some general assumptions made relative to future park sites. Overall the Manhattan urban area has an acceptable ratio of parkland to total population. The deficiency, if any, is more related to location than total acreage. This is difficult to correct in largely built-up areas because of the cost and difficulty in obtaining usable tracts of land. As re-development or infill occurs in these areas developers should be encouraged to include some recreational facilities as part of their development. In rapidly developing areas new park sites need to be identified early so that adequate areas are preserved well in advance of actual development. Developers should be required to participate in providing recreation facilities in newly developed areas."

"A major feature of the city's present parks and recreation plan is the development of a Linear Park interconnecting various areas of the city with a system of hiking and biking trails. A portion of this Linear Park is already in place and the updated land use plan includes provisions for its ultimate completion around the city."

Implications for Parks and Recreation Planning

The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is intended to build upon and refine land use plan directions. In this more thorough evaluation of parks and recreation, some recommendations of the 1991 Comprehensive Land Use Plan will be superseded or expanded. In the following Parks and Facilities Inventory, a revised park system structure and standards are recommended. Other points for re-emphasis or reconsideration are as follows:

- It should be re-emphasized that cooperative development of schools and parks facilities can result in cost efficiency and improvement facilities for both concern. Such joint program should be a high priority in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

- The statement in the Land Use Plan that the value of small parks (implied neighborhood parks) is mainly ornamental and the recommendation to restrict their number is inaccurate.

- Strategically located neighborhood level parks not only provide "walk-to" recreational facilities, but can be landmarks in residential areas and provide individuality and identity for a neighborhood. The cost of maintenance of neighborhood level park is generally little more per comparative acre than larger parks unless such parks are in extremely remote locations or unless a substantial change would be necessary to establish a system of transportation for maintenance equipment.

- Recognizing the contribution of other public agencies and private operations in the community inventory and encouraging further such development should be a priority of the Plan.

- References to projections for development for parks and recreation land in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan are useful as a
general description of land use recommendations. However, it should be recognized that these projections may be more specific than is practical for long range planning purposes and that the projections are for approximately the planning period of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

- The linkage of urban areas, parks and recreation sites through a Linear Park Trail or trail system is important to both give structure to developing land use patterns and to provide parks and open space facilities to the public. Trails and linear parks should be a high priority in the Master Plan.
Community Open Space and Greenspace Objectives

The principal statement of policy regarding community open and greenspace is the Open Space Element of the Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The following are excerpts from the plan regarding Open Space policy.

Open Space Policy

"Open space is a desired amenity of the urban environment which can be achieved in various ways. Historically, public parks have been the primary means of maintaining large tracts of undeveloped land in urban areas. However, this is not the only source for incorporating open space in the urban area land use plan. Major drainage courses and areas of rugged terrain can be protected from building encroachment by allowing affected land owners to develop adjacent lands at a slightly higher intensity with the provision that the undeveloped areas be maintained as permanent open space. With appropriate planning and coordination of adjacent development projects a system of interconnected belts of permanent open space can be created to provide a haven for wildlife, enhance community views and vistas or simply provide a pleasant contrast to the urban scene."

"Circumstances and conditions under which open space areas should be set aside relate largely to community's commitment for improving the visual appearance of the city. As a minimum, wetlands, floodway and land areas with 20 percent grade or greater should be protected from extensive urban development, if at all possible. In addition, there are other areas within and around the community that have a scenic value that enhances the quality of life. Such areas include natural woodland, open vistas and corridor entrances to the City. These areas should be identified and protected whenever possible through the use of conservation or scenic easements, or other land use techniques. Roadways and utility improvements, as well as buildings and signage should be controlled so that they are sensitive to adjacent scenic areas.

The updated land use plan provides for extensive areas of open space with the potential to accommodate a network of greenways, hiking and biking trails linking cultural, recreational and community activity centers within the urban area."

Implications for Parks & Recreation Planning

The community policy regarding open space and strategies for protection, preservation and appropriate use are well stated by in the Land Use Plan and are appropriate as guidelines for Open Space policy within the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. Methods of supporting this policy include would include:

- Maintaining a street tree planting program.
- Use of conservation easements and reservation ordinances.
- Development of a Urban Forestry Master Plan

A complete description of plan recommendation for open space areas is provided in Section Two, under Greenspace and Linear Park Development Programs.
Public Preference & Opinion

Central to the Community Inventory process is determining what the people of Manhattan feel is important about parks and recreation and what directions they feel the park and recreation program should go. Consequently, one of the principal activities of the inventory process is measurement of public opinion about parks and recreation. In order to gain a thorough and accurate measure of public opinion, a variety of methods was used to engage the public in the process, including public meetings, open newspaper surveys and detailed random surveys.

Public Meetings

A series of five public meetings was held to invite public comment over a six week period. The meetings were held at various locations throughout the city to encourage the participation of residents in all city neighborhoods. The meeting schedule was as follows:

- January 6, 1992, Senior Center.
- February 3, 1992, Holidome.
- February 11, 1992, Fire Station Headquarters.

Advertisement of the meetings included display ads in the local papers and announcement on local radio. A complete record of the meetings is provided in the appendix and summary of the topics mentioned more than once is provided below. Several interest groups showed their concern by making presentations at public meetings. The Manhattan Marlin swimming team was well represented and constituted approximately two thirds of the expression for municipal indoor swimming facilities. The square dance clubs in the Manhattan area represented the need for indoor dance facilities. Various representatives of the cultural arts community expressed the need of the city to plan for the needs of the arts in Manhattan and requested a similar planning process for the cultural arts.

In summary, the public meetings seemed to indicate the following areas of emphasis by the public that attended:

- Increased facilities for indoor recreation activities, particularly for indoor swimming.
- A substantial emphasis on the increasing amount of greenspace and natural areas in the system.
- Wide spread, but not intense, support for more neighborhood parks.
- A recognition of the efficiencies of joint park/school development.

Topics

(Number of Meetings Discussed/Number of Comments)

Need for Indoor Swimming 5/12
Importance of Greenspace* 5/8
Need for Neighborhood Parks/Facilities* 5/6
Importance of Cultural Arts Needs 4/9
Supports Shared School/Recreation* 4/7
Comments on Process & Other Plans 4/6
Supports Linear Trail 3/4
Need for Square Dancing Facilities 3/4
Need for Ball Field Facilities 2/6
Need for Multi-Use Indoor Facilities* 2/5
Compliment Openness of Process 2/3
Need for Partnerships 2/3
Need for Ice Skating Facilities 2/2
Emphasis on Quality Facilities/Aesthetics 2/2

*Topic Initiated by Facilitators at Each Meeting
Written Comments

To give the public an alternative to oral comment, several methods were used to encourage the public to indicate their opinions. Short surveys were distributed at public meetings for written comments; a similar survey was published in the Manhattan Mercury; and radio announcements encouraged written comments to the Parks & Recreation Department.

Seventy-one short surveys were received and 12 written letters. The topics addressed more than once in written comments are indicated below. A complete listing of comments and summary of all topics mentioned are provided in the appendix. Unless otherwise indicated, support for the activities was recommended.

Written Comment Topics - Times Mentioned

- Neighborhood Parks 8
- Ceramics 7
- Natural Areas 6
- Ballroom & Square Dance 5
- Butterfield House & Log Cabin 5
- Supports Linear Park Trail 5
- Cultural Arts 4
- Group Trips 3
- Bike Lanes/Trails 3
- Ballfields & Facilities 3
- Indoor Facilities 3
- Support for the Museum 2
- Developer Dedication of Park Facilities 2
- Square/Ballroom Dance Lessons 2
- Transportation to Facilities 2

As with the public meetings, several organizations encouraged member to support their particular interests. Most of the letters supporting ceramics resulted from the Making Memories Ceramics program. The Goodnow Neighborhood Association submitted a well documented evaluation of Goodnow Park with recommendations for improvements (provided in the appendix).

Generally, the expression of public opinion through written methods reflects the oral public comment. There was less expression for indoor swimming facilities and more for neighborhood parks. In comparison, the short surveys and letters more frequently addressed specific activities of individual interest than the oral comments, which tended to relate individual interests to comprehensive development of the parks and recreation system.

Random Public Survey

The Survey Process - A random public survey of recreational interests was conducted to obtain a scientific sampling of recreation interest in the population of Manhattan. To achieve a scientific sample of the city population, the sample size and population base were carefully selected. Approximately 600 households were selected at random from City water department records. Surveys were mailed in mid-March. As of April 15, 389 (approximately 65%) of the surveys had been returned and tabulated. A copy of the survey form is provided in the appendix.

A comprehensive tabulation of the results of the total survey population is provided in the appendix. A summary of the fifteen most popular activities, as determined from a weighed average of responses, is provided below. Several subgroups were evaluated to measure differences in target user from the interest of the overall population.

Most important of the subgroups is the renter sub-group. Because City water bill accounts were used to select the sample, the survey is likely to select a higher percentage of owners in the survey than in the population as a whole. The percentage of owners/renters in the results was compared to the ratio identified by the 1990 U.S. Census. Whereas 21% of those responding to the survey were renters, 55% of the households in Manhattan were identified as renters in the 1990 census. However, weighting the survey data to account for a the 55% weight indicated little significant change in ranking of activities.

Fifteen Most Popular Activities - (Out of 51 Indoor and Outdoor Activities)

Number of Respondents - 389

1. Concert & Entertainment
2. Picnicking
3. Area Walking
4. Trail Walking
5. Wildlife Observation
6. Indoor Swimming
7. Environmental & Habitat Trails
8. Indoor Running/Walking
9. Playgrounds (Tie)
9. Nature & Discovery Center (Tie)
11. Fishing
12. Performing Arts
13. Bicycle Trail Riding
14. Softball
15. Jogging/Running

**Fifteen Most Popular Activities - Renters Only**

*Number of Respondents - 80*

1. Concerts & Entertainment
2. Trail Walking & Hiking
3. Picnicking
4. Indoor Swimming
5. Environmental & Habitat Trails
6. Area Walking
7. Wildlife Observation
8. Indoor Running/Walking
9. Playgrounds
10. Nature/Discovery Center
11. Fishing
12. Bicycle Trail Riding
12. Jogging/Running
14. Weightlifting
15. Softball

*The Survey Results - In evaluating the survey results, it is important to recognize that the potential for casual use of any given activity affects the response. The activities provided to the respondents require a wide range of skills and in some cases require special equipment or gear for typical enjoyment. The activities that require significant skill and special gear are less likely to be attractive for casual use, incidental use or opportunistic use. Accordingly, while the survey provides an accurate indication of some interest in the activities, it does not indicate the intensity of interest or the potential frequency of use by the population.

Nonetheless, the survey results indicate a strong community interest in natural area activities and concerts and entertainment. Of particular note is the interest in indoor swimming, bicycle trail riding, and softball, activities that require at least some level of skill and/or dedicated involvement. That nature and discover centers finished high in each sub-group is significant considering no such facility presently exists in the Manhattan area. Weightlifting was particularly popular among renters and finished just below the top fifteen in the general population.

Review of two age sub-groups indicate that family responses were quite similar to the general population (with the exception of increased interest in playgrounds), while those 55 and older reflect the greatest divergence from average. Respondents 55 and older indicated an increased preference for bird watching, group trips, the performing arts and visual arts and less interest in swimming, playgrounds and other active recreational activities.*

**Fifteen Most Popular Activities - Family Groups**

*Number of Respondents - 59*

1. Playgrounds
2. Concerts & Entertainment
3. Picnicking
4. Trail Walking & Hiking
5. Indoor Swimming
6. Environmental & Habitat Trails
7. Wildlife Observation
8. Nature & Discovery Center
9. Area Walking
10. Fishing
11. Bicycle Trail Riding
12. Indoor Running/Walking
13. Indoor Playground
14. Performing Arts
15. Canoeing

**Fifteen Most Popular Activities - Age 55 & Over**

*Number of Respondents - 92*

1. Concert/Entertainment
2. Wildlife Observation
3. Picnicking
4. Indoor Running/Walking
5. Area Walking
6. Bird Watching
7. Fishing
8. Trail Walking & Hiking
9. Environmental & Habitat Trails
10. Performing Arts
11. Group Trips
12. Visual Arts
13. Nature & Discovery Center
14. Playgrounds
15. Swimming (Indoor)

The respondents were also asked to evaluate the importance of having the use of several categories of parks. Seventy-three percent indicated that having use of a community park was important or very important, compared to 55% for neighborhood parks, 50% for natural area parks and 38% for indoor recreational facilities. It should be noted that the activities identified as most important above do not always correspond with the types of park thought to be the most important.

Implication for Parks and Recreation Planning

The number of methods the City has used to capture the ideas, opinions and guidance from the public reflects the dedication to public involvement in the planning process. The combined results of the public involvement process suggests the following direction for parks and recreation planning:

- There is a broad and well defined interest in natural oriented recreational activities. Development of these natural areas, facilities and program should be a high priority during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

- There is a high interest in a variety of indoor recreational activities, an intensely high interest in indoor swimming. Development of an community-wide indoor swimming facility should be a high priority during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

- There is a substantial interest in improving neighborhood level parks system ("walk-to parks) and facilities in Manhattan.

- There is a substantial interest in community park activities particularly league oriented large volume sports such as softball, baseball, soccer and football. That many survey respondents indicated that both community parks and natural area activities were important suggests that more natural area features should be developed in these parks.

- There is general agreement that joint development of school and parks is appropriate where feasible and cost effective.

- There is a definitive interest in cultural arts activities including the performing arts and visual arts. Interest in the arts is particularly strong among those 55 and older.
PARKS & FACILITIES INVENTORY

The Parks and Facilities Inventory measures the community's parks and recreational facilities in several ways. First, the structure of the park system is evaluated to indicate how the levels of parks work together to serve the people of Manhattan. Next, the number and distribution of facilities will be evaluated to establish the current adequacy of recreational facilities. Finally, each park will be reviewed as to its contribution to the overall park system and how that park can be improved to better serve the community.
The Structure of the Park System

The existing park system originated in 1857 when the City fathers set aside approximately 80 acres of its new community for recreation and open space. Those sites are known today as City Park, Longs Park, Douglass Park and Griffith Park. From that commitment to a park system, Manhattan has built a system that is centered on providing a variety of recreation services to the people of Manhattan. Map 1 indicates the distribution of the parks in the system and characterizes the facilities available at each site.

Evaluation of the Park System Structure

Since 1991, Manhattan has followed a Park System Program defined in the 1991 Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Plan identifies three principal types of recreational parks: Regional Parks, Community Parks and Neighborhood Parks, and a Green Space nature park category. Each of these park categories has their own standard and facilities objectives.

In practice, however, the system in Manhattan has been developed as a two-tiered system of recreational parks, with two categories of park in each tier. Natural Area Parks and Speciality Parks complete the system. The Park System Programming Standards of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan, shown in Table 4, are modified from the 1991 Standards and the previous Park Master Plan to reflect this recommended park system structure. The modifications retain the overall amounts of acreage, distribution, and facility requirements as is found in more typical systems and reallocates the standards within the two tiered structure.

The clearest distinction between the two types of Recreational Park is the range of their service areas. Neighborhood Level Parks are "walk-to" parks, focused on a "walkable" service area with no pedestrian barrier between residents and the park. Community Level Parks are designed as "drive-to" parks intended to serve the entire community. Although Community Level Parks will typically be reached by car, neighborhood park type facilities may be found in Community Level Parks to serve the immediate residential area.

Important to the success of Manhattan’s current system is that Manhattan’s size is a reasonable service area for community oriented parks. The fact that every Manhattan resident is within comfortable driving distance to any community park allows these community parks to specialize in the high volume facilities (such as softball, baseball and soccer), minimizing the duplication of recreational facilities.

Neighborhood Level Parks

The focus for Neighborhood Level Parks is to provide park and recreational facilities to residential areas that can be reached on foot on a casual basis. The defining principal of the Neighborhood Level Park is that every Manhattan resident live within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood oriented park with access free of natural or traffic barriers. As much as possible, Neighborhood Level Parks should be a visual and functional neighborhood landmark—a place that helps to emphasize the individual identity of the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Park is the principal type of Neighborhood Level Park, supplemented by smaller Neighborhood Playgrounds.

Neighborhood Parks - Neighborhood Parks, usually 3 to 14 acres, contain a variety of activities to serve a broad range of age groups. Neighborhood Parks usually serve up to 7,000 persons. Typical core facilities for Neighborhood Parks are playgrounds, landscaped sitting areas, picnic facilities and at least one of the following: walking trails, free play fields and open space, basketball court, tennis court, Youth Sports ball diamond and/or soccer field. Neighborhood Parks may be located adjacent to elementary schools that will allow for a sharing of resources. A park/school relationship may permit the outdoor facilities of the park to be complemented by indoor facilities, with the school providing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Types</th>
<th>Service Area Population</th>
<th>Service Area Radius</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
<th>Programming Standard</th>
<th>Current Inventory</th>
<th>Existing Land Area</th>
<th>Target Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATIONAL PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Level Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1/2 Mile</td>
<td>3–14 Acres</td>
<td>Douglas, Goodnow</td>
<td>47 Acres</td>
<td>46.5 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longs, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Playgrounds</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1/4 Mile</td>
<td>1–2 Acres</td>
<td>Harbour Park</td>
<td>0.5 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Level Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1 1/2 Miles</td>
<td>15–100 Acres</td>
<td>CiCo, City,</td>
<td>235 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Anneberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Playfields</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1 1/2 Miles</td>
<td>15–34 Acres</td>
<td>Griffith, Gorman</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Recreational Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5 Acres/1000</td>
<td>292 Acres</td>
<td>399 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL AREA PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Acres/1000</td>
<td>363 Acres</td>
<td>380 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Standards: National Recreation and Park Association
Analysis by Oehsner Hare & Hare
enclosed space for meetings, arts and crafts programs, restrooms and storage. Several of Manhattan’s parks, Girls Scout Park, Pioneer Park and Warner Park, provide neighborhood open space with fewer recreational facilities than is typical. Accordingly, these parks serve as both neighborhood parks and natural area parks.

**Neighborhood Playgrounds** - A playground is a small recreation area typically less than three acres in size. Ideally, Neighborhood Playgrounds should be used to service to small isolated neighborhoods or to supplement facilities in areas with substantial non-park recreational facilities such as schools or community wide parks. Core facilities include playground and landscaped sitting areas and may also include picnic facilities.

**Community Level Parks**

The core of the present Manhattan park system is the community wide parks. City Park, Cico Park and Frank Anneberg Park are the vanguard Manhattan parks, providing a range of recreational facilities to the entire community. Griffith Park and, to a lesser extent, Gorman Fields also contribute to community-wide facilities as community playfields. Manhattan’s concentration of population allows Community Parks to be somewhat specialized, permitting some parks to provide a special focus for a different high volume athletic activity. Frank Anneberg Park is the community center for soccer and softball, Cico Park is the center for baseball. Griffith Park is used for a variety of league activities as is City Park.

**Community Parks** - The Community Parks are the most identifiable parks in the City system. The multi-purpose Community Parks should have well landscaped central open space areas for family activities and passive recreation and will also be the center for higher intensity, league organized recreational activities, and contain areas that contribute to significant community open space. Such facilities may include swimming pools, ball fields, walking trails, picnic facilities, playgrounds and special communities facilities such as an amphitheater or day camp. Depending on the location, Community Parks may also provide neighborhood level facilities to serve the surrounding residential area.

**Community Playfields** - More specialized than Community Parks, Community Playfields provide facilities for one or two large scale community-wide recreational activities, such as football, softball, baseball or soccer. In addition to the core facilities, typical development includes such as playgrounds, shelters and support buildings. Community Playfields should also be developed to serve as a Neighborhood Level Park if the location is appropriate and designed with the potential for expansion to broader use as a Community Park as demand requires.

**Natural Area Parks**

Natural Area Parks provide the opportunity for experiences and enjoyment of the natural environment. Natural Area Parks are the most diverse in the park system and may range from a small stream corridor path to a several thousand acre reserve. The location of Natural Area Parks is often more “resource based” rather than “population based”. That is, Natural Area Parks are typically developed more to preserve or feature a significant natural resource than to be close to population centers. Activities include picnicking, water recreation, trail use, camping, equestrian activities, and beach swimming.
Park Facilities Inventory

Park Distribution

Two of the most important factors in an inventory of parks and recreational facilities are the amount of facilities in a community and the distribution of those facilities. Maps 1 and 2 indicate the location of the parks operated by the City. The map shows that Community Level Parks are generally well distributed throughout the community. The three principal multi-purpose Community Parks -- City Park, Cico Park and Frank Anneberg are in central locations in the City, with the northeast sector the only area not specifically served by a Community Park. Neighborhood Level Parks are more concentrated within the older parts of the City with few neighborhood recreational opportunities facilities in the western suburban areas, although CiCo and City Park serve as neighborhood parks in their respective areas. School facilities compliment Neighborhood Level Parks in many areas of the City. However, to meet the objective that every Manhattan resident live within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood oriented park with access free of natural or major trafficways, future Neighborhood Level Park development is needed in the western parts of the City.

Table 4 indicates acreage standards for each park type. The table indicates that Manhattan is deficient in acreage for Neighborhood Level Parks by 67 acres (or six to eight Neighborhood Parks) and for Community Level Park by 40 acres (or one Community Park). The deficiency of Community Level Park acreage is somewhat compensated for by the Community Level facilities provided in Northview Park (swimming pool and one baseball field) and the indication in Table 5 that Manhattan meets most of the requirement for facilities found principally in Community Level Parks. Acquisition and development of one additional Community Level Park in the northeastern part of the City during the planning period would round out an already well established system of Community Parks.

Development of a comprehensive Neighborhood Level Park system, however, will require a greater commitment of resources. Map 5 on page 46 shows the locations of parks and schools providing recreational facilities. The map shows deficiencies throughout the perimeter of the city, particularly in the Stagg Hill area and the northern suburbs. Additionally, several parks in the western central area (i.e. Sunset Park, Girl Scout Park and Pioneer Park) have few of the facilities that typically make up a neighborhood park, such as playground facilities and picnic areas. Table 6, Evaluation Summary of Recreational Parks, indicates that several of the Neighborhood Park facilities in the center part of the city are worn and/or substandard. To bring the Neighborhood Level Park system to a level to meet current standards would require the construction of at least six Neighborhood Parks or the equivalent mix of Neighborhood Parks and Neighborhood Playgrounds. Additionally, it is projected that at least two more Neighborhood Level parks would be required to meet population expansion during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Facilities Inventory

A complete inventory of park facilities available to City residents within the Manhattan area is provided in Tables A through E in the Appendix. Table A indicates facilities provided in Recreational Park by the Parks and Recreation Department. Table B indicates the facilities provided in Natural Area parks. Table C indicates facilities that the Manhattan School District contributes to the community recreational inventory. The facilities of each of these combine to make up the Manhattan area facilities inventory which are evaluated against Parks and Facilities Standards in Table 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (Adult &amp; HS)</td>
<td>1 Field/10,000 Population</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (Youth)</td>
<td>1 Field/6,000 Population</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Outdoor)</td>
<td>1 Court/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Field</td>
<td>1 Field/10,000 Population</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>1 Course/25,00 Population</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball Court</td>
<td>1 Court/5,000 Population</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Court</td>
<td>1 Court/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini - Use Court</td>
<td>1 Court/3,000 Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Theater</td>
<td>1 Theater/20,000 Population</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelter</td>
<td>1 Shelter/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>1 Table/125 Population</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-195</td>
<td>-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1 Playground/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Field</td>
<td>1 Field/4,000 Population</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1 Field/3,000 Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball, Youth Field</td>
<td>1 Field/5,000 Population</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool (25M)</td>
<td>1 Pool/10,000 Population</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool (50M)</td>
<td>1 Pool/20,000 Population</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>1 Court/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Bicycle</td>
<td>1 Mile/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Equestrian</td>
<td>1 Mile/6,250 Population</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Exercise</td>
<td>1 Mile/5,500 Population</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Hiking</td>
<td>1 Mile/4,000 Population</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Jogging</td>
<td>1 Mile/2,000 Population</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Nature</td>
<td>1 Mile/2,500 Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Court</td>
<td>1 Court/5,000 Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wading Pool</td>
<td>1 Pool/5,000 Population</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Facilities Standards: National Recreation & Park Association
Analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare
Manhattan School District Facilities

The schools in Manhattan provide a varying degree of facilities for public use. Typically, the school facilities most used by the public are playground facilities at elementary schools but playfields, tennis and basketball courts and gymnasiums are also used. Although hours of use of these facilities are restricted, school facilities serve as a complement to park facilities and are considered a pragmatic and cost effective method to meet neighborhood and community wide facilities standards without substantial conflict. Location of schools contributing to the recreation inventory is shown on Map 3. Further evaluation of indoor facilities provided by the school system is provided in the Indoor Facilities section that follows.

Other Government Agencies

More than many communities, Manhattan benefits from the proximity of park facilities operated by other governmental agencies. Kansas State University facilities, targeted for student, faculty and staff use, serves a high percentage of the population of the city. K-State particularly helps to meet recreational facilities needs for tennis courts, basketball courts and indoor recreation space for this segment of the community. Table E in the Appendix provides an inventory of recreational facilities for Kansas State University.

Several agencies provide nature area parks in the area. Riley County Department of Parks, Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers all manage nature area parks within ten miles of Manhattan. In Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Manhattan residents are within 20 minutes of one of the most significant natural resources parks in the central Kansas region. This park absorbs some of the demand of City residents for natural resource park activities and relieves the Department of Parks and Recreation of committing substantial resources for such activities as camping, picnicking, open space, boating and hiking. Tables D and E in the Appendix provide an inventory of recreational facilities for parks within ten miles of Manhattan.

Recreational Facilities Evaluation

The standards identified in Table 5 have been developed by the National Recreation and Park Association. These standards are typically used as an initial measure of park and recreation programs. A review of Table 5 indicates that the strength of Manhattan system is the availability of ball fields and playing fields. These facilities permit strong recreational league development in soccer, softball, baseball and football. Facilities in each of these activity types are well distributed within the community. Additionally, facilities at Tuttle Creek Reservoir adds to the community inventory in trails, picnic facilities, swimming and water recreation facilities. Manhattan is also within two hours of Milford, Pomona, Wilson, Council Grove, Melburn, and Clinton Reservoir.

Compared to national standards, the Manhattan system is most in need of facilities typically categorized as neighborhood activities (such as tennis, handball and basketball courts) or complementary park activities (such as horseshoes, shuffleboard). Not reflected in these standards is the community's expressed need for indoor facilities, particularly indoor swimming.

Overall, Manhattan meets the national facilities standards fairly well. From a cost and budget perspective, Manhattan has already addressed the most costly outdoor facilities needs and can make needed improvements in a cost effective manner. Development of indoor facilities, however, will be costly.

Evaluation of Existing Parks

A Summary Evaluation of the Parks and Recreation Department parks is provided in Table 6 and Table 7. Several particular areas of strengths and weaknesses in the current parks are evident from the evaluation summaries. The principal limitation of both recreational and natural parks is that current design and use of space does not allow a park to reach its potential. Another common limitation of the natural area parks is inaccessibility or lack of visibility. Briarcliffe and Spencer Park are almost totally inaccessible from public access and parts of Wildcat and Sunset Parks can be reached only through other rugged park property.
Implication for Parks and Recreation Planning

The Parks and Facilities Inventory has identified a number of findings regarding the current park system. Among the principal findings are:

- The major deficiency of type of park land in Manhattan is in Neighborhood Level Park land.
- Manhattan meets standards for Community Level Parks and Nature Area Park land area.
- Many areas of the city, particularly in the west and southwest, are not served by "walk-to" neighborhood parks.
- Evaluation of the recreational facilities of the park system indicates a particular deficiency of facilities typically found in Neighborhood Level Parks (such as volleyball courts, basketball courts, and tennis courts and multi-use courts) and some deficiencies in facilities typically found in Natural Area Parks (such as hiking, biking and natural trails, and picnic facilities).
- Evaluation of the Community Park indicates that they are well distributed within the community and generally are well equipped. Evaluation of the Natural Area Park indicates several are inaccessible to the public and do not have a clear role within the park system.
- Several park areas within the core areas of the city with potential for neighborhood park use are underdeveloped.
MAP #2
Natural Area Parks
Inventory of Indoor Recreational Facilities

More than many park and recreation systems its size, the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department provides a wide range of programs for areas residents. City sponsored indoor programs are so popular that city owned facilities are filled, forcing the Department to make substantial use of area school facilities and even rent commercial space to provide sufficient space for all activities. The following is a review of facilities currently used by the Department.

Evaluation Of Indoor Facilities

Community Building

The Community Building is the principal location for city sponsored fine arts and crafts classes, ceramics classes and pre-school classes. Senior citizen programs are also provided and the building contains a small gymnasium activity areas for youth basketball, adult volleyball, aerobics and fitness, and theater classes. A community youth center (not managed by Parks and Recreation Department) is housed on the first floor. The building is also used on a space available basis by area organizations as a youth center, and for group meetings, banquets, wedding receptions and other group functions.

Since the City began using the building for parks and recreation programs the Community Building has been overcrowded and the demands for space in the building are now the most competitive of any park and recreation facility. Gymnastic programs, which had been located in the building, quickly outgrew the facilities and are now being housed temporarily in the Town Center. Recently renovated, the Community Building is in fair condition considering its heavy use, although the electrical system is inadequate.

The heavy use and competition for space of the Community Building clearly indicates that the demands for recreation sponsored indoor programs here are far greater than the indoor facilities available.

City Auditorium

The City Auditorium is a principal venue for city sponsored athletic programs such as youth basketball, volleyball, adult basketball, volleyball and fitness classes. The facility is also used for community activities such as craft shows, book sales, concerts, music festivals, scout functions, and Middle School and Christian College use. The building condition is good as are the prospects for long term use. Generally, the demand for indoor athletic facilities exceeds the space available at City Auditorium. This demand is marginally met by programming activities in area school gymnasiums.

Douglass Center and Douglass Annex

The Douglass Center contains a gym, shower facilities and T.V. room. The Annex contains a dining room, day care and two classrooms. The two buildings provide space for sports intermurals, tournaments, Boy's Club and Girl's Club meetings, and community organizations. The condition of both buildings is fair and both are scheduled for continuing repairs in the next several years.

As with all the indoor recreational facilities, Douglass Center and Annex are heavily used. The location within the residential area is particularly convenient for residents of the area.

Pavilion at City Park

The Pavilion houses the ice rink in the winter and serves as general purpose open air shelter for City Park event during the warm weather months. Park and Recreation Department sponsored events include Arts in the Park exhibits, day camp, city band concerts, movies and puppet shows. It is used by community groups for picnics, reunions, band concerts and civic group events. With 3,200 square feet of usable space, it is marginally adequate for existing demand.
Round House at City Park

The Round House provides space for dance classes and rehearsal and serves as overflow space for registration of Parks and Recreation Department classes and arts and crafts fairs. The Roundhouse is not an appropriate facility for this use.

Arts in the Park Facilities

The stage, dressing room and toilet facilities provide good facilities for Arts-In-The-Park activities.

Summary Of Existing Indoor Recreational Facilities

By using facilities in local schools the Parks and Recreation Department is providing an impressive number of programs ranging from league play to arts and craft classes and facilities. However, the need for suitable indoor facilities continues to grow as evidenced by the need for the Department to currently rent commercial space in Town Center to accommodate gymnastics classes.

The overcrowding of indoor facilities are among the most pressing facility demand in the current park system. Furthermore, the demand for space for indoor facilities is expected to increase over the Ten-Year Planning Period, based on the growth of Department programs in recent years. Particular indoor facility needs will be swimming facilities, gymnasium, multi-purpose space, meeting room, crafts rooms and gymnastics facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Types</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Principal Site Features</th>
<th>Facilities Evaluation</th>
<th>Access &amp; Circulation</th>
<th>Principal Contribution to Current Park System</th>
<th>Principal Limitations Within Park System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Open, Level Site With Adjoining Community Center</td>
<td>Good Playground, Also Shelter, Basketball, Pool</td>
<td>Good Neighborhood Location in Central Park</td>
<td>Well Located Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Pool Size &amp; Limited Space For Further Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scout Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rolling Site - River &amp; Hilltop Environment</td>
<td>Virtually No Facilities Extremely Underserved</td>
<td>Good Neighborhood Location</td>
<td>Good Neighborhood Location</td>
<td>Underutilized Park Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodnow Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Steep Natural Area Rambles From Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Excellent Active Area Excellent Neighborhood Location</td>
<td>Excellent Neighborhood Facilities Fire Safety Site</td>
<td>Excellent Neighborhood Facilities Fire Safety Site</td>
<td>Natural Areas &amp; Overgrown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open, Level Site In Neighborhood Setting</td>
<td>Ages Playground &amp; Shelter Limited Planning Improvements Neighborhood Location On Edge of Commercial Strip</td>
<td>Open Space in Urban Neighborhood Environment</td>
<td>Open Space in Urban Neighborhood Environment</td>
<td>Facilities and Park Qualifiers Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Park/ School Site In Neighborhood Setting</td>
<td>Recently Renovated Facilities Needs Landscaping</td>
<td>Excellent Neighborhood Location</td>
<td>Excellent Neighborhood Location</td>
<td>Expansion to Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gently Sloping Site With Historic Pioneer Houses Excellent Buildings With Few Other Improvements</td>
<td>Location on Major Traffic Corridor Mixed Uses</td>
<td>Open Space Preserving Historic, Cultural Buildings</td>
<td>Open Space Preserving Historic, Cultural Buildings</td>
<td>The Park Quality Of The Site Are Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Small Playground Serving Immediate Neighborhood Small But Good Playground</td>
<td>Neighborhood Location On Traffic Corridor</td>
<td>Provides Playground Facilities In Residential Area</td>
<td>The Small Size Inhibits Use and Visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY LEVEL PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Site Slopes to Swale &amp; Vegetative Corridor</td>
<td>Good Ballfield Facilities Needs Further Landscape</td>
<td>Very Accessible As A “Drive-In” Park</td>
<td>Good Ballfield Facilities In Good Suburban Location</td>
<td>The Park Quality Are Undeveloped – Needs Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Flat Site With Many Activity Areas</td>
<td>Good Facilities Though Not Sufficient for Site</td>
<td>Highly Visible &amp; Accessible Urban Park</td>
<td>A Landmark of Community With a Good Range of Facilities</td>
<td>Number of Activities Limit Potential Landmark Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Amberg Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Flat Site Surrounded By Public Hills &amp; Woodland Excellent Ballfield Fair Need Further Landscape</td>
<td>Accessible Suburban “Drive To” Location</td>
<td>Excellent, Well Designed Community Ballfields</td>
<td>Further Development of Facilities to Reach Potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Playfields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flat, Beside Site Adjacent To School</td>
<td>Substandard Ballfields No Lighting</td>
<td>Neighborhood Location On The Edge of the City</td>
<td>Provides Open Space In Residential Area</td>
<td>Basement, Poorly Drained Site With Limited Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flat, Playfield Surrounded By Wall</td>
<td>Adequate Ballfield Facilities Accessible Location On Traffic Corridor</td>
<td>Accessible Location On Traffic Corridor</td>
<td>Constitutes To The Ballfield Inventory</td>
<td>Limited Visibility &amp; Narrow Shape Limits Use &amp; Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evaluation and Analysis by Odessa Hoven & More*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Principal Site Features</th>
<th>Facility Evaluation</th>
<th>Access &amp; Circulation</th>
<th>Principal Contribution to Current Park System</th>
<th>Principal Limitations Within Park System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL AREA PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibbiddie Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unprogrammed Wooded Stream Corridor</td>
<td>Landlocked and Unaccessible</td>
<td>Contributes To Greenway Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unaccessible Land With No Public Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Acres Natural Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unprogrammed Sleping Wooded Site In Residential Location</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Neighborhood Location With Very Small Potential Service Area</td>
<td>Small Site With Limited Service Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackett Trail</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Upper Trail Corridor</td>
<td>Trail In Good Repair But With No Specific Trail Linkage</td>
<td>Neighborhood Location With Key Link To Other Trail Corridors</td>
<td>Trail With No Linkage To Other Trail Systems</td>
<td>Trail Is Removed From Populations Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Park</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>First Mile Trail Corridor</td>
<td>Trail and Entrance Are Well Designed and Constructed</td>
<td>Current Location Along River Removed From Population</td>
<td>Trail Is Removed From Populations Centers</td>
<td>Trail Is Removed From Populations Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Park (E. BRAT)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Upper Prairie Open Space</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Contributes To Greenway &amp; Promotes Sensible Praxe</td>
<td>Contributes To Greenway &amp; Promotes Sensible Praxe</td>
<td>Contributes To Greenway &amp; Promotes Sensible Praxe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowbird Trail</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Undeveloped Site With Strand of Coniferous Trees</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Provides Greenway Use Limited By Wet Conditions</td>
<td>Use Limited By Wet Conditions</td>
<td>Use Limited By Wet Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small Stream Corridor Site Unprogrammed Use</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Landlocked &amp; Unaccessible</td>
<td>Unaccessible Land With No Public Visibility</td>
<td>Unaccessible Land With No Public Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Urban Open Space With Vegetation Along Edges Fills Emptyly Sleeping</td>
<td>Picnic Facilities Are In Disrepair</td>
<td>Provides Greenway Along Neighborhood Edge</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner Park</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Beautiful Open Space Prairie Park Crowned By Dune, Tree Covered Valley And Not Accessible By Public</td>
<td>Picnic Facilities Are In Disrepair</td>
<td>Provides Greenway Along Neighborhood Edge</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildcat Linear Park</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unprogrammed Wooded Stream Corridor</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Provides Greenway Along Neighborhood Edge</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Natural Area</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Unprogrammed Greenway Along Westwood Road</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
<td>Provides Greenway Along Neighborhood Edge</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
<td>Limited Accessibility Because Potential Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALTY PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Zoological Park</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Largely Rated Site Atop Ridge Line</td>
<td>Not Evaluated For This Study</td>
<td>Location Limits The Potential For Landmark Impact</td>
<td>Excellent Special Park Use</td>
<td>Limited Visibility Maintains Tranquil Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Cemetery</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Largely Rated Site Atop Ridge Line</td>
<td>Road Surface &amp; Landscaping Meet Minimum Standards</td>
<td>Residential Location Suggests Open Space, Greenway Walks School Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential Location Suggests Open Space, Greenway Walks School Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential Location Suggests Open Space, Greenway Walks School Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Cemetery</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Urban Cemetery, Mature Landscape Ridge Top Location</td>
<td>See Old Stone Work &amp; Landspace Shows Decline</td>
<td>Location Adjoining High School Good Transition For A Space</td>
<td>Limited Visibility Maintains Tranquil Mark</td>
<td>Limited Visibility Maintains Tranquil Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Size (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>Types of Facilities</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Programs</td>
<td>Community Use</td>
<td>Principal Contribution to Current Park System</td>
<td>Principal Limitations Within Park System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY OWNED FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Gym, 7 Classroom 2Office, 1 Storage</td>
<td>Cricket, Gymnasium, Park School Classes</td>
<td>Youth Center, Banquets &amp; Dinners</td>
<td>Heavily Used All Purpose Facility</td>
<td>Very Crowded, Demand For Extra Available Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Auditorium</td>
<td>60/400</td>
<td>Gym/Auditorium With Bleachers</td>
<td>Larger Volleyball, Basketball, Aerobics</td>
<td>Craft Shows, Festivals, Concerts</td>
<td>Central Location Clean Space Good Condition</td>
<td>Demand for Space Exceeds Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Center Asovets</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Gym, Showers, Full Kitchen</td>
<td>Sport Instraments, Intramurals, Boy &amp; Girls Club, Group Meetings</td>
<td>Senior Homes, U.F.M., P.A.D.</td>
<td>Excellent Location for Neighborhood Use</td>
<td>Facilities In Poor Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool House</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>Large Open Air Building With Stage &amp; Concession Booths - Jet-Ride</td>
<td>Ice Skating, Exhibits, Day Camp City, Band &amp; Show, Puppets Shows</td>
<td>Group Social &amp; Recreational</td>
<td>Large All Purpose Shelter In City Park</td>
<td>Increase in Size Would Permit More Extensive Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round House</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>One Large Room With Handicapped Restroom</td>
<td>Dance Center &amp; Rehearsal Choral/Choral Theatre Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unused Space in High Activity Area</td>
<td>Limited Use Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Opera Stage With Drawing Room/Stage</td>
<td>Arts-In-The-Park</td>
<td>Available for Community Use</td>
<td>Good Theater Facilities In Pleasant Park Setting</td>
<td>Stage Not Covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Gymnasium and Some Classroom</td>
<td>Youth Intramurals, Open Gym, Group Meetings</td>
<td>Availability Through School District</td>
<td>Provides Space For League Administrator</td>
<td>Limited Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Middle School</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>League Volleyball, Basketball, After School Sports</td>
<td>School Uses</td>
<td>Provides Good Facilities For Leagues Play</td>
<td>Limited Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan High School</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Two Gymnasiums With Bleachers</td>
<td>League Basketball, Volleyball, Intramural Sports</td>
<td>School Uses</td>
<td>Provides Good Facilities For Leagues Play</td>
<td>Further Development of Facilities to Reach Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Dolor School</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>Youth Basketball, Volleyball, Intramural Sports</td>
<td>Youth Basketball, Volleyball</td>
<td>Provides Facilities for Leagues</td>
<td>Limited Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation & Analysis by Bruce McMillen, AIA, Architect
Section Two

PLAN ELEMENT
The principal guiding element of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is the Plan Priorities element. The Plan Priorities are based on the information indicated in Section One - Inventory and Analysis and is used to indicate areas of emphasis within the park system as well as to suggest relative levels of programs and facilities development over the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Plan Priorities is the element of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan that gives continuity to the plan, providing long term flexibility to guide the development of the park system through the Ten-Year Planning Period.

The effect of priorities on funding and other implementation mechanisms of park and recreational projects is discussed further in the Financial Analysis section.
Description of Plan Priorities

The Plan Priorities element has been developed based on the information presented in Section One - Inventory and Analysis. Table 9, Plan Priorities - A Summary of Evaluation Factors, provides an overview of the factors described in the Inventory and Analysis, and how those factors support the various priority elements.

Top Priority Activities

The plan priority activities listed below are the recommended principal areas of focus for facilities and program development. Relatively equal resources and attention to development should be given to each of these programs although development will often accompany opportunities.

Greenspace and Linear Park Development Programs

Major emphasis in the implementation of the Parks Master Plan is placed on identification, development and improvement of Greenspace and Natural Areas. All evaluation factors reinforced an emphasis for greenspace and natural area development, with public preference strongly supporting these environmentally oriented park projects. Description of plan elements related to Greenspace and Linear Park development begins on page 36.

The first sections of the Linear Park Trail have been actively used since construction and the Linear Park receives widespread public support for further development. The Linear Park links other parks and greenspace areas, extending their influence throughout the city. Linear Park Trail development is a principal priority during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Indoor Recreational Facilities Development

The need for Indoor Facilities is also identified as a top priority. The evaluation of indoor facilities indicates a severe shortage in the amount of space for arts and crafts program, non-league sports, and classrooms. Through comments at public meetings, residents strongly supported development of indoor facilities, particularly year-round swimming and community space facilities. Description of plan elements related to Indoor Recreation Facilities development begins on page 42.

Neighborhood Park Development

Neighborhood Park development is identified as an area of emphasis for the Ten-Year Planning Period. Deficiencies in the number of Neighborhood Parks were identified in the Park and Recreational Inventory and in the public meetings. The emphasis in the development of future Neighborhood Parks is to match the character of the facility to the needs of the neighborhood. Description of plan elements related to Neighborhood Park Development begins on page 44.

Community Park Development

Broad public support for continuing development and improvement of Community Parks as the signature park of the Manhattan park system was evident in the community-wide public survey. Community Park development, therefore, remains as a principal priority through the Ten-Year Planning Period. Description of plan elements related to Community Park Development begins on page 47.

Plan Support Activities

Plan support activities are those activities that are recognized as important to the development of a well rounded comprehensive parks and recreation system but serve in a supporting role rather than a lead role in the system. Consequently, commitment of resources to these activities will be less than to the plan priority activities.
### Table 9
Priorities For Plan Development
As Emphasized By Inventory & Analysis Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Development</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Rec. Goals/Objectives</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Land Use Patterns</th>
<th>Land Use Plan Recommendation</th>
<th>Open Space Objectives</th>
<th>Public Preference</th>
<th>Financial Analysis</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Rec. Inventory</th>
<th>Overall Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace Areas and Facilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Level Parks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Level Parks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways &amp; Entries</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards &amp; Streetscapes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ○: Strong Emphasis
- ●: Moderate Emphasis
- ○: Slight Emphasis
Parkway Development & City Entryways

Parkway and Entryway development are plan elements that particularly reinforce Manhattan's land use and open space objectives but were not emphasized through public comment. They are identified as plan support activities. It should be stressed that plan support activities are important to the development of comprehensive park and recreation system and should be included, albeit in lesser numbers or funding level, than high priorities. Description of plan elements related to Parkway and Entryway Development begins on page 49.

Street Tree Planting and Boulevard Development

Street tree planting and boulevard improvements help to extend the influence of the parks and greenways into the "working areas" of the city. They are recognized as plan support activities. The level of commitment to these programs should be continued at current levels. Description of plan elements related to Street Tree Planting is provided on page 51.
Greenspace and Linear Park Development

A high priority for implementation of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is development and improvement of Greenspace and Natural Areas. The emphasis on this environmentally related plan element stems from its strong relationship to community land use, open space objectives and strong public support for improving the profile of natural area amenities within the park system.

The principal objective of the greenspace and natural area development within the Comprehensive Park Master Plan is to increase the number and usability of these areas within the Manhattan park system over the Ten-Year Planning Period. The main strategy for implementation of this objective focuses on bringing environmentally sensitive areas or unique environments into the park system either through acquisition or benevolent regulation. Such areas would then:

- Conserve and preserve the region's most environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide greenspace for passive recreational activities
- Provide environmental education opportunities such as nature/education centers
- Provide greenspace for unstructured recreation and discovery
- Provide an optimal mix of development and greenspace within the community
- Reinforce Land Use Policies identified in the Manhattan Land Use Plan

The project areas have been defined by focusing on environmentally sensitive areas or unique environments that have been determined to be important to the Manhattan community. Map 4 locates these areas. The areas located in the water corridors and areas of steep slopes have been identified through Comprehensive Land Use Plan recommendations. Other project areas were identified through staff identification, comments at public meetings and written public comments. It is recommended that these project areas be protected within the park system during the Ten-Year Planning Period, although all are not appropriate for fee simple acquisition. Appropriate recreational uses for these areas are encouraged.

The qualities of these project areas also serve as a standard to evaluate other potential greenspace and natural area projects that may become evident over the planning period.

Target Funding for Greenspace and Linear Park development and improvements is identified in the Financial Strategies. Funding over the Ten-Year Planning Period should be roughly equal for Greenspace, Indoor Facilities, Community Parks and Neighborhood Parks. It is recommended that at least 50% of the money spent on Greenway and Linear Park projects over the period be targeted for acquisition and development of new greenspace and trail areas.

Linear Park Development

The Linear Park Greenway and Trail System was approved by Manhattan voters as part of the 1986 Quality of Life Bond Issue. At that time, $455,000 was established for the proposed initial ten mile route linking eastern Manhattan with western Manhattan via a southern route. The route parallels major traffic ways but is removed from the vehicular roads by considerable distances. The first five mile phase was constructed on top of the City's flood levee system. The second five mile phase, currently under construction, follows along Wildcat Creek and will be established on portions of the former Rock Island Railroad right-of-way. It is envisioned that future phases will eventually circle the city.

One of the primary purposes for the Linear Park is to establish safe routes for bicyclists and pedestrians to reach other areas of the city. At the same time, the Linear Park has the additional ad-
vantage of providing for better health, fitness, and recreational opportunities. With the increase in demand for healthier lifestyles and environmental concerns, the public is demanding safer and better bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Increased walking and cycling results in individual, environmental, and societal benefits. The Linear Park should continue to provide a safe commuter route to allow users to reach specific destinations as quickly and as safely as possible with few interruptions. According to the Bicycle Federation of America, bicycling is a realistic alternative to car commuting as more than half the population lives within five miles of their work. In addition, the federation has conducted significant research and found that many more people would ride to work, to businesses, run errands, or would let their children ride to and from school if there were better and safer riding conditions and facilities. Therefore, it is recommended that future phases of the Linear Park continue to be developed with these concepts in mind.

In addition, it is envisioned and recommended that future phases of the Linear Park System be developed to eventually encircle the City with access spurs to schools, Kansas State University, business areas, residential areas, and parks to establish a comprehensive, safe and contiguous bicycle and pedestrian greenway network. Furthermore, consideration should be given in locating future routes within conservation easement areas to give additional support to the concept of preserving natural vegetation along drainage corridors to slow storm water run off and erosion.

Map 4 illustrates existing routes as well as possible future route areas for the Linear Park Trail System. Actual alignments will depend on a number of factors including developer cooperation, public demand, financing, public/private cooperation and partnerships (as has been emphasized in the development of the Hudson Trail) and the ability to take advantage of opportunities as they arise.

The following Linear Park Trail projects are recommended as high priority for development within the Ten-Year Planning Period. Each are important to achieving a comprehensive trail system throughout Manhattan:

- Establishing a pedestrian/bicycle overpass in the downtown area across Fort Riley Boulevard and the Union Pacific Railroad track to establish access to the Linear Park Trail system as well as to the Kansas River.

- Acquisition of the necessary land and construction of a pedestrian/bikeway crossing under the Union Pacific Railroad bridge and the Fort Riley Boulevard bridges on the west bank of Wildcat Creek to provide a safer crossing than the intersection of Fort Riley Boulevard and Richards Drive crosswalks.

- Establishing a pedestrian/bikeway corridor from Frank Anneberg Park tunneling under Anderson Avenue and extending north across and under Kimball Avenue.

In addition, it is recommended that as new areas and facilities are developed, adequate measures are taken to ensure the system's operations and maintenance. The Parks and Recreation Department has done a good job to date and this level of service will need to continue. It is further recommended that public/private partnerships be developed and encouraged with programs such as "Adopt a Trail" as well as special events such as past participation by the American Heart Association's "Walk America" program. Such activities spur interest and use of the trail and Linear Park Trail system. With the presence of Kansas State University and the significant number of students with bicycles, the City of Manhattan, along with other public and private organizations, has a great opportunity to provide a showcase bikeway and pedestrian system.

**Recommended New Greenspace And Natural Areas**

**Wildcat Creek Flood Plain**

The Wildcat Creek Project Area includes presently undeveloped and unprotected areas within the 100-year flood plain along the principal stream corridor of Wildcat Creek. Although strategies for project implementation include fee simple acquisition for park activities areas, the principal emphasis of the project is on conserva-
tion of the water corridor. Acquisition of conservation easements are recommended to protect these sensitive areas. Possible facilities within these easement corridors include trail development, depending upon the negotiated terms of the easement.

Little Kitten Creek Flood Plain

The Little Kitten Creek Project Area includes all presently undeveloped and unprotected areas within the 100 year flood plain along Little Kitten Creek, plus undeveloped areas along the stream corridor in the upper watershed. The principal emphasis of the project is on conservation of vegetation in the water corridor. It is recommended that the conservation easements be acquired (through purchase or donation) to protect the sensitive areas. Possible facilities within these easement corridors include trail development, depending upon the negotiated terms of the easement. Fee simple acquisition (through purchase or donation) of property to connect the corridor with Marlatt would also be appropriate.

Eureka Oxbow Wetlands

The Eureka Oxbow Wetland is perhaps the most unique natural environment in the Manhattan area. This area is located in the Eureka Valley outside of the Manhattan city limits east of the Job Corps Center. Ecologically, the site is varied in microclimates and vegetative species. From a cultural perspective, the Eureka Oxbow was once the site of a resort, from which a school and church building remain.

The wetlands should be a principal priority for long range natural area park development. Fee simple acquisition (through purchase or donation) is recommended, which would permit a full expression of park potential and conservation impact. The property would be an excellent site for environmental interpretation and education including such facilities as a natural or discovery center, nature and hiking trails, and picnic areas. Other appropriate facilities could include parking and access roads, and restroom facilities.

Shrub Urban Wilderness Area

The Shrub Urban Wilderness Area is located just northwest of Wildcat Park and northwest of Sunset Cemetery. This twenty-eight acre property of first growth forest is on steep slopes and is largely inaccessible by either roadway or trail. Fee simple acquisition (through purchase or donation) of the property is recommended. Facilities development should be sensitive to the wilderness character of the property and should be limited to nature trails. Access to the property should be principally pedestrian through adjoining park properties.

Eureka Valley Bluffs and Paw Paw Glen Bluffs

The bluff areas along the Eureka Valley and areas southeast of the city are significant natural landmarks for the western Manhattan area. These bluffs are characterized by wooded areas on steep slopes. The Manhattan Comprehensive Land Use Plan identifies them as environmentally sensitive areas. It is recommended that the Eureka Bluffs be identified as Community Landmark Greenspace, or highly visible areas within the community that are not occupied as parks, but are protected from inappropriate development through zoning and subdivision land use regulations governing steep slopes.

Acquisition (through purchase or donation) of conservation easements would also be appropriate for the most highly visible areas of moderate slopes. Resource protection of sensitive areas should be addressed through subdivision regulations, environmental or tree protection ordinances and scenic/conservation easements. The city should continue to evaluate potential use of these methods to determine the full scope, appropriate protection needs and additional areas to be protected through greenspace and natural area designation.

County Landfill Site

The Manhattan Comprehensive Land Use Plan identifies the potential for development of the County Landfill site south of Manhattan as a park facility. Recent discussions with the County indicates that a partnership may be feasible for
park development. Potential park activities could include mountain bike trails and nature trails.

**Recommended Improvements for Existing Greenspace and Natural Area Parks**

The inventory in Section One provides a summary evaluation of the natural area parks in the Manhattan park system indicating principal site features, facilities evaluation, access and circulation, and principal contributions and limitations of the park to the park system. As indicated above, approximately 50% of the money to be spent on Greenspace and Natural Area Parks is targeted for improvements to existing natural area parks.

**Blue River Recreational Area**

This recreational area provides parking and boat access to the Big Blue River. Although the park nominally provides natural area recreational facilities, such as trails, these facilities are undeveloped given the potential of the site. The site offers the potential to be a superior quality open space and river environment.

**Briarcliffe Park**

Briarcliffe Park is one of the most inaccessible parks in the Manhattan park system. Briarcliffe's principal value is that of conservation and protection of the Wildcat Creek water corridor. Current construction Linear Park Trail along the stream corridor will provide the access that the park now lacks. Subsequently, appropriate use for Briarcliffe would be as a natural area park.

**Cedar Acres Natural Area**

A one acre wooded lot on sloping terrain in a residential area, Cedar Acres presently is unused wooded property. Site constraints prohibit development of the property for active recreational uses. It is recommended that the property remain as natural area to conserve the steep slope and provide a buffer between residential and institutional land uses.

**Girl Scout Park**

Girl Scout Park is well positioned to provide neighborhood greenspace to the surrounding residential area. Currently the park has some peripheral vegetation but further landscape development would be important to help the park reach its potential. Facility development could include picnic and paved parking. Walking trails would better integrate the park with the areas formally known as Jorgenson Park, providing neighborhood trail system.

**Goodnow Park-North**

Approximately 15 acres of Goodnow Park is identified as natural area park. This area includes the Goodnow Cabin and the parking area atop Bluemont Peak. Walking trails have been proposed for the slopes between the cabin and the hilltop in a master plan prepared at the time of facilities renovation. It is recommended that these trails, along with improvements to the hilltop parking area, be constructed during the Ten-Year Planning Period. The overlook has considerable opportunities for enhancement and development and could include picnic facilities. All improvements should focus on emphasizing the views of the city. Recommendations for the southern part of Goodnow Park are provided under Neighborhood Parks.

**Marlatt Short Grass Prairie Park**

Marlatt Park, owned by Kansas State University, is an open space natural prairie at the edge of suburban development in northwest Manhattan. Aside from contributing to the region's inventory of natural open space, the 160 acre site is important because of its location at the head waters of Little Kitten Creek, an area likely to experience land development pressure over the long term. The site also provides an appropriate interim destination along the extension of the Linear Trail. It is recommended that the city continue to support the preservation of this short grass prairie area through cooperation with Kansas State University.
**Greenspace and Linear Park Development**

**Pioneer Park**

Pioneer Park may be characterized as a specialty cultural park, that also provide neighborhood park greenspace. The three acre site includes the Riley County museum and the Goodnow House, a historic property operated by the Riley County Historical Society. The grounds supporting the historic structure are principally undeveloped open space. It is recommended that the park remain as a cultural park with emphasis on the Goodnow House. It is further recommended that the Department work with the Goodnow Society to locate groupings of large deciduous trees, indigenous to the areas, along the park periphery to provide a partial screening of the residential property to the south and further emphasize the relationship of the open space to the Goodnow House.

**Southeast Park**

Southeast Park is a 12 acre tract of land located between the Kansas River and the Linear Trail just south of the central business district. Because of its central location, access from the Linear Trail and rich river environment, Southeast Park has significant potential as a greenspace recreational center, such as picnicking, or hiking. Because it is located outside of the levee, any facilities must be either able to withstand flooding or be expendable.

**Spencer Park**

A narrow strip of property located along Wildcat Creek below Wildcat Ridge, Spencer Park contributes to the conservation of the Wildcat Creek water corridor. Because access to the property is limited, the property has little potential for recreational use and its long term value will be protection of the stream corridor.

**Warner Park**

Warner Park is presently an underused resource, providing scenic open space for pedestrian users and nearby residents. The site has potential for picnicking, trail development and possibly nature center development. Of all of the natural area parks in the Manhattan park system, Warner has the most impressive scenic quality. In particular, the openness of central ridge line provides striking long views and the old tree growth in the adjoining deep ravines make up rich enclosed spaces. These natural environments and vistas should be preserved throughout the life of the park. Because of these superior natural qualities, development of Warner Park principally as a major recreational activity center, either in the short or long term, is not recommended.

It is recommended that Warner Park remain principally scenic open space. However, small scale recreational activity areas would be appropriate along the park periphery to provide neighborhood park facilities to the adjoining residential areas. Any development of structural facilities or activity areas should be located on the park perimeter and below the ridge line elevation so as not to diminish the effect of these special qualities.

**Westwood Natural Area**

Westwood Natural Area provides a buffer between Westwood Avenue and the residential area. As such, Westwood creates a parkway quality for a small part of Manhattan. Despite the fact that Westwood is not a park that is suitable for activities or occupation, this natural area is serving a role within the park system. Introduction of a naturalistic edge along the roadway, such as a narrow wild flower strip or several flowering trees is recommended to improve the quality of the parkway.

**Wildcat Creek Linear Park**

Located at the base of Wildcat Ridge, Wildcat Creek Linear Park contains informal trails and serves to protect this water corridor. Over the Ten-Year Planning Period, emphasis should be given to improving the use and visibility of Wildcat Creek Linear Park through improved access and through pedestrian linkage to other park elements. Continuation of the Linear Park Trail will substantially contribute to achieving these objectives and to provide access from the Linear Park Trail to both the zoo and the high school.
This park area offers the most significant diversity of flora and fauna in the existing park system, providing opportunities for partnerships with the zoo and the high school.

Sunrise Cemetery

Sunrise Cemetery is the more recently developed of the city cemeteries. When dedicated in 1965, the site was essentially an open field. An ongoing planting program is beginning to establish a shaded park-like quality. This planting program should continue. Introduction of more formal plantings and stone monumentation (such as column features) would enrich the cemetery landscape. It is recommended that a detailed landscape master plan be developed for this cemetery.

Sunset Cemetery

Dedicated as part of the original town plot in 1856, Sunset Cemetery is approaching capacity with only a few plots sold each year. However, the cemetery remains an important element of the greenspace system of the city. The ornate stonework of bridges and monument and the mature landscape will require maintenance and replacement to maintain the property as a quality greenspace along Wildcat Ridge.

Sunset Zoo

Improvement projects for the Sunset Zoo are currently identified in the Sunset Zoo Master Plan prepared for the zoo in 1987. Because the separate nature of activities and funding of the zoo, the Comprehensive Park Master Plan will not include specific recommendations for the zoo. However, because of the complete change of zoo administration, development of the zoo trust and new admission fee policies, an update to the Zoo Master Plan is recommended.

Recommended Facilities for Greenspace Parks - 1993-2002

The Park and Recreation Inventory identified deficiencies in several facilities types typically provided in greenspace parks. The following are recommended targets for facilities development within either new or existing greenspace parks. These targets are based on facility standards and reflect current deficiencies and needs resulting from estimated population growth over the Ten-Year Planning Period, as indicated in Table 5 on page 24.

Targets for Facility Development

Picnic Shelters - 7 Shelters
Picnic Tables - 242 Tables
Bicycle Trail - 17 miles
Hiking Trail - 4 miles
Jogging Trail - 13 miles
Nature Trail - 15 miles
Nature Center/Discovery Center - 1 Center
Indoor Recreational Facilities Development

Very often indoor facilities are not a principal focus of community-wide comprehensive parks and recreation master plans. There are no comprehensive facility standards for indoor recreation as exist for outdoor recreation facilities. However, several factors make indoor facilities a high priority for development in the Manhattan park system. First, current demand for indoor facility space indicates a need for more space for existing programs. And second, public comment and public survey results indicate a high demand for indoor activities that are not currently provided in Manhattan. Consequently, development of adequate indoor facilities for Parks and Recreation programs is rated as Plan Activities in the Facilities Development Program. The effect of priorities on funding and other implementation mechanisms of park and recreational projects is discussed further in the Financial Strategies section.

Recommendation for Existing Indoor Facilities

Generally, the current programming of city owned indoor facilities is appropriate for those facilities and is recommended to continue into the Ten-Year Planning Period. The following is a summary of recommendations for each existing facility.

Community Building

The Community Building’s location in downtown Manhattan is convenient for most residents as is evident by high usage. Despite recent improvements to the building, long term usage much beyond the Ten-Year Planning Period is questionable.

The Community Building serves as the center for most arts and crafts classes, as well as providing space for league sports. Currently, the arts and craft classes are experiencing significant space shortages. Demand suggests that, over the long term, substantial space for arts and crafts will be needed. Two scenarios are suggested to meet this demand. First, that the Community Building be substantially reconfigured as an arts and crafts center, sacrificing the athletic facilities currently available on the second floor. Development of one floor of workshop/studio/classroom space could be provided in this current gym space. This scenario would require acquisition/development of additional gymnasium space at another location. Cost for complete adaptation of the gymnasium space (4,500 sq. ft.) would be approximately $150,000-$175,000, including upgrade of electrical systems. Second, that arts and crafts be relocated to a new Community Center building. The Community Building would then be available for other Parks and Recreation Department uses.

City Auditorium

The City Auditorium provides gymnasium space for league and community sports, as well as meeting and exhibit space. Although the space is not particularly flexible in its usage, alternation of the facilities to permit a wider range of uses is not feasible. It is recommended that the City Auditorium continue in its current role in the park system through the Planning Period.

Douglass Center/Douglass Annex

The Douglass Center/Douglass Annex provides neighborhood center facilities to south central Manhattan. The buildings are in fair condition and continual improvements will be important to maintain an adequate level of service in this neighborhood.

Pavilion

The pavilion is a flexible shelter space in heavily used City Park. It is recommended that the Pavilion continue in its current usage through the Ten-Year Planning Period.
Roundhouse

The Roundhouse is principally used as studio space for dance classes and rehearsals. It is recommended that the Roundhouse continue in its current usage in the short term. New dance facilities would be appropriate for a recreation center. Subsequently, the Roundhouse could be more appropriately used as for storage space.

Town Center Facilities

Currently gymnastics classes are held in the Town Center. The year-to-year use of this space is subject to availability and should be considered temporary. Development of gymnastics facilities in conjunction with new school construction would be beneficial for both the city and the school system.

Continued Use Of Area School Facilities

A principal reason Manhattan can offer residents the substantial number and high quality of recreational programs is because of the excellent relationship that the Park and Recreation Department has developed with the area school district. As emphasized in the Administrative Strategies, page 68, continuation of this strong partnership is important for effective provision of recreational programs over the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Partnerships For Future Facilities Use

The level of use of current school facilities seems to have reached an effective maximum and no expansion within these facilities is recommended. However, it is recommended that partnerships be vigorously pursued with the school district in the development of new or additional facilities. In particular, joint development of a community center/athletic facility (as outlined below) with funding from both the city and the school district would benefit both systems agencies and probably provide a level of facility that neither could afford separately.

Recommendations For New Indoor Facilities

The most direct solution to alleviate the need for more space for recreational program would be construction of a recreation center. To meet the needs currently identified through the Ten-Year Planning Period, such a center would include:

- Multi-purpose Space
- Large meeting room
- Stage
- Seating for 200
- Arts & Crafts Classrooms With Storage
- Gymnastics Room
- Four Basketball Courts (25,000 sq. ft.)
- Running Track/Viewing Area Above Courts
- Four Handball/Racquetball Courts
- Indoor Pool
- Dressing Rooms
- Locker Rooms
- Restrooms
- Offices and Storage
- Mechanical, Utilities
- Custodial
- Vending Area
- Kitchen

Total estimated cost for a recreation center as identified above, including swimming pool would be approximately $4.5-5.5 million. Cost of an indoor swimming pool facilities alone would be approximately $2 million.

The Target Funding Level for Indoor Facilities is recommended to be at relatively equal level to Greenspace and Natural Area Development, Community Parks and Neighborhood Parks for the Ten-Year Planning Period. A comparison of probable funding levels and suggested indoor facilities indicates a concerted effort should be made to develop indoor facilities through partnership with other agencies or organizations.
Neighborhood Park Development

Neighborhood Parks offer the potential for highly cost effective park improvement to the Manhattan system. The present system has quality neighborhood park sites that, with relatively low cost improvements, would provide high quality park sites throughout the city.

Whereas much of the impact of the larger community level parks and natural area parks comes from the expanse of open greenspace, the impact of neighborhood parks is dependent upon quality execution of design, from the details of materials and landscaping to the aesthetic quality of recreational facilities themselves. Recent improvements to southern Goodnow Park reflect these characteristics and show the impact that quality improvement, even in small neighborhood parks, can add to the park system. However, these material and facilities need not be expensive to achieve a quality park space.

Strategies for neighborhood park development and improvement begin with initiating dialogues with the neighborhoods to identify specific area needs. Different neighborhoods have different needs. Whereas some parts of the city may find neighborhood parks particularly significant to their daily life, others may find that community park facilities meet the neighborhood’s needs. It is recommended that the Parks and Recreation Department work with neighborhoods to develop appropriate neighborhood level facilities, particularly in the areas identified below that are deficient in neighborhood facilities by evaluation standards.

Map 5 indicates the areas of the city currently served by neighborhood type facilities, whether by Neighborhood Parks, neighborhood facilities in Community Parks, or by facilities at area schools. Service areas of Neighborhood Park are based on the national standard of 1/4 mile radius of the park in central city areas and 1/2 mile radius in the less dense suburban areas. Areas not currently served by neighborhoods are also identified. The character of these areas and consideration for development of facilities are provided below to stimulate dialogue between the neighborhoods and the Parks and Recreation Department.

Areas for Possible Neighborhood Park Development

Blue Hills

The Blue Hills area is a collection of residential areas that extends northward from Old Manhattan east of Manhattan Avenue. The linear configuration and low density of this area makes complete service by neighborhood park facilities difficult. It is recommended that neighborhood dialogue focus on the need for a small Neighborhood Park to be developed in a central location within the area or whether the facilities at Goodnow and other city parks meet current needs.

East Casement

The East Casement area is a residential area east of Casement Road in northeast. Residents of this area presently drive to Northview Park or Harbour Park for neighborhood park facilities. As noted in the following section, a Community Park is recommended in the East Casement area. Design of that facility should include neighborhood facilities for the East Casement area.

Little Kitten Area

The Little Kitten Area is the neighborhood of most recent residential expansion and a location expected to absorb much of the residential growth through the Ten-Year Planning Period. Residents of this area typically drive to Cico Park, neighborhood schools or other Neighborhood Parks for neighborhood park facilities. The location of property for acquisition and development of a Neighborhood Park in this area should serve for the continuing expansion of residential areas.
North Browning

The residential areas along the northern part of Browning Avenue are also projected to experience residential growth in the next ten years. The school district currently anticipates development of a school on property it owns just north of the city limits sometime within the Ten-Year Planning Period. It is recommended that Neighborhood Park facilities be developed in a partnership with the school district at the time of school construction.

Stagg Hill Area

The Stagg Hill area is the most isolated residential neighborhood in the city, in terms of distance from neighborhood park and recreational facilities. It is recommended that the Stagg Hill area be among the first Manhattan neighborhoods with which the Department establishes a working dialogue to identify and address its neighborhood park needs. It is anticipated that acquisition of property (approximately 5 acres subject to availability) and development of neighborhood park facilities will be a high priority for consideration within Stagg Hill.

Sunset Hill

Sunset Hill is the residential area between the Sunset Zoo and Park and Westwood Avenue. Although there is substantial greenspace along the neighborhood edges, there are no neighborhood park facilities. It is recommended that parts of adjacent Sunset Park be considered for development as a neighborhood park for this area.

University Heights

The University Heights neighborhood is bounded by Warner Park to the south, providing significant park open space to this suburban residential area. But the area does not have immediate access to playground facilities or other neighborhood type recreational facilities. It is recommended that acquisition and development of a Neighborhood Park in a location to the west of the neighborhood be considered to serve the University Heights area.

Wildcat Ridge

Wildcat Ridge is a collection of somewhat isolated residential neighborhoods on either side of Anderson, east of the commercial areas near Seth Child. Although Cedar Acres Natural Area is located in this area, site constraints prohibit even small neighborhood playground development. Neighborhood dialogue should be established to determine what neighborhood facilities needs are and where they would be most appropriate.

Recommended Improvement To Existing Neighborhood Parks

Douglass Park

Several facilities have recently been upgraded and renovated at Douglass Park, most notably the playground equipment and picnic shelter. The Douglass Community Center and Douglass Annex complement the park facilities to provide the most complete neighborhood recreational experience in the city. It is recommended that continuing improvement of facilities, particularly the buildings, continue over the Ten-Year Planning Period and the outdoor improvement focus on further landscape development to provide a more park-like quality to the park and renovation of the basketball court.

Goodnow Park-South

Goodnow Park is really two distinct park environments. The area closest to the surrounding residential areas has been recently redeveloped as one of the community’s finest neighborhood park facilities. No principal facilities development is recommended for this southern part of the park during the Ten-Year Planning Period. Recommendations for Goodnow Park - North are provided in the Greenspace and Natural Area Parks section.

Longs Park

Longs Park serves the southeastern part of old Manhattan. The existing playground and picnic shelter provides basic neighborhood park facilities but the park does not reach its potential
as a quality Neighborhood Park. New playground equipment, picnic tables and landscape improvements, including plantings, walkways and lighting would substantially improve the park environment of Longs Park during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Northview Park

With facilities that are often found in Community Level Parks, Northview offers the most comprehensive range of facilities of the existing Neighborhood Parks. Northview also serves as an excellent example of a workable cooperative relationship between the park system and the school system to provide facilities for the benefit of both. Recent improvements to the swimming pool have improved the overall park quality of Northview. It is recommended that landscape improvement be developed over the Ten-Year Planning Period to further improve the park-like quality of Northview.

Sunset Park

Sunset Park is part of the Sunset Zoo proper, although not programmed by zoo activities. The park is principally an open space area south and east of the zoo. Since no neighborhood park facilities are immediately available in the surrounding residential area, Sunset Park offers the opportunity to be developed as a neighborhood park. Facilities would include playground and improved picnic facilities.

Harbour Park

Harbour Park is the only park in the Manhattan system that fits the classification of Neighborhood Playground. The small site provides playground facilities for the surrounding residential area in northeast Manhattan. The existing facilities are adequate for the park's role and no major improvements are recommended for Harbour Park during the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Target Funding Levels for Neighborhood Parks are recommended to equal funding for Greenspace and Natural Area Development, Community Parks and Indoor Facilities.

Target facilities for Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks are indicated following the Community Park Development section below.
Community Park Development

Providing a wide range of the recreational facilities, including ballfields for league play, Community Parks are the most used and the most visible parks in the Manhattan system.

Recommendations For Existing Community Park Improvements

Cico Park

Cico Park is administered by a partnership of the City, the County and the school district. The ballfield complex and adjoining parking occupy most of the area of city responsibility with little space available for expansion of city administered facilities. It is recommended that within the Ten-Year Planning Period the parking areas for the ballfield complex be paved and landscaped, that the ballfield complex continue to be upgraded and that the planting program around the ballfield complex be continued with a particular emphasis on perimeter planting.

City Park

City Park is the most visible and most used of the Manhattan parks. Located south of Aggieville, it serves as a Community Park for community-wide events, a Neighborhood Park for surrounding residents and a Greenspace Park for older areas south of Aggieville. Despite the number of activities contained within the 45 acres, City Park functions well as an all-purpose park. For this reason, no extensive changes are recommended for City Park for the Ten-Year Planning Period. Recommendations for the Ten-Year Planning Period:

- Develop no large scale facility types within the park.
- Develop small scale facilities, such as basketball courts in locations that are sensitive to the site.
- Continue tree planting along park periphery and between facility areas.
- Improve landscape detail around buildings such as pool, pavilion, and offices.
- Recondition ball fields to improve soil and drainage conditions.

Frank Anneberg Park

The newest park in the Manhattan system, Frank Anneberg Park is an excellent example of well planned, well designed facilities that meet the needs of the community. The facilities emphasis is on provision of league and tournament level ballfield facilities, particularly for softball and soccer, with facilities also provided for passive activities. Continuing improvements in the park are guided by a master plan for development. It is recommended that this plan continue to serve as the specific guide for park development throughout the Ten-Year Planning Period and that particular emphasis be placed on development of natural facilities, such as trails and picnic facilities.

Griffith Park

Griffith Park provides ballfield facilities for softball and soccer league games and practice. The size and configuration of the site make the community playfield function appropriate for Griffith Park.

However, several improvements would add to the park environment and use. Irrigation of the playing fields is a high priority due to use by Parks and Recreation Department and by the Middle School. Landscaping along the northern and western boundaries would complement the stone wall and provide a more park-like quality. Because of heavy Middle School use, improvements at Griffith Park are particularly appropriate for partnership development.
**Gorman Fields**

Gorman Field, owned by the school district, is currently used as practice fields for soccer and softball. The poor soil and inadequate drainage of the area has limited full use of the site. Use of Gorman Field is appropriate as a practice field site. It is recommended that minimum perimeter landscape be considered in a partnership with the school district to provide greenspace for the neighborhood area.

**Areas Recommended For New Community Park Development**

Section One - Inventory and Analysis indicates that Manhattan is within 10 percent (40 acres) of meeting standards for Community Level Parks. The recent construction of Frank Anneberg Park has significantly contributed towards meeting a large share of the city’s Community Park Needs. Therefore, development of a Community Park the size and scope of Frank Anneberg is not anticipated for the Ten-Year Planning Period. However, two areas of new Community Park development are recommended during the planning period.

**Northeast Community Park**

A Community Level Park, approximately 40-50 acres in size, is recommended for the northeastern part of the city (east of Tuttle Creek Boulevard). Although this park should address the city deficiency of baseball fields, the park should also serve as quality greenspace and provide passive recreational experiences for this part of the city. Such greenspace would be appropriate to meet practice field needs. Further, recreational facilities at the park should be suitable to provide neighborhood facilities needs.

**The Western Suburbs**

Section One indicates that much of the residential growth in Manhattan is anticipated to be in the north and western areas of the city over the next twenty years. Acquisition of approximately 100 acres in the western suburbs during the Ten-Year Planning Period for development of a Community Level Park after the planning period is recommended.

The average Target Funding Level for Community Parks improvement and development is recommended to be approximately equal to other top priority activities. It is recommended that partnership development of Community Park facilities and improvement be vigorously pursued.

**Recommended Facilities For Neighborhood And Community Parks - 1993-2002**

The Parks Facilities Inventory identified deficiencies in several facilities types typically provided in neighborhood and community parks. Many facility types are appropriate for either Neighborhood Level Parks or Community Level Parks. The following are recommended targets for facilities development within these parks, either new or existing. These targets are based on facility standards and reflect current deficiencies and needs resulting from estimated population growth over the Ten-Year Planning Period. (see Table 5, page 24).

**Targets for Facilities Development**

- Baseball Fields, Adult, HS - 3
- Baseball Fields, Youth - 1
- Basketball Courts, Outdoor - 8
- Horseshoe Courts - 16
- Playgrounds - 3
- Soccer Fields - 3
- Softball Fields - 6
- Swimming Pool (25M) - 2 (Could be Indoor)
- Swimming Pool (50M) - 1
- Tennis Courts - 3
- Volleyball Courts - 13
Parkway & Entryway Development

Parkway Development

One of the most effective methods of structuring land use patterns within a community is the development of a park system. Parkways serve several functions within the city:

- Parkways serve as urban greenspace corridor within a built-up area.
- They provide a transition between potentially conflicting land uses, such as residential and commercial or industrial properties.
- Parkways provide for an ecological balance within urban areas.
- Parkways extend the influence of parks and greenspace areas throughout the community.
- Parkways are the most well used and most highly visible of all parks.

Recommended areas for future parkway development includes the Kimball Avenue corridor and the Scenic Drive corridor.

Entryway Improvements

Although development of parkways throughout Manhattan would greatly enhance the aesthetic and environmental quality of the city, existing use patterns and high costs make immediate wide spread parkway development programs unrealistic. It is recommended, therefore, that the parkway standards be established initially through the beautification of city entryways.

The quality of the city's entrance corridors sets the image of the community to its residents and visitors alike. The appearance of entryways along commercial areas can protect property values while creating a pleasant environment that attracts customers. Moreover, landscaped entrances help make a pleasant transition from the countryside to the city.

The focus on improvements for entryways should center on the primary entrances and entryway corridors to the city. Principal improvements will include new entrance signs and appropriate landscaping. It will be necessary to coordinate design and improvements with the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), as KDOT controls most of the existing right-of-way along these entry corridors. In addition, sharing funding may be available with KDOT for these types of enhancement improvements. The following areas are recommended for entryway improvements:

- K-177 Bridge Area - Improvements would include an entrance sign and landscaping on west side with irrigated turf and flower beds on top areas along with natural grasses and wildflowers on slopes.
- U.S. 24 (West End of Blue River Bridge to Intersection of Fort Riley/Tuttle Creek Boulevard) - Improvements would include an entry sign just after the bridge with various naturalistic landscaping transitioning to irrigated turf with perennial flower beds at wall intersections.
- Tuttle Creek Boulevard (Marlatt Street to Kimball Avenue Intersection) - Improvements would include an entrance sign and naturalistic landscaping, and redesigned traffic islands at Kimball Avenue.
- Seth Childs Road - Improvements would include an entrance sign near Gary Avenue with landscaping treatments to the Kimball Avenue and Anderson Avenue interchanges.
- Fort Riley Boulevard (Warner Park Road to Richards Drive) - Entrance sign near crest of the hill east of Warner Park Road. Native grasses, wildflowers, shrubs and
redbud trees would be appropriate along the corridor, as would as a naturalistic treatment to the Seth Childs interchange and irrigated turf in median at Richards Drive.

Detail plans, based on these general recommendations, should be prepared with public involvement and in partnership with Kansas Department of Transportation. The provision of an adequate maintenance staff to care for the proposed improvements is important to ensure a quality and inviting appearance.
Street Tree Planting & Boulevard Improvements

The City of Manhattan currently has a street tree planting and management program to improve the appearance and environment of all city streets. The focus of the program is the planting of street trees along the most visible and highly traveled streets and neighborhoods in Manhattan. Approximately 200 street trees are planted annually. It is recommended that this street tree program be continued and enhanced as funding allows.

It is recommended that an average of approximately $13,500 per year (1992 dollars) be allocated for street tree planting and boulevard improvements over the Ten-Year Planning Period.

It is also highly recommended that an Urban Forestry Master Plan be developed and implemented to ensure proper management of street tree objectives for the community.
FINANCIAL STRATEGIES

Two types of park and recreation funding are important for consideration in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. Development and improvement of park and recreational facilities, such as parks and playgrounds, are typically funded through capital funding. Program costs and administrative expenses are more often funded through operating expenses. This section will evaluate current funding patterns and identify financial strategies that will guide and support plan implementation.
Capital Funding

Funding Sources

Table 10 indicates the level, distribution and sources of funding for Parks and Recreation Department capital improvements as defined in the Manhattan 1992-1997 Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The figures reflect that the City has accepted a level capital spending of approximately $666,000 per year (average) for identified projects and equipment expenses, including the zoo. Table 14 indicates that most of the zoo spending is funding from the Special Sunset Zoo. Sources of funding that significantly contribute to parks and recreation capital funding are:

- General Fund
- General Improvement Fund
- Park Development Fund
- Recreation Fund
- Special Park & Recreation Fund

Although these funding sources are unevenly applied from year to year, all seem relatively stable in their prospects for long term application, and funding projections in this analysis assume these funding sources will continue.

Future Capacity For Capital Improvement Funding From Non-city Funding Sources

As indicated in the Administrative Strategies in the section that follows, a particular strength of the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department is the proven ability to identify and develop joint programs with area organizations and agencies, expanding the range of programs available. A principal recommendation of the Administrative Strategies is that partnerships be aggressively developed to not only provide joint programs but also to develop joint facilities to meet the parks and recreational demands. Development of non-city funding sources for capital improvements seems to offer more promise as a means to expand capital improvements funding than does expanding current city funding sources. Such potential funding sources include:

- Partnerships with the school district
- Partnerships with Riley County and other-surrounding counties
- Partnerships with Kansas State University
- Partnerships with civic associations and community groups
- Partnerships with Kansas Department of Transportation
- Programs focused on encouraging property donations and easements
- Grants

Financial Strategies For Plan Implementation

City Funding

The Plan Priorities element indicates the areas of emphasis in the development of the parks and recreation programs over the Ten-Year Planning Period. A principal method of implementing
these priority objectives is through capital improvement funding targets.

The principal financial strategy of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is that the city target and/or pursue funding relative to the priority of the activity. For example, Greenspace and Natural Area Development, Indoor Facilities Development, Neighborhood Park Development and Community Park Development are all listed as high priority activities.

Expenditures for such activities should be relatively equal among themselves over the Ten-Year Planning Period and should be higher than the Parkways and Entryways or Street Tree Planting and Boulevard, activities that are identified as Plan Support Activities.

Table 11 identifies the current level of funding for plan priorities. The figures indicate that, based on the City of Manhattan 1992-1997 Capital Improvements Program, approximately one quarter of the parks and recreations budget is designated for the zoo, approximately one third for department equipment acquisition and replacement, with the remaining 45%, or approximately $300,000 per year available for projects for development of or improvement to parks and recreational facilities. Currently, improvements to community parks are projected to receive over half of that funding.

Table 12 indicates the target average funding for city funding for each priority category for the Ten-Year Planning Period. The Target Funding Levels reflect a substantial increase in funding for Greenspace and Natural Projects, Indoor Facilities, and Neighborhood Facilities. The average level of spending for Community Parks would be reduced from current projected levels. The Target Levels are based on the following factors:

- Funding for overall capital improvements remains at current projected levels
- Funding for parks and recreation projects increases from current levels of 45% of capital budget to 50% of capital budget
- Funding for parks equipment and administrative capital costs is reduced from 33% of the capital budget to 28% of the capital budget
- Funding for the Sunset Zoo remains at current funding levels or with capital increases coming from zoo associated revenue sources
- Funding of priorities is prorated to reflect the weights of individual priorities. The relative percentage amounts reflect the degree of emphasis for the particular priority element as indicated in Section One - Inventory and Analysis.

Non-City Funding Strategies

The availability of non-city funding sources is more speculative and less consistent. However, as indicated above, development of more non-city funding sources is an important part of the overall strategy to improve parks and recreation facilities. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that amounts identified for plan activities will exactly match the levels relative to their priority weights. However, the level of effort in developing such non-city sources should match the priority level.

The Target Funding Levels provide tangible, flexible parameters to guide development of Park and Recreational program development over the Ten-Year Planning Period. The Target Funding Levels have been used to guide recommendations for facilities improvements identified in the previous section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Zoo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$1,123,326</td>
<td>$1,014,580</td>
<td>$26,788</td>
<td>$81,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvement</td>
<td>$202,545</td>
<td>$90,920</td>
<td>$111,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Development Fund</td>
<td>$842,199</td>
<td>$842,199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Fund</td>
<td>$220,147</td>
<td>$220,147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Park &amp; Rec Fund</td>
<td>$795,957</td>
<td>$775,957</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Sunset Zoo Fund</td>
<td>$803,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$803,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Trust Fund</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3,997,814</td>
<td>$2,943,803</td>
<td>$148,403</td>
<td>$905,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare*
Table 11
CURRENT LEVEL OF CAPITAL FUNDING
FOR PLAN PRIORITY ELEMENTS
Based on 1992–1997 Capital Improvements Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Priority Elements</th>
<th>Average Annual Capital Budget</th>
<th>Total Capital $ 1992–1997</th>
<th>Projected Capital % of Parks &amp; Rec. Over 10 Years</th>
<th>CIP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Priority Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace &amp; Linear Park</td>
<td>$32,973</td>
<td>$197,835</td>
<td>$329,725</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td>$20,044</td>
<td>$120,266</td>
<td>$200,443</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>$19,524</td>
<td>$117,146</td>
<td>$195,243</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>$163,630</td>
<td>$981,779</td>
<td>$1,636,298</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Priority Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways &amp; Entryways</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards &amp; Streetscapes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Specified for Priority Elements</strong></td>
<td>$236,171</td>
<td>$1,417,026</td>
<td>$2,361,710</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Projects</td>
<td>$61,007</td>
<td>$366,040</td>
<td>$610,067</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available for Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td>$297,178</td>
<td>$1,783,066</td>
<td>$2,971,777</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Zoo</td>
<td>$150,933</td>
<td>$905,598</td>
<td>$1,509,330</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Equipment</td>
<td>$218,192</td>
<td>$1,309,150</td>
<td>$2,181,917</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parks &amp; Rec Capital Funds</strong></td>
<td>$666,302</td>
<td>$3,997,814</td>
<td>$6,663,023</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis by Ochaner Hare & Hare
Table 12
TARGET LEVELS FOR CITY CAPITAL FUNDING
FOR PLAN PRIORITY ELEMENTS
For Ten-Year Planning Period
In 1992 Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Priority Elements</th>
<th>Total Target 10-Years</th>
<th>% of Parks &amp; Rec. CIP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Priority Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace &amp; Linear Park</td>
<td>$776,250</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td>$776,250</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>$776,250</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>$776,250</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Priority Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways &amp; Entryways</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards &amp; Streetscapes</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total For Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Zoo</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Equipment</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parks &amp; Rec Capital Funds</strong></td>
<td>$6,750,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Operational and Program Funding

Current Funding Levels

The current funding for recreational programs and operating expenses is approximately $765,000 per year. The figure does not include funding for zoo operations and programming. This level represents approximately $20.15 per city resident per year, which is considered moderate for operational funding compared to other similar sized communities Ochsner · Hare & Hare has sampled. Of the $766,000, over $260,000 (approximately $6.85 per resident per year) is funded through user fees. The amount of user fee support in the operating budget is also moderate in comparison to other similar sized communities Ochsner · Hare & Hare has sampled.

Maintenance Costs Resulting From Recommended Programs

With increases in the number of parks and recreational facilities, maintenance costs will also increase. Table 13 provides an estimate of the additional maintenance costs, in 1992 dollars, that will result from the development of the recommended improvement in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan, based on target funding levels identified in Table 14. These maintenance costs are based on current maintenance work support levels of $25,849 for Maintenance Worker II, and $2,937 for a Part Time Worker (16 Weeks).

Since these figures are based on Target Funding Levels, they do not reflect increases for larger projects that may be developed as a result of special funding opportunities or partnerships. Table 14 provides estimates of maintenance expenditures by facility type for evaluation on a case by case basis.

It should also be recognized that increases in maintenance and will contribute to additional need for programming personnel, administrative equipment and supplies.

Implication For Planning

The evaluation of program elements with the Manhattan parks and recreation system indicate that residents expect a lot from their park system. There is a high demand for recreational programs and a high degree of satisfaction with the programs provided by the Parks and Recreation Department. The principal concern of the public related to recreational programs is that there are not enough to satisfy all demands.

Like recommended funding for capital improvements, target funding for recreational programs and administration is recommended to approximate current per capita per year funding levels through the Ten-Year Planning Period. The maintenance cost increases indicated in Table 13 would approximate the current operational cost per capita per year when accounting for increased city population. Expansion of program services should be matched by user fees, although adding user fees system-wide to current "no fee" programs is not considered an appropriate method of revenue generation.

Development of new programs should reflect the plan priorities. Because recreational programs rely principally on indoor facilities or community parks for support and because of the high percentage of direct user fee support, a significant adjustment of program spending patterns is not deemed to be an effective method of priority implementation, as is recommended for capital improvements.
Table 13
INCREASED MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURES
RESULTING FROM PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS*
For Year Five and Year Ten
In 1992 Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Addtl Employees</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
<th>Addtl Employees</th>
<th>Year Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace &amp; Linear Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,874</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Support Priority Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Year Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkways &amp; Entryways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards &amp; Streetscapes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Increased Maintenance</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Year Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$17,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based On Target Funding Levels
Actual Staffing Level Will Depend On Needs Of Individual Facilities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Yearly Employee Cost</th>
<th>Total Yrly Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace (250 acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcape (10 miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Park (10 miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Indoor Rec. Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,849</td>
<td>$31,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Indoor Rec. Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,874</td>
<td>$14,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Indoor Pool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12,925</td>
<td>$12,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Entryway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actual Staffing level will depend on needs of individual facilities.*
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The administrative strategies of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan focus on implementation of plan policies and objectives through the use of partnerships. This section provides an overview of current program characteristics, identifies partnership opportunities and outlines administrative guidelines for evaluation and development of facilities improvements.
Current Program Administration

The current parks and recreation system reflects dedication to provide not only quality facilities, but also a comprehensive program of recreational programs and classes. Among the most telling measures of the scope of program activity which the Parks and Recreation Department provides are the listing of programs offered, and number of participants per year in each program and the groups that use the city facilities on a regular basis. The complete list of 1991 program information may be found in the Appendix.

The information indicates the following key point regarding current programming:

- The Parks and Recreation Department managed over 60 separate sports, arts and crafts programs in 1991 serving over 80,000 participants.
- Over 50 organizations use city parks and recreation facilities on a regular basis.
- The Parks and Recreation Department has cooperative programs with more than a dozen area organizations and agencies, and over ten programs with the school district alone.
The Partnership Concept

The evaluation of Manhattan's current parks and recreation system indicates a system that provides a variety of recreational programs for a public that demands the best in recreational services. Although Manhattan currently provides a higher level of service than most cities its size, meeting the public expectations for quality service and facilities with limited financial resources is expected to be an on-going challenge for the Department throughout the Ten-Year Planning Period. Manhattan, therefore commits to the Partnership Concept of plan implementation to extend the delivery of parks and recreational facilities to other appropriate organizations and agencies in the community. Several factors indicate that the Partnership Concept is a realistic method of implementation of planning policies and objectives:

- Manhattan's proven ability to accomplish park and recreation service through cooperation with related agencies and organizations
- The projection of limited financial resources of the City of Manhattan in development of capital improvements during the Ten-Year Planning Period
- The proven interest of well managed, related agencies and organizations in Manhattan to work with the Parks and Recreation Department
- The ability of Manhattan to attract a consistent level of high quality management and staff, permitting a substantial reliance of interactive and coordinated programs

Therefore, it is recommended that the Partnership Concept be a major method of implementing plan priorities over the Ten-Year Planning Period.

Strategies for Implementation of the Partnership Concept

The principal objective of the Partnership Concept is to build up parks and recreational facilities and services by entering into partnerships and working agreements with related organizations and agencies in Manhattan in mutually beneficial relationships. Although the Parks and Recreation Department currently coordinates with numerous other organizations and agencies in the delivery of services, the adoption of the Partnership Concept as a principal method of plan implementation reflects the following key features:

- The Parks and Recreation Department will actively seek and evaluate appropriate partnerships in the provision of appropriate parks and recreational services and facilities
- A statement of evaluation will be delivered to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board before the development of new facilities and programs as to the availability of potential partnerships
- Although most current cooperative agreements center on cooperative recreational programs, there should be an emphasis within the Ten-Year Planning Period to develop parks and recreation facilities in partnership agreements, featuring shared development costs
- Development of any parks and recreational facilities partnership should be structured through a formal partnership agreement that identifies, at a minimum, responsibilities and funding share for initial construction, maintenance, and subsequent capital improvements, and also identifies time and type of use available for each partner.
• Anticipating the benefit to the proposed partner is regarded as equally important to the success of the partnership as to the benefit to the Parks and Recreation Department.

Potential Partners

Manhattan School District

Interrelationship of facilities and programs between the Parks and Recreation Department and the school district is impressive and it is anticipated that this relationship will form the most productive partnership over the Ten-Year Planning Period. The following are particular recommendations for the park system-school system partnership:

• The current relationship of cooperative programs and shared facilities should continue at no less than current levels.

• It is recommended that there be joint development of a nature/discovery center that provides both formal educational opportunities and recreational facilities during the Ten-Year Planning Period. It is recommended that such a center be developed near an environmentally sensitive or unique area, as identified in the Facilities Development element.

• In the development of new school facilities, serious consideration should be given to the joint development of indoor physical, educational and recreational facilities, particularly a community-wide indoor swimming pool and community-wide multi-purpose space, as well as significant greenspace for practice/play fields.

• It is recommended that consideration be given to joint improvement of existing school sites to provide improvements to physical education facilities and equipment while providing small landscaped areas and recreational facilities for area neighborhoods.

• It is recommended the city and the school system consider joint purchase of property in suburban areas for combined school-park site development.

Non-Profit and Civic Organizations

Non-profit and civic organizations have contributed numerous recreational services and facilities to Manhattan’s park system in the past. Such groups include but are not limited to the American Legion, Optimist Club, Arts Council and Civic Theater. It is reasonable to expect that these groups will continue to be generous and responsive in their support of area parks and recreation programs.

Guidelines to encourage meaningful dedications of recreational services and facilities include:

• Periodic presentation of Parks and Recreation Department objectives

• Monitoring of civic group activities to facilitate Parks and Recreation initiative for partnership projects that will benefit both organizations

• Development of partnerships based on sharing of development costs and maintenance and/or management of facilities.

Land Developers

In many localities, contributions from land developers are important sources for park land and facilities. Although regulations requiring a minimum dedication of public space for each land subdivider has been discussed in Manhattan, such regulations have not been adopted.

It is recommended that dedication requirements for appropriate public facilities be established within the subdivision regulations and site plan review guidelines in Manhattan. The need for more open space and/or recreation facilities is particularly important in evaluating large numbers of residential units. Accordingly, evaluating the level of impact of a perspective development on the recreational system, the Urban Area Planning Board and Park and Recreation Advisory Board should consider that Neighborhood Parks serve a service area of approximately 2,000
households and that an additional Community Level Park is necessary for each 10,000 households. One acre of greenspace and open space is recommended for every 20 additional households.

**Urban Area Planning Board**

Many of the policies of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan are based on the Manhattan Comprehensive Land Use Plan. An emphasis in this plan is on reinforcing sound land use patterns and protection of environmentally sensitive or unique area.

In pursuing these broad community objectives, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board shares a common mission with the Urban Area Planning Board. As the principal overseer of land development in the Manhattan area, the Urban Area Planning Board has authority within the city limits and all areas within 3 miles of the city limits. The Urban Area Planning Board is guided by the policies of the Land Use Plan and has regulatory authority through the zoning and subdivision ordinances.

The emphasis of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan on reinforcing the influence of Greenspace and Natural Areas in Manhattan suggests the need for formal cooperation between the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and the Urban Area Planning Board. To improve efficiency of these interrelated missions, it is recommended that:

- The Urban Area Planning Board formally seek the advice and council of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board in the evaluation of proposals for development of property in areas designated by the Land Use Plan as environmentally sensitive or unique.
- The Urban Area Planning Board formally seek the advice and council of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board in the evaluation of proposals for development of property or change in city policy plans in areas designated by the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan as project areas for possible future greenspace or natural area.
- The Urban Area Planning Board revise current zoning and subdivision ordinances to require dedication of property or fees in lieu of dedication for land development proposals containing more than 10 residential housing units.

**Kansas Department of Transportation**

Several of the recommended programs reflect the development of corridor and transportation relate projects, such as Linear Park development, parkway, entryway and, to a lesser extent, boulevard development. For the projects that related to transportation, coordination and partnership with the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) is recommended when feasible. Areas of emphasis for transportation related projects include:

- Identifying and pursuing KDOT grant programs for recommended projects
- Periodic discussion and dialogue with KDOT on Parks and Recreation policy and program priority;
- Coordinated statement of understanding on mutual maintenance responsibilities for improved corridor areas within the city limits.
Guidelines for Evaluation & Design of Future Facilities

Design Guidelines for Improvements

The emphasis for refinement of the Manhattan park system is to establish a more comprehensive park system through improvement of existing parks, development of greenspaces and natural areas and development of new recreational facilities. An important objective of each of these areas of emphasis is to enhance the image of Manhattan and its park system. As Manhattan commits to building the types of projects that will enhance the community image, it should also commit to using the same quality of design, materials and construction that is feasible and appropriate for new development. The difference between civic projects that evoke a sense of visual quality from those that represent functional utility is more often a dedication to detail and maintaining a commitment more than a function of expense. The success of the development of the recommended projects in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan depends on the continuing commitment of City Council, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and staff to quality improvements.

Guidelines for Project Development

- Improvement projects or project elements that require specific expertise or result in visibility by the public, even small projects, should be professionally designed and constructed when appropriate.

- Landscape material should be of sufficient size and quality to insure long term suitability.

- Continue the commitment to proper maintenance and sufficient maintenance staff. The existing parks and recommended improvements represent a commitment of City resources and tax dollars. Adequate care of these facilities is important to protecting this investment.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Proposed Park Sites and Natural Areas

The Site Selection Checklist found in Appendix D provides a means of evaluating potential park sites and natural areas for appropriate to the park system needs.

In addition to use for comparison of alternative sites for potential community and neighborhood parks, the Site Selection Checklist will be used to evaluate the park potential of property proposed for dedication to meet open space or environment standards.

Accessibility for the Disabled

All future improvements projects, whether for new facilities or upgrade of future facilities, should be designed and constructed to provide access of the facilities by the disabled.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a new federal statute that is modeled on Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The ADA, which became effective January 26, 1992, extends equal rights and access to citizen of all ages with disabilities. All future improvements for parks and recreation will comply with the ADA. Design standards for ADA are outlined in ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities. Example of the guidelines most relevant to development of parks and recreational facilities are provided in Appendix G.
Appendices
Appendix A

PUBLIC MEETING NOTES
Public Meeting Notes - January 6, 1992

Senior Center - January 6, 1992

Mary Nichols, Chairman of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board called the meeting to order and introduced the Board members, staff and consultants. Ms. Nichols indicated that the meeting was the first of a series of public meetings designed to gain public input about the parks and recreation program to help in the development of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

Foster Paulette, of Ochsner, Hare & Hare, explained the planning process for the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. He explained that the objectives of the Plan are to 1) identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources; 2) identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs and 3) identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreations, identified several of the issues most discussed to date. Those issues included: 1) combining joint use of school property and parks; 2) the continuing development of green space systems; 3) the importance of the development of neighborhood parks and common areas; and 4) the costs of improvements.

Ms. Nichols then opened the floor for comments.

The following is a summary of individual comments:

Comment 1 - Wes Stadler

We need more for space for square dancing. Manhattan has 3 square dancing clubs and 1 round dance. We need more space to keep up with demand. The club has used schools and used the legions and lately have been using the Municipal League. We would like to use City Auditorium but can't because there is so much competition for the space. There 300-400 active square dancers in the area. Out-of-town square dancers could bring in a lot of money to the area if there were a place for conventions. We would like to see Parks and Recreation sponsor square dancing groups.

Comment 2 - Mary Hall

I wanted to comment on the land on Kimball & Browning, which will be the subject of a hearing for rezoning for use as an apartment complex. It would make a wonderful place for a neighborhood park or for open space. The property was used by kids to play. My family kept cattle on the property, thought of as a nuisance then, but now people are nostalgic about them. I suggest delay action on rezoning and trade the property from Ball Cottage for it.

Comment 3 - Jean Heffel

In the last several years, our taxes have doubled and it is the older people that get left out. Aquacise is only offered one day a week. We need more opportunity for elderly swimming.

Comment 4 - Betty Donner

We need to provide year around swimming for the community. We need more senior swimming and facilities so that family members and young people can participate. Parks are OK but the swimming facilities are lousy. We are at a point where we need to develop facilities as well as land.

Comment 5 - Georgia Mullinax

The rates are too high in the Natatorium. There is a conflict of university users and high schools.

Comment 6 - Ken Brooks

I think it is important that we have a goals setting process for Plan so that planning and design don't surprise the community. We need efforts...
at "fence mending" and to identify and articulate goals. We need a balance between regional and neighborhood facilities. We need to take a close look at relationships between neighborhood and school input and develop a long term agreement for common goods.

The plan should address maintenance concerns. The plan should make direct relationships to the land use—not just lip service but follow the direct recommendations. We need to create a plan developers can use to develop around Resources are often drawn away. We need to follow the Master Plan for the Linear Park. In the Comprehensive Plan hearings there was a "wish list" developed but a lot of comments didn't get into the land use plan for implementation.

We should identify a greenway system that is logical and built on areas of special ecological character. Identify constructive ways to define and enhance land use character. Goals should be environmentally responsible and fiscally responsible.

Comment 7 - Wanda McVey

Concerned about the expense involved. Need to create more ice skating. The current facilities are limited. Need expansion room. There are a number of people from the north who enjoy this type of activity. It could be a multi-use facility for square dances or other uses. The neighborhood/school cooperative arrangement is good as long as mainte nance of the facilities is no problem.

Comment 8 - Joyce Furne

I am a member of the Municipal Civic Theater Board and serve as Chairman of the outreach theater committee. I think we need to address cultural activities and the arts. Parks are places to build arts and culture. We need to have both facilities and programs. The theater will facilitate however we can to help in the Master Plan.

Comment 9

Does the City require developers to set aside green space?

Terry DeWeese

No, there was a proposal to include dedication requirements in the City codes several years ago but the it was defeated in the Board of Commissioners vote.

Comment 10 - Bill Dorsett

I feel we need more neighborhood parks -- more parks we can walk to. It is important to recognize the value of for natural areas for their own sake and encourage their development.

Comment 11 - Ken Burns

The casual use of the school ground meets some of the recreational needs of the community already.

Comment 12 - Bill Dorsett

Potter Hall is used that way.

Comment 13

What is the budget for the park system?

Terry DeWeese

The park system is made up of a number of components. Currently, the total budget is approximately $2.5 million, of which approximately $100,000 is identified for park construction. The recreation budget is 50-60% support by fees.

Comment 14

Will the admission charge for Sunset Zoo be decreased?

Terry DeWeese

We found that 76% of the zoo users were from outside of Manhattan and felt that they should support zoo operation and maintenance. The revenue from admission has helped to make the zoo much better.

Comment 15 - Bill Dorsett

I'd like to complement you on the openness of this process.

Ms. Nichols thanked the audience for their participation. The meeting was adjourned.
Public Meeting Notes - January 23, 1992

Amanda Arnold Elementary School -

Mary Nichols, Chairman of the of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board called the meeting to order and introduced the Board members, staff and consultants. Ms. Nichols indicated that the meeting was one of a series of public meetings designed to gain public input regarding the parks and recreation program as part of development of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

Foster Paulette, Of Ochsner, Hare & Hare, explained the planning process for the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. He explained that the objectives of the Plan are to 1) identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources; 2) identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs and 3) identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities. He indicated that initial evaluation of Manhattan parks and recreation program suggest a system that is strong in providing the types of programs that the people of Manhattan want. He indicated that the full Inventory and Analysis of the system would be presented the first week in March.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, identified several of the issues most discussed to date. Those issues included: 1) combining joint use of school property and parks; 2) the need for indoor facilities versus outdoor facilities; 3) the continuing development of greens space system; 4) the importance of the development neighborhood parks and common areas; and 5) the costs of improvements.

Ms. Nichols then opened the floor for comments.

The following is a summary of individual comments:

Comment 1

We are military and I think there are great facilities here. But I don't know why we don't have a community indoor pool. To use the [K State] natatorium you have to join the Alumnae Association. Why don't we have an indoor pool facility?

Terry DeWeese

The issue is largely a financial one. There was consideration of developing an indoor facility when the new [outdoor] facility was planned at CiCo but it was constructed as an outdoor facility at that size because of budget. It's a good point--one that came up at the last meeting.

Comment 2 - John Linden

Manhattan has a parks and recreation system it can be justifiably proud of. The staff does a good job. There are several things I'd like to comment on. There is a request for zoning change at Claflin Avenue intersection for 6 acres of undeveloped property proposed for apartment development. I live just behind that property. Over years it has grown up into trees and has the start of a wooded area. City Commission action in the past resulted in leaving the property as it is. My concern is that there is no provision in the City ordinance that would allow an undeveloped area to evolve to this condition if someone requests that it be mowed. There should be provisions in the City ordinance for nature areas to be left as they are. The Comprehensive Parks Master Plan is a good place to start. I am a forester by background and grew up with woods behind my house and know the value of unplanned open space whether it be for free play or wildlife habitats.

I have a great interest in the Linear Park. I hope the plan includes opportunities for extensive of the Linear Park. The questions about its use have been answered. It is well used and I expect it will be even more used when the western section through the population centers are opened. I would like to see it extend-ed even further. I have noted that the drainage problems
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playground there now because it is close to neighborhoods.

Comment 11
I like the idea of the community park system we have now. I lived in California where the small neighborhood parks without programmed activities ended up as hang-outs that got vandalized. The size of the parks wasn’t big enough to generate the activity to protect the park. I like the present system.

Terry DeWeese
How about combining school facilities and park facilities? Or park adjoining school to encourage development of shared facilities. Any thoughts on that?

Ron Fehr
An example of that type of facilities is Northview Elementary.

Comment 11 - John Linden
With limited budgets and limited facilities, it makes sense to combine facilities sometimes. On the issue of neighborhood parks versus community-wide parks, it really doesn’t have to be "either or". We should develop both.

Comment 12
The only problem I see with developing adjoining facilities is that I think of a park as a place to sit and have lunch. You don't get that atmosphere at a school. In other communities I've lived in, the parks have become places for homeless people to hang out and that would not mix well with school activities.

Mary Nichols
We thank you for your comments. Our next meeting will be Tuesday, January 28 at Northview Elementary. Please tell your friends. Meeting adjourned.
along Little Kitten Creek have become worse now since the area has become developed. We need to preserve greenspace to help the drainage conditions.

Comment 3

I agree with the last comments. We need a balance of active and passive parks. In Wichita, there is the Chisholm Trail park developed by Bob Gress with the City of Wichita. They have allowed natural vegetation to be the principal feature of this linear park. Wellington, Kansas has a merry-go-round that is located in a natural park environment.

Comment 4

I am a square dancer and would like to emphasize the need for more square dancing facilities in Manhattan. It is good clean fun and good exercise. Parks and Recreation should consider providing lessons. We particularly need a place to have square dances. What facilities are shared with the school system?

Terry DeWeese

We have a cooperative agreement with the school system that allow us to use school facilities, including this school, after hours for programs. It has been a good working relationship that make efficient use of community resources. Any thoughts on combining school and recreation facilities?

Comment 5

I am with the Catholic school system. I know the field across the from the Catholic school is used now for play activities. I hope the field will be preserved in the future or replaced if used for the new City jail site.

Comment 6

What is the status of the 8-10 acres near the levee near the Readi-Mix-Plant?

Terry DeWeese

This property is currently planned as natural area.

Comment 7

How is the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan going to relate to the Land Use Plan? They should be integrated.

Terry DeWeese

The Land Use Plan was developed recognizing that the Parks Master Plan would be developed. Greenspace areas were identified in the Land Use Plan. We are working with the Urban Area Planning Board to insure that the plans are compatible.

Terry DeWeese

Do any of you have any thoughts on the need for indoor space versus outdoor space?

Comment 8

I guess I came to talk specifically about the need for indoor space. We have good outdoor facilities but need an indoor pool. We can’t use K State’s pool and there are no other facilities available.

Terry DeWeese

Does anyone have any comments about the performing arts or arts and crafts?

Comment 9

First, I’d to reinforce the indoor pool idea. Also, I think we need a sign or plaque at the sculpture on Claflin [in Pioneer Park].

Ron Fehr

Are there any thoughts about the needs for more neighborhood parks within walking distance of residents? Or a need for more community-wide parks?

Comment 10

I like the idea of small parks for neighborhood use. I don’t want Manhattan to have concrete everywhere. The loose character of neighborhood parks is important. I live near CiCo and my boys used it like a neighborhood parks, playing ball on the fields when there wasn’t something else going on. I see the children using the
Public Meeting Notes - January 28, 1992

Northview Elementary School

Mary Nichols, Chairman of the of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board called the meeting to order and introduced the Board members present. Ms. Nichols indicated that the meeting was one of a series of public meetings designed to gain public input regarding the parks and recreation program as part of development of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced the Parks & Recreation staff present.

Foster Paulette, of Ochsner, Hare & Hare, explained the planning process for the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. He explained that the objectives of the Plan are to 1) identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources; 2) identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs and 3) identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities. He indicated that initial evaluation of Manhattan parks and recreation program suggests that the system is strong in providing the types of programs that the people of Manhattan want. He indicated that the full Inventory and Analysis of the system would be presented the first week in March.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, identified several of the issues most discussed to date. Those issues included: 1) joint use of school property and parks; 2) the need for indoor facilities versus outdoor facilities; 3) the continuing development of greenspace; 4) the importance of the development of neighborhood public parks and common areas; and 5) identifying what the public willing to pay for.

Ms. Nichols then opened the floor for comments.

The following is a summary of individual comments:

Comment 1
I live in the Stagg Hill area of Manhattan. We are landlocked and the only place there is to play is the cemetery, which probably isn't encouraged, or the street. Warner is the closest park which I use but no one ever seems to be there. There are about two cross country meets a year and people walking their dogs occasionally. It would be easy some facilities there to increase the use, such as volleyball, basketball or tennis.

Terry DeWeese
A member of the staff prepared a Master Plan for Warner several years ago and surveyed the surrounding residents about Warner use. Most indicated that they preferred that the park remain in natural area. Proposed activities for Warner include trails development, drinking fountain and restroom facilities. The schools use the park for environmental education programs. We had to close off vehicular access because of the vandalism that was occurring at the shelter areas.

Comment 1 (continued)
I want to reinforce the point about Stagg Hill. The kids play in the street up there and with the traffic on Allison, it's very dangerous.

Terry DeWeese
Good point.

Comment 2
In the joint facilities at Northview School, which are park facilities and which are school facilities?

Terry DeWeese
The ball field, pool, playground and tennis
courts are City facilities. The multi-purpose courts are school facilities. Under cooperative agreements, the school uses the pool for physical education programs, as well as the ball field.

Comment 2 (continued)

You mentioned the idea of joint school and park facilities and I think it makes sense. Also, is there a certain amount of park property necessary and do school facilities count towards that? If school facilities are counted, does that relieve developers of responsibility for providing facilities? And is the City proposing reservation of large tracts of park land for the future as CiCo and City was reserved many years ago?

Terry DeWeese

School ground do contribute to the open space inventory and there are a number of cooperative programs for use of both school facilities by parks and park facilities by schools. We are working through the Urban Area Planning Board to strengthen the accountability of land developers for providing usable open space.

Comment 2 (continued)

Does the Land Use Plan propose any additional park land in the Northview area?

Terry DeWeese

The Land Use Plan identified greenspace areas. It was anticipated that the Parks Master Plan would be more specific in parkland identification.

Foster Paulette

You mentioned reserving park property for the future. Is this something you think should be done?

Comment 2 (continued)

I think we need to both kinds of parks and I think it is important to have parks in the neighborhood. Northview is well used and so is Harbour, but I recognize these are higher maintenance parks. I hate to see the smaller neighborhood parks abandoned in favor of the large facility parks. Northview, like Stagg Hill, is isolated. But at least we have Northview Park and Harbour Park. I suggest that we have better access to this eastern end of Linear Trail in the form of sidewalks. It is dangerous to walk down Case-ment Road to get to the Linear Trail.

Comment 3

I think small parks are important. I live in Northview and use the parks a lot. My daughter is in the Manhattan Marlins Swimming Team. The swimming team has no City wide indoor facilities. We have been using Kansas State facilities for $1,400 a month matched by the high school, but K State wants us out within 2-3 years. Swimming is good exercise and a good way to keep the kids occupied. I would think for the money that is being contributed to the K State we could do something on a City basis.

Comment 4

I attend the Parks & Recreation Board meetings. I understand there has been an inventory of plots of land over property that has been donated to the City and is not being used. I suggest those be officially recognized in the Master Plan as natural areas and the public be educated as the value of such areas.

Terry DeWeese

There are several areas that had been donated in the past. We now evaluate each proposed donation to insure that it is usable for the City and should be removed from the tax rolls. A list of these property is available from our office.

Comment 4 (continued)

I would also like to comment on Goodnow Park. The playground area is the most visible but there is also the slope and the observation area. The slope behind the Goodnow Cabin seems to be unstable and soil is building up at the rear wall. This is probably increased by the children playing on the slope. There was to be a second phase of Goodnow Park improvements that included trail development. I hope the Master Plan recognizes this and proposes a trail corridor system that will help prevent the erosion and keep the
area naturalistic.

Comment 5

I want to comment on the Linear Trail. My wife and I use the trail and encourage the extension of it. The problem is the access particularly at the eastern end. Secondly, there seems to be a need for more community indoor space. Community House, Douglass Center and City Auditorium are always occupied and are getting old. We have done an excellent job of developing our outdoor facilities over the last 10 years, but need indoor facilities or a multi-purpose center.

Comment 6 - Dwight Naismith

On the subject of indoor facilities, the Performing Arts Group has moved all over town in the twenty plus years of existence and we have never been in more inadequate facilities than we are now. We are paying $16,000 a year to use our current inadequate facilities. Is there a chance of duplicating what Junction City has done in renovating a building for theater productions? The Performing Art Groups needs facilities specifically for theater.

Mike Toy

Where is the Junction City facility?

Comment 6 (continued)

18th Street. It would seem that Manhattan could accomplish something similar.

Comment 7

Salina has a similar arrangement that is maintained by the City. It seems that a flexible performing arts space could accommodate all types of arts events.

Terry DeWeese

The need for indoor facilities is something that has come up at the last two meetings.

Comment 8

For indoor athletic facilities, I would say larger facilities complexes are best. Families can come and different members can do different things at the same time. What is the state of gymnastics now? Does Parks and Recreation sponsor a program?

Terry DeWeese

We have a gymnastic program up to intermediate level but we do not have competitive gymnastics.

Comment 9 - Ann

On the subject of indoor space and as a member of the Goodnow Cabin Committee, I request we please don’t forget the cabin during the development of Parks Master Plan.

Comment 10

I think that combining park and school facilities is a good way to give the taxpayers a break. The new [Annenberg] Complex gives the taxpayers a break by bringing money into the community [through tournaments]. I think that school/park facilities should be developed through long range plans and long term agreements.

Comment 11 - John Biggs

I would like to emphasize that the Manhattan Arts Council has many cooperative programs with the schools and other community interests and expand the influence of our activities. Our principal problem is lack of investment funds to expand to meet needs.

Comment 12

It is disappointing to have the children dance and music recitals in such poor surroundings after they work so hard every year.

Comment 13

A large mutlipurpose facility would require a lot of parking. Perhaps locating activities in separate places by reusing existing buildings would be a better use of space.

Comment 14

I am from the square dance club and we also need indoor space for activities. We have used
schools and City Auditorium in the past but it is harder to find space and the appropriate surface to dance on. The ballroom dance folks have to carry their floor with them.

Comment 15
Something could be done with the Keller Building. But I wonder how we would pay for all these wonderful facilities we are talking about. Is it possible to work something out with K State for performing art facilities?

Comment 16
K State is used to the maximum.

Comment 17 - John Biggs
Our objective in the Manhattan Arts Council is the increase the number of participants and accommodate the demand for participation in theater and arts. To say that we have enough space for spectator theater in Manhattan is like saying basketball courts are adequate because we can see all the basketball we want. We need to recognize the importance of participation not just viewing. Our principal frustration is that we don’t have access to the ad valorem tax base to improve the facilities.

Comment 18
I appreciate the improvements that have been done at Anneberg and I think we should follow the examples in developing new facilities.

Whatever we develop in the future, we should do it well and build to last.

Comment 19
Relative to the issue of greenspace, I coached boys baseball and we always were looking for practice space. Greenspace could be use for practice space also.

Comment 20
One way to improvement funding for many of these activities is to establish foundations for endowments or to facilities dedication by people’s estates.

Mary Nichols
The School Board has establish such a foundation in the past eighteen months.

Terry DeWeese
Don Wixsone has established the Zoo Trust which has been important in development of new zoo facilities.

Terry DeWeese reviewed the schedule of future meetings and events of the Parks Master Plan process. Mary Nichols adjourned the meeting.
Public Meeting Notes - February 3, 1992

Holidome - February 3, 1992

Mary Nichols, Chairman of the of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board called the meeting to order and introduced the Board members present. Ms. Nichols indicated that the meeting was one of a series of public meetings designed to gain public input regarding the parks and recreation program as part of development of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced the Parks & Recreation staff present.

Foster Paulette, of Ochsner, Hare & Hare, explained the planning process for the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. He explained that the objectives of the Plan are to 1) identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources; 2) identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs and 3) identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities. He indicated that initial evaluation of Manhattan parks and recreation program suggests that the system is strong in providing the types of programs that the people of Manhattan want. He indicated that the full Inventory and Analysis of the system would be presented the first week in March.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreations, identified several of the issues most discussed to date. Those issues included: 1) joint use of school property and parks; 2) the need for indoor facilities versus outdoor facilities; 3) the continuing development of greenspace; 4) the importance of the development of neighborhood parks and common areas; and 5) identifying what the public willing to pay for.

Ms. Nichols then opened the floor for comments.

The following is a summary of individual comments:

Comment 1 - Graham Rose

I am someone who wears many hats relative to Parks and Recreation in Manhattan. First, I'm a Manhattan Marlin parent. I have three teenagers, one of whom is swimming competitively in college now. Over the last 25 years, the Marlin program affords many children a chance to participate in sports and exercise that wouldn't otherwise participate in sports. It is good cardio-vascular exercise. The team is privately funded and really have no facilities for indoor use. Of course, we have been using the K State Natatorium but the expense and competition for time is constantly increasing. K State has said that we should look for other facilities within 2-3 years.

We feel Marlin significantly contribute to Manhattan's community spirit and has a positive economic impact on the community. We have state and regional-wide outdoor meets in the summer that attract 400-600 swimmers to Manhattan, each with 1-2 parents. If we had indoor facilities, we could meets in the winter, and the income from participation, as well as the money generated [from staying, eating and shopping in Manhattan] could help pay for the facility. As I said, my kids are teenagers, and won't have the opportunity to use whatever is built as a Marlin, but I feel it is important for the community to have.

Another hat I wear is that of a pediatrician, having practiced here for 16 years. I see a lot of kids that are physically fit but many others that are not. Swimming is one sport that almost anyone can do, either individually or competitively. It is good for the self image. At the moment it is difficult for individuals to swim other than in the summer. Lessons at the K State pool are expensive. From a health standpoint, we are seeing more and more children with asthma, nationwide. Swimming is one of the few activities that children with asthma can participate in. In all, swimming opens athletics up to a sizable percent-
age of children.

From the perspective of a middle aged Manhattan, I recognize that Manhattan's population is aging. Anaerobic exercise is good and swimming is particularly good exercise for seniors.

Comment 2 - Cheryl Collins

The Parks and Recreation Department has been successful in developing partnerships with other organizations such as the Riley County Historical Society and developing support groups, such as the Friends of the Sunset Zoo. I think these groups are important and would like to see more.

Comment 3 - Karen Winslow

I come as a mother with children that Park and Recreation facilities and I am particularly supportive of developing facilities for swimming. I didn't know Dr. Rose would be here but he was the one who suggested to me that my child do more exercise and to help cholesterol levels and that swimming was particularly good. With the Natatorium hours restricted it seems apparent that other indoor swimming facilities should be developed. I think a pool could support itself in this community. I think you would see significant support from the senior community.

Comment 4 - Jerry Hester

I have enjoyed Parks and Recreation facilities over the years. Tonight I want comment on the need for square dancing facilities in Manhattan. The square dance clubs could use support and need facilities to dance. It is good, clean fun, with no alcohol. It would be good if Department of Parks and Recreation would sponsor or help square dancing. We have 300-400 square dancers in Manhattan and dancers come in 3-4 times a year to Manhattan from around the region to dance, bringing in money.

Comment 5

I am from the Long Rangers, which is the singles square dancing group. There are four clubs in Manhattan. There is a bill in the State Legislature to make square dancing the Kansas Folk Dance. Just to give some idea of our activities...none of the clubs dance on the same

night. We car pool to go to other communities and other clubs come to Manhattan. We have a lot of people and all ages. Each year there is a state wide dance held in Salina where we have national and local callers. Square dancing is good recreation. Right now the only way we can support the club is to give lessons, and I'd like to see more City sponsorship of square dancing activities.

Comment 6 - Marilyn Woodward

My comments refer to the lack of space for the arts and exhibit space for the arts. There is certainly a need in Manhattan for space for cultural activities. These types of activities are particularly appropriate for an aging population.

Terry DeWeese

Does anyone have comments about the need for neighborhood parks?

Comment 7 - Polly Williams

I like Manhattan parks as they are now, but would like to see more areas and facilities for family groups. Linear Park should be developed and extended.

Comment 8 - Gary Walter

Will the Master Plan address needs of the cemetery? I think we have some outstanding cemeteries and they should be recognized in the plan.

Terry DeWeese

Sometimes people do use the cemeteries as passive parks. We're not planning on addressing the cemeteries in the Plan, principally because Sunset Cemetery is almost full and Sunrise Cemetery has already been programmed.

Comment 9 - Karen Winslow

I find this process very interesting because it's so open. How will you weigh the comment and incorporate in the Plan?

Terry DeWeese

These public meetings give people to help
shape the Plan. The comments will viewed as a whole, not just based on the number of times something was said. We will also have feedback survey in the newspaper and a random survey of 350-400 households.

Foster Paulette

Yes, the comments will not be tallied and quantified but be taken as a whole as an expression of community interest and concern. This community is more committed to public involvement than many we have work in. We encourage this type of interaction because at the meetings, we find out what people feel strongly about and it allows us to get better in touch with community values.

Comment 10 - Gary Walter

I've been something of a student of this process. I'm involved in marketing in my business and I was wondering about the random survey. Will these meeting help determine what is surveyed?

Foster Paulette

Yes, the public meetings are being used to identify issues that will important to measure community-wide. The focus of the survey will be to measure satisfaction level of various parks and recreation facilities and in that way determine needs and priorities from a cross section of the population.

Comment 11 - Burt Biles

I seems we are talking about apples and oranges when we speak of indoors pool and performing arts facilities. With the indoor pool situation, the community will know the value of its loss because there have been programs at the K State facilities. But the community has never been able to realize its potential in development of the performing arts because it never has had adequate facilities to develop truly supportive programs. Other communities, such as Salina and Lawrence, have made the commitment to the performing arts. The performance arts serve a different segment of the population than do sports.

I think, too, that we have often confuse the resources of K State as resources of the community and we are starting to realize that K State is phasing out how much it can support community activities. Similarly, we tend confuse facilities needed for arts and crafts and needs of the Manhattan Civic Theater, which has never had adequate facilities. The City of Manhattan needs to support and facilitate development of facilities for both types of activities.

Terry DeWeese reviewed the schedule of future meetings and events of the Parks Master Plan process. Mary Nichols adjourned the meeting.
Public Meeting Notes - February 11, 1992

Fire Station Headquarters

Mary Nichols, Chairman of the of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board called the meeting to order and introduced the Board Members present. Ms. Nichols indicated that the meeting was one of a series of public meetings designed to gain public input regarding the parks and recreation program as part of development of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced the Parks & Recreation staff present.

Foster Paulette, of Ochsner, Hare & Hare, explained the planning process for the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. He explained that the objectives of the Plan are to 1) identify a program for the effective use of existing facilities and natural resources; 2) identify facilities and programs necessary to meet both immediate and long-term needs and 3) identify pragmatic financial and administrative strategies that will lead to the acquisition and construction of recommended facilities. He indicated that initial evaluation of Manhattan parks and recreation program suggests that the system is strong in providing the types of programs that the people of Manhattan want. He indicated that the first presentation of concept alternatives would be presented the first week in several weeks.

Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks and Recreation, indicated that alternative concepts of the plan would be presented April 6, instead of March 2 as previously announced. The additional time was felt to be necessary to allow the random public survey to reflect issue identified in the public meetings. Mr. DeWeese identified several of the issues most discussed to date. Those issues included; 1) joint use of school property and parks; 2) the need for indoor facilities versus outdoor facilities; 3) the continuing development of greenspace; 4) the importance of the development neighborhood parks and common areas; and 5) identifying what the public willing to pay for.

Ms. Nichols then opened the floor for comments. The following is a summary of individual comments:

Comment 1 - Bernd Foerster

I applaud the Parks and Recreation Commission for the openness in the development of the Plan and for allowing the public to participate. In looking over the past comments, I see a lot of emphasis on recreation, on recreation for senior citizens and an interest in natural areas. I would like to make a few points about opportunities at Goodnow Park. Because of the expansion of the water treatment facility the playground has been improved. But there is also opportunity for the development of passive recreation on the western side of the park as well as on the top of the hill. The top of the hill has a wonderful view of the area and has been neglected. The paving in the parking area is cracked and broken. I would like to see more attention given to these areas of Goodnow Park.

Comment 2 - Dorothy Bronson

It seems that we have some good facilities for children and adults but we need equipment for adolescents such as basketball. We need to also insure that our park have passive spaces for people not just facilities on pavement.

Comment 3 - Bob Lamborn

I have several concerns. I have been a volunteer coach for youth basketball. We have had a good relationship with the schools but finding a place and time for practice has been a problem. Facilities are limited and scheduling is helter-skelter and scattered all around the city. It is impossible to practice for adult league basketball. The suggestion for indoor pools are good but I think we should also consider the need for basketball free play. Right now, we only have the opportunity on Sunday night. I would also like to see more opportunity for handball and racquetball and weight lifting facilities. I recognize that in-
door facilities are expensive, but they are very much needed.

Comment 4 - Chris Wounder
I am member of the Manhattan Marlins and want to emphasize the need for indoor swimming facilities. The Natatorium is expensive and K State has said that they want us to find another place within several years. But there is no other place. We need a community indoor pool, not just for the Marlins but for the general population as well. Swimming provides a different type of activity from football or baseball. Some kids aren't good at team sports and swimming offers an alternative.

Comment 5 - Jerry Carpenter
I am the coach for the Manhattan Marlins. Chris and Nikki, who will speak in a minute, are just two of the many kids who are in the Marlin program. I could have had fifty here tonight to emphasize the importance of maintaining the Marlin program at no less than current levels. Many people don't realize that the Marlin program is a year 'round activity and that there are meets around the region in the winter. We have finally talked K State into providing the facilities for the Division II Missouri meets which will bring a number of people and money into the city. The use of the K State facilities for practice is extremely expensive--shocking in fact. Comparisons with other areas indicate that what we are being charged may be among the highest in the country for a community swim club. And we have no alternative. We have over 70 kids ages 6-18 in the program and keep getting more. Members of the Marlins have gone on to receive college scholarships in the past and others have that potential now. We have a strong program but it's barely a break even venture. When the rates go up, we have to pass it on the kids. I can't stay tonight because we have a board meeting to consider another rate increase by K State. Other places can't believe what we pay and we are becoming quite frustrated.

Comment 6 - Nikki Wounder
I am a junior high school student and a member of the Marlins as well as other activities. Our family moved here several years ago and one of the considerations for us was the opportunity to participate in a year 'round swimming program. The Marlins are an excellent way to stay in shape. Some of the Marlins have aspirations to be in the Junior Olympics and for college scholarships. That requires year 'round training. If a facility is built it probably won't effect me but other kids need the chance I have had. We need facilities that offer many types of recreational activities. We need to encourage a continuing awareness of the importance on physical fitness. Thank you and I hope you take this into consideration.

Comment 7
I noticed on the map of parks that Riley Park on south Juliette was not identified as a park or greenspace. That property was dedicated as a park in 1955 and a lot of children play there, particularly poorer children. I think it should be recognized.

Terry DeWeese
Like many private parcels, that property provides play space for children of that area but it is not owned by the City and is not part of the official Manhattan Park system.

Comment 8 - Jan Garton
I have a number of comments and I have summarized them in a handout. I went through the Urban Area Plan and identified elements that related to parks, playground and aesthetics. My handout outlines many of the policies from the Plan those areas. I also have several other comments.

I suggest that you look through the neighborhoods for potential park space that could serve as neighborhood parks. I think that there should be a policy that in the development of any PUD or residential subdivision, there be a requirement for dedication of open space and/or park land and, if possible such property should be contiguous with similar property to increase its impact.

I noticed that the map on the wall shows only the City limits. The Urban Area Planning Board
has jurisdiction out as far as 3 miles beyond the city limits, which could extend out to the Eureka Valley and the river flood plain. I would like to suggest that Manhattan combine with Riley County and Fort Riley to make the whole flood plain area a natural area and make Central Park of the "Little Apple". The area could contain wetland and tall grass prairie. It could be a teaching laboratory for students. We don't have enough opportunity for exposure to natural history—to the real workings of nature. We should establish a junior naturalistic program to encourage a stewardship of the earth and awareness of ecological importance.

I think the City should make effort to protect the Eureka Oxbow, which is the only oxbow of the Kansas River. It has historical importance—there was once a resort there. The church and school there could be headquarters for the naturalistic program. It would be a major opportunity to tie into the Linear Trail and establish not only a loop, but provide a scenic trail through undeveloped areas.

I would also like to see opportunities for natural areas or undeveloped areas or bike trails in urban areas. They need to be identified now before they are absorbed by development. I would like to see natural areas and open space in commercial areas for people to gather, sit and enjoy the outdoors.

The Urban Area Plan recognizes the importance of Eureka Oxbow, Pawpaw Glen and others. The Parks Master Plan should defines ways to protect these areas.

The City should also develop backyard habitat plans to allow exclusion to the mowing ordinance. Owners wishing to participate would receive designation and certificates. Although we need to be careful that people don't apply just because they are too lazy to mow, I think we need to protect the right to create a natural area.

I would also like to see a greater appreciation and development of natural area parks. Bob Gress in Wichita has developed this type of park through trail development, encouraging natural area education. When kids don't have developed parks, they tend to find vacant lots and woods. I don't think that's bad. Children learn to use and develop their imagination. There is a real value to wild nature—to the sounds and silence of nature.

Finally, I would like for the public to have the opportunity to review the draft of the plan.

**Terry DeWeese**

Good comments. We encourage the public to attend and participate in the presentation of the three alternative concepts and the presentation of the final draft. We will have them in locations that will allow for public involvement.

**Comment 9 - Norman Schlesener**

I moved here 2 1/2 years ago. It's the fourth time I've lived here. I moved back because this is a nice place to live. I appreciate what the last speaker said about the need for open space although I wouldn't go so far as to say I'd like to see the City buy a bunch of vacant lots [laughter]. But I would like to see more appreciation for greenspace and for the aesthetics—for finely landscaped greenspaces and walkways. I love sports, as both a spectator and a participant. But don't minimize the importance of aesthetics in developing parks.

**Comment 10 - Leland Reitz**

I am representing the American Legion. We would like to indicate our appreciation for the excellent park system that has been developed by Terry DeWeese and the staff over the years. I have been impressed by the importance of a number of interests that have been expressed at these meetings—the indoor pool and others. I am here to talk about baseball, which is the interest of the American Legion. The American Legion feels Manhattan needs more baseball facilities. The City has 53 City League baseball teams and 9 nine traveling teams for a total of 62 team competing for playing fields. These teams serve young people from the ages 9-18. We have six existing ballfields—3 at CiCo and 3 City—and only one is regular size, with 16 teams completing for use. Many people might think that Anneberg has baseball diamonds but those are only softball. K State generously allows the traveling teams to use Meyer Field after their season is completed. Actually though, the use is by contract under which the City spent $95,000 for lighting and in return
can use the fields when it doesn't conflict with K State activities. But that contract ends in the year 2000. Then there will be only one regular size playing field. I think there would be great use of more baseball field and encourage their development.

Comment 11 - Sydney Carlin

I'd like to ask a question of Dr. Reitz—are the baseball teams you spoke of just boys?

Dr. Reitz

Yes, approximately 900 boys in the City League each summer.

Sydney Carlin

I would like to see some batting cages at CiCo like there are at Anneberg—my boys would like to see one in our backyard [laughter]. I also want to note that Mike Clark, K State baseball coach makes fields available for practice and provides temporary fields for three age 12 and under teams.

Terry DeWeese

The individual who has the concession on the batting cages at Anneberg also has a three year option on the batting cages at CiCo and has talked about developing some there as soon as he gets the money.

Comment 12 - Jim Hamilton

I'm not exactly sure how this fits in. We have had a lot of talk about spaces—new and existing. And the relationship of recreational programs to spaces, and I support that. I learned to skate on the ice rink here and the we used the ice rink as a selling point in recruiting people for my department. People from up north were surprised to find an ice rink here.

I would like to direct several comments at the City Commissioners—I see at least one in attendance. We need exactly the same type of process for the arts and for arts facilities. Having the Civic Theater in the Warham raises the visibility but we have to build a complete theater facility every time we have a production. The arts activities are either completely dependent on K State facilities or struggling to fit into back rooms. I support a master plan for the cultural arts.

Comment 13 - Gary Walter

I am here tonight representing the Arts Council. I've been a student of this process and have been very interested in seeing what has gone into the process. We heard a lot about recreation and there is no argument there is a need for recreational facilities. There are a few related things I would like to enter into the public record through this forum. I have been on the board of Arts in the Park program and recognize the importance and power of partnerships in the community. Many people have come to these meetings asking for facilities and programs. The Arts Council is offering partnership. The Parks and Recreation Commission and staff have established experience in leveraging private funds and grants through taxes dollars and have secured an excellent administrative framework to serve Manhattan. We in the art community have been building a network of experience and skills in the cultural arts for 46 years. I think we can assist and we feel there are some valid relationships.

I support a cultural arts plan for Manhattan—a plan that addresses performing arts, visual arts, art education and one that provides direction and establishes a definitive track for the development of the arts. As a business man, I know have seen the impact of the arts as a business recruiting tool and their importance in keeping people in Manhattan. I cannot over emphasize the importance of the arts in economic development, although the impact is hard to quantify. We don't come tonight asking for money or an arts center. We would like to have one because right now a place to call home is missing, but we are not asking for that. But what we lack is the direction to build appropriate program and build appropriate arts facilities. A cultural arts plan would greatly help efforts to obtain grants, private endowments. Grantors are reluctant to give without knowing where the arts community is going and where the arts fit into community plans. The way we in the arts community can help now is through partnership.
Comment 14 - Deborah Frye
I first want to thank the Parks and Recreation Department for the recent park improvements, especially to Anneberg Park. Having established so many soccer teams, now it’s hard to find practice space. The park next to the jail is used for T Ball practice and soccer but practice space is limited. I also think we need more parks you can walk to--parks that people can spend the morning in. The map on the wall shows a high population in areas with few parks.

Comment 15
I would like to address the issue of partnership with arts agencies. I would like to see a clear partnership between park and recreation and the arts. But I think we should leave the program [development] for a later date.

Comment 16
I was reading through comments from the other meetings and I don’t see that the issue of after school programs has been raised. The issue is not going to go away. In our case, we pay a K State student to care for children after school and often our house becomes the center for the neighborhood. I’d like to see a long range program and a well thought out plan. I would like to see park and recreation address the issue because it’s only going to get worse.

Comment 17
An after school program would create jobs.

Terry DeWeese
We ran a program for a while but it ran into cost difficulties. We couldn’t get the S.R.S subsidy. The majority of the families couldn’t pay full fee and we lost $10,000 in 2 months.

Mary Nichols
These are the type of issues that are being raised in the Manhattan-Ogden 2000 meetings.

Comment 18 - John Biggs
The Manhattan Arts Council has an after school program. The challenge is to expand the program. There is a lot of appeal and the program seems to be working. The cost is $30.00 per child, meets twice a week 2 hours per session for a month. Right now there are 40 paying students and a few others on scholarship. Pat Stevens is running it and we are finding it is a good way to integrate after school activities with the arts.

Phyllis Moore
There has been a program at Amanda Arnold that was started at the same time Pat [Stevens] had her program. The Amanda Arnold program focused on Math and Science. There were also programs at Lee and Wilson. There is certainly a need for this. These programs where funded by the National [??Academy of Sciences??]. Amanda Arnold initially had 65 students when Pat was running her program and we only had 14 computers. This past semester when Pat didn’t have her program, we closed the registration at 95 students. As an aside, we have noticed that interest in these types of programs drops off after the 6th grade.

Comment 19 - Edith Hindrichs
Is the school system attempting to generate interest?

Phyllis Moore
Yes, but there are limitations. The teachers, for example are currently donating their time for the program.

Comment 20 - Edith Stunkel
Going back to the basics and looking at the broader vision, how are people going to get access to the parks and facilities? We need to think about public transportation to provide access to these facilities.

Terry DeWeese
I thank you for coming. Please pick up and fill out a survey on the way out. Again, the presentation of conceptual alternatives will be April 6.
Appendix B

*CITIZEN SURVEY FORM*
The Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department is in the process of developing a Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan for the City of Manhattan for the next ten years. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, who is overseeing the completion of the Master Plan, has been gathering information from the community through public meetings, meeting surveys, newspaper surveys, and letter correspondence. The Board is very interested in public opinion and your household has been chosen at random from the Manhattan community to provide opinions about the Manhattan Parks and Recreation System. All information you provide will be CONFIDENTIAL.

Because this is a random survey, return of each survey is very important. A prompt response by taking a few minutes to complete the survey and enclose in the prepaid envelope will be extremely appreciated and will provide necessary input for the development of the Master Plan. In addition for taking the time to complete and return this survey, WE WILL CREDIT YOUR WATER BILL ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT OF $2.00. This survey is coded and when the code is entered into the computer, it will automatically credit the account that corresponds with the code. This will be done in two different steps to ensure confidentiality.

Please circle your appropriate answer. Thank you very much for helping us make our parks and recreation programs and facilities better.
1. On average, how frequently have members of your household used Neighborhood Parks (such as Goodnow, Harbour, Douglass, Northview, Longs Park) over the course of a year?
   a. More than once a week.
   b. Approximately once a week.
   c. Approximately once a month.
   d. Approximately every other month.
   e. Rarely or never.
   f. Don't know.

2. What is the primary reason that you do not use Neighborhood Parks more often? (Please select ONE that most applies).
   a. There is no Neighborhood Park in our area.
   b. Not attracted by the facilities or atmosphere of the Neighborhood Park in our area.
   c. The park in our neighborhood is difficult to get to.
   d. Prefer activities at Community or Natural Area Parks.
   e. Not interested in going to parks.
   f. Already use Neighborhood Parks frequently.
   g. I do use Neighborhood Parks.
   h. Other (please specify) __________________________
   i. Don't know.

3. How important is it for your household to have a park in your neighborhood you can walk to?
   a. Very important.
   b. Important.
   c. Not very important.
   d. Not important at all.
   e. Don't know.

4. How important is it for your household to have use of Community-Wide Parks (such as CiCo, City, Anneberg, Griffith, etc.)?
   a. Very important.
   b. Important.
   c. Not very important.
   d. Not important at all.
   e. Don't know.

5. How important is it for your household to have use of City Natural Areas (such as Warner, Linear, Wildcat Creek Park, etc.)?
   a. Very important.
   b. Important.
   c. Not very important.
   d. Not important at all.
   e. Don't know.
6. How important is it for your household to have use of indoor recreational facilities (such as the Douglass Center, Community Building, City Auditorium)?

a. Very important.
b. Important.
c. Not very important.
d. Not important at all.
e. Don't know.

How interested is your household in participating in each of the following indoor recreational activities? Since the level of interest may vary among household members, please indicate the level of interest by the household member or members most likely to participate in the activity.

7. Aerobics/jazzercise, etc.

a. Very interested.
b. Interested.
c. Not very interested.
d. Not interested at all.
e. Don't know.

8. Basketball

a. Very interested.
b. Interested.
c. Not very interested.
d. Not interested at all.
e. Don't know.

9. Billiards and pool

a. Very interested.
b. Interested.
c. Not very interested.
d. Not interested at all.
e. Don't know.

10. Crafts and ceramics

a. Very interested.
b. Interested.
c. Not very interested.
d. Not interested at all.
e. Don't know.
11. Dancing (square dancing, ballroom dancing, clogging)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.

12. Games and cards
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.

13. Gymnastics
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.

14. Ice skating
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.

15. Ice hockey
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.

16. Indoor playground (Discovery Playground)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don’t know.
17. Indoor running/walking
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

18. Rifle/archery (indoor range)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

19. Swimming (indoor)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

20. Performing arts
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

21. Racquetball, handball, & squash
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

22. Table tennis
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
23. Tennis (indoor)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

24. Visual arts
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

25. Volleyball (indoor)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

26. Weightlifting & fitness
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

27. Other (please specify)

How interested is your household in participating in each of the following natural area recreational activities. Since the level of interest may vary among household members, please indicate the level of interest by the household member or members most likely to participate in the activity.

28. Area walking & hiking (no trail)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
29. Bird watching
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

30. Fishing
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

31. Canoeing
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

32. Nature & discovery center
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

33. Environment & habitat trails
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

34. Picnicking
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
35. Cross country skiing
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

36. Trail walking & hiking
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

37. Wildlife observation
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

38. Other (please specify)

How interested is your household in participating in each of the following outdoor recreational activities. Since the level of interest may vary among household members, please indicate the level of interest by the household member or members most likely to participate in the activity.

39. Baseball
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

40. Softball
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
41. Outdoor basketball
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

42. Bicycle trail riding
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

43. BMX (bicycle motor cross)
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

44. Concerts/entertainment
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

45. Youth flag football
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

46. Frisbee golf
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
47. Group trips
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

48. Outdoor handball/racquetball
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

49. Horseshoes
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

50. Golf
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

51. Jogging & running
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

52. Mountain bike riding
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
53. Playgrounds
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

54. Rifle/archery range
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

55. Roller blade skating
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

56. Skateboarding
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

57. Soccer
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

58. Tennis
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.
59. Sand volleyball
   a. Very interested.
   b. Interested.
   c. Not very interested.
   d. Not interested at all.
   e. Don't know.

60. Other (please specify)

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

61. Some communities have found that jointly sharing facilities between entities (such as the City and the School District) is an efficient way to provide public facilities. Do you think that such joint use is an acceptable way to meet the community needs for education, recreation, and open space?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
   c. Don't know.

62. Age:
   a. Under 22.
   b. 22-34.
   c. 35-55.
   d. 55 & over.

63. Gender:
   a. Female.
   b. Male.

64. How long have you been a resident of Manhattan?
   a. Less than one year.
   b. 1-5 years.
   c. 5-15 years.
   d. More than 15 years.

65. Is respondent a full-time student at Kansas State University?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
66. Age of household members, including yourself (indicate number of people in each age category selected).

A. Number age 7 & under
B. Number age 8-13
C. Number age 14-18
D. Number age 19-25
E. Number age 26-34
F. Number age 35-54
G. Number age 55 & over

67. Do you rent or own your living space?

a. Rent.
b. Own.

68. Household income from all sources before taxes?

a. Less than $20,000.
b. $20,000 - $35,000.
c. $36,000 - $50,000.
d. More than $50,000.
Appendix C

CITIZEN'S SURVEY RESULTS
### Manhattan Park and Recreation Random Survey
#### Tabulation of Interest in Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Very Interested Opinion</th>
<th>Total Opinion</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Walking</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Watching</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert/Entertainment</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Trails</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee Golf</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games &amp; Cards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Trips</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Skating</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Playgrounds</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Running/Walking</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/Rolling</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike Riding</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature &amp; Discovery Center</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Raquetball</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping Pong</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquetball</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Antebay</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skateboarding</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Indoors)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis (Indoors)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Walking &amp; Hiking</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voleyball</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fogging</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Observation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Country Skiing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Flag Football</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabulation by Manhattan Parks & Recreation Department
Analysis by Chester Hare & Harv

Appendix C Manhattan Comprehensive Parks Master Plan
Appendix D

INVENTORY OF PARK FACILITIES
TABLE A
INVENTORY OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Recreational Parks Operated by Parks & Recreation Department

| RECREATIONAL AREA     | SERVICE AREA       | ACRES | Basketball (Indoor) | Basketball (Outdoor) | Football Field | Golf Course | Handball Court | Horseshoe Court | Multi-use Court | Outdoor Theatre | Picnic Shelter | Picnic Tables | Playground | Soccer Field | Softball | Softball, Youth Field | Swimming Pool (25M) | Swimming Pool (52M) | Tennis Court | Trail Bicycle (miles) | Trail Exercise (miles) | Trail Hiking (miles) | Trail Jogging (miles) | Trail Nature (miles) | Volleyball Court | Wading Pool |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| FRANK ANNEBURY PARK   | Community          | 100   | 6                   | 2                    | 2                | 12          | 1             | 7              |                 |                |                |               |               | 1           | 5           | 1             | 5              | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| CICERO PARK           | Community          | 20    | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 5             | 1              | 5              |                |                |               |               | 1           | 1           |               |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| CITY PARK PARK        | Community          | 46    | 6                   | 1                    | 8               | 1           | 3             | 1              | 6              |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| GORMAN FIELDS         | Community          | 6     | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| GRIFFITH PARK         | Community          | 5     | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| DOUGLASS PARK         | Neighborhood       | 1.6   | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 4             | 1              | 1              |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| GIRL SCOUT PARK       | Neighborhood       | 11    | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| GOODNOW PARK          | Neighborhood       | 20    | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| HARBOUR PARK          | Neighborhood       | 0.8   | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| LONGS PARK            | Neighborhood       | 3     | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 3             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| NORTHVIEW PARK        | Neighborhood       | 5     | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| PIONEER PARK          | Neighborhood       | 5     | 1                   |                      |                 | 1           | 1             |                |                |                |                |               |               |             |               |                |                | 2.0               |                |                   |                     |                    |                     |                     |             |                     |                     |
| **TOTAL**             |                    |       | 8                   | 0                   | 1               | 4           | 0             | 8              | 1              | 2              | 5              | 29             | 9             | 7             | 11            | 0             | 4               | 11             | 0              | 0             | 0              | 35             | 20             | 10             | 0             |                     |                     |
# TABLE B

## INVENTORY OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

**CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS**

Natural Area Parks Operated by Parks & Recreation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATIONAL AREA</th>
<th>SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>Basketball (Adult &amp; HS)</th>
<th>Basketball (Youth)</th>
<th>Football Field</th>
<th>Golf Course</th>
<th>Horseback Court</th>
<th>Multi-Use Theatre</th>
<th>Outdoor Theatre</th>
<th>Picnic Shelter</th>
<th>Picnic Tables</th>
<th>Playground</th>
<th>Soccer Field</th>
<th>Softball</th>
<th>Softball Youth Field</th>
<th>Swimming Pool (50M)</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Trail Biking (miles)</th>
<th>Trail Exercise (miles)</th>
<th>Trail Horseback Riding (miles)</th>
<th>Trail Jogging (miles)</th>
<th>Trail Nature (miles)</th>
<th>Volleyball Court</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Sand Volleyball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLUE RIVER</td>
<td>RECREATIONAL AREA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCLIFFE PARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR ACRES NATURAL AREA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDSON TRAIL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINEAR PARK</td>
<td>5 Mi</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARLATT PARK</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENCER PARK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNRISE CEMETERY</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSET CEMETERY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSET ZOO</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTWOOD NATURAL AREA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILDCAT CREEK</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNER PARK</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C
INVENTORY OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Recreational Facilities at Local Schools

<p>| RECREATIONAL AREA           | SERVICE AREA | ACRES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AMANDA ARNOLD ELEMENTARY    |              |       | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| BLUEMONT ELEMENTARY         |              |       | 1 | 1 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| EUGENE FIELD SCHOOL        |              |       | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| LEE SCHOOL                 |              |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MANHATTAN VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL | | |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MANHATTAN HIGH SCHOOL      |              |       | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MANHATTAN MIDDLE SCHOOL    |              |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MARLATT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  |              |       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| NORTHVIEW ELEMENTARY       |              |       | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| SEVEN DOLORS SCHOOL        |              |       | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| THEODORE ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY |          |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| WOODROW WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL |        |   | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <strong>TOTAL</strong>                  |              |       | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Riley County</th>
<th>Cigo Park (part)</th>
<th>Keats Park</th>
<th>Wildcat Park</th>
<th>U.S. Army Corp of Engineers</th>
<th>Outlet Area</th>
<th>Stockdale Rec. Area</th>
<th>T.C. Cove Rec. Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey (infield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey (outfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool (25m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Area (outdoor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (outdoor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (surf 4 hr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley County</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigo Park (part)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keats Park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildcat Park</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corp of Engineers</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet Area</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockdale Rec. Area</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.C. Cove Rec. Area</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TABLE E
### INVENTORY OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
#### CITY OF MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Area Parks Operated By Other Agencies

| RECREATIONAL AREA                  | SERVICE AREA | ACRES | Baseball (Adult & MHS) | Basketball (Outdoor) | Football Field | Golf Course | Handball Court | Multi-Use Court | Outdoor Theatre | Picnic Shelter | Playground | Soccer Field | Softball | Softball, Youth Field | Swimming Pool (25m) | Swimming | Tennis Court | Trail Bicycle (miles) | Trail Equestrian (miles) | Trail Exercise (miles) | Trail Jogging (miles) | Trail Running (miles) | Trail Nature | Volleyball Court | Trail Camping |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| KANSAS DEPT. OF WILDLIFE & PARKS   |              |       |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| FANCY CREEK PARK                   | REGIONAL     | 200   |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| NORTH RANDOLPH PARK                | REGIONAL     | 40    |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| SPILLWAY PARK                      | REGIONAL     | 30    |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| RIVER POND PARK                    | REGIONAL     | 160   |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| POTAWATOMIE PARK                   | REGIONAL     | 65    |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| DEEP CR. WILDLIFE AREA             | REGIONAL     | 20    |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
| KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY            |              |       |                        |                      |                   |             |                |                |                |                |              |             |            |            |                            |                          |          |              |                         |                          |                        |                         |                           |              |                     |               |
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PARK SITE SELECTION PROCESS
Park Site Selection Process

I. DEVELOPING A PRELIMINARY PARK CONCEPT

The following are considerations for organizing program elements on a site:

A. Identifying Existing Site Conditions

1. Views From or To the Site
2. Distance to Utilities
3. Physical Features
   - Vegetation
   - Waterbodies or Streams
   - Landforms
   - Site Drainage and Floodplains
   - Existing Structures or Barriers to Development
   - Hazard
   - Soils
4. Topography
   - Parking Lot: 1%-5%
   - Sports Field: 1 1/2%-2%
   - Basketball and Tennis Courts: 1%
   - Plazas: 1%-2%
   - Walks: 2%-8%

   - Turf Areas: 2% min., 25% max.
   - Other Slopes: 3:1 maximum (33%)

B. Relationships of Activities to Adjacent Land Uses

1. Compatible Uses
2. Use Conflicts

C. Relationships of Program Elements with the Park

1. Complimentary Uses (Picnic Shelters and Playgrounds)
2. Use Conflicts
3. Cost Efficiency of Combined Uses

D. Circulation Links

1. Vehicular Access and Parking
2. Pedestrian/Joggers
3. Bicycle
4. Equestrian

E. Possibility of Phasing Park Construction

II. WORKSHOP FORMAT

The Workshop is an optional step that allows the community to help shape the direction of proposed parks. The purpose of the Workshop Format is to compare two alternative park sites by developing a concept for each park.

- Workshop participants break into groups of 8-10 people
- The main group forms two subgroups of 4-5 people
- Each subgroup develops a concept for one of the two sites
- A representative from the subgroup presents the concept to the other subgroups
- Through discussions, a preferred site is chosen
- The groups report their selection to the remainder of the workshop participants
III. SITE SELECTION PROCESS

A. Identification of Community Needs

1. Parks and Recreation Master Plan
   - Neighborhood Parks
   - Community Parks
   - Regional Parks
   - Open Space
   - Special Use Areas

   - Open Space Links
   - Utilities
   - Police/Fire/Medical Facilities

2. Identify Potential Sites

B. Inventory of Identification of Potential Sites

1. Development Preliminary Park Program
2. Define Study Area
   - Jurisdictional Boundaries
   - Service Radius of Proposed Park
   - Development General Siting Criteria
   - Undeveloped or Easily Developed Land
   - Parcel Size
   - Site Configuration
   - Paved Access
   - Available Utilities

3. Inventory Study Area
   - Existing and Proposed Land Uses
   - Public/Private Lands
   - Access

C. Evaluate Potential Sites

1. Develop Site Evaluation Criteria
   - Land Use
   - Amenities
   - Access
   - Site Development
   - Utilities
   - Land Acquisition

2. Evaluate Site Based on Criteria
3. Choose 2 or 3 Sites

D. Further Evaluate Preferred Sites

1. Develop Concept Plan for Each that Incorporates Program Elements
2. Compare Development Costs
3. Evaluate Workability of the Sites
4. Choose Most Desirable Site
5. Acquire Property
CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

POTENTIAL CATCHMENT AREAS

- Abutting Properties
- Neighborhood
- Communities
- City Wide
- Regional

POTENTIAL USER PROFILE

- Age
- Special Needs (i.e., Disabilities)
- Individual
- Groups
- Public vs Private

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES

- Community Centers
- Land Bank
- Campgrounds
- Organized Sports
- Passive Activity
- Parking Lots
- Bike Ways
- Pedestrian Ways
- Commercial Ventures
- Zoos
- Performing & Visual Arts
- Picnic Areas
- Fairs/Carnivals
- Seasonal Activities
- Water Activities
- Educational
- Maintenance/Storage

DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY LEVELS

- Nature Preserve/Undisturbed
- Accessible Wilds
- Moderate Developed & Maintained
- Highly Developed
- Urban Developed
CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE MADE WITH REGARD TO THE SCALE OF THE CATCHMENT AREAS TO THE PARCEL BEING VIEWED.

IDENTIFY WHICH OF THE LISTED CATEGORIES THE PARCEL CAN BEST SERVE. THE PARCEL SHOULD BE COMPATIBLE IN SCALE TO THE AREA SERVED.

IDENTIFY CHARACTERISTICS OF USERS OF THE PARTICULAR PARCEL.

DETERMINE WHETHER IT CAN MEET THE NEEDS OF USERS IN AN UNDEVELOPED OR DEVELOPED CONDITION.

SELECT FUNCTIONS COMPATIBLE WITH THE PHYSICAL QUALITIES OF THE PARCEL.

IDENTIFY CATEGORIES OF DEVELOPMENT COMPATIBLE WITH IDENTIFIED CATCHMENT AREAS AND USERS.

IDENTIFY THE EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT CAPABLE WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE PARCEL'S PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

CONSIDER THE LEVEL OF MONETARY INPUT NEEDED TO PROVIDE POTENTIAL USABLE SPACE IF REQUIRED.
# INVENTORY CHECKLIST FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPOGRAPHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETATION/HABITAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS/RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT LAND USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER BODIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC VISIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---
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RECREATIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION
MANHATTAN PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT

List of facilities we use, programs offered, and number of participants per year in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th># of PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Softball (Summer)</td>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Softball (Fall)</td>
<td>Wilson, Northview</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Softball</td>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Apple City Golf Tourn</td>
<td>Manhattan Country Club/Stagg Hill</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>Lud Fiser Youth Sports Complex</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>Miller, Baker, Wilson</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>Griffith East &amp; West</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baseball/Softball</td>
<td>Northview, Gorman E &amp; W, Arnold</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Flag Football/Soccer</td>
<td>Anneberg Park</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Intramurals/Volleyball</td>
<td>Manhattan High School</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Intramurals/Volleyball</td>
<td>Manhattan Middle School</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Intramurals/Volleyball</td>
<td>(5) Elementary Schools</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Volleyball</td>
<td>Luckey High School</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Volleyball</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Volleyball</td>
<td>Douglass Community Center Gym</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Basketball/Volleyball</td>
<td>City Auditorium</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basketball/Volleyball</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Volleyball/Volleyball</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics Classes</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics/Tumbling Classes</td>
<td>Heartland Gym/Hall</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Apple Day Camp</td>
<td>City Park Pavilion</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Skating/Lessons</td>
<td>Ice Rink - City Park</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Discover</td>
<td>Girl Scout House</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Populations (Handicapped)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th># of PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miniature Golf</td>
<td>Putt Putt</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>KSU Union</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>KSU Natatorium</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazzercise</td>
<td>Roundhouse</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Impact Aerobics</td>
<td>Roundhouse</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Dances</td>
<td>Douglass Community Center</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnics</td>
<td>Tuttle Creek State Park</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Classes</td>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Appreciation</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Classes</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Programs (55 &amp; Older)</th>
<th>Community Building</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Years</td>
<td>Holidome</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquacise</td>
<td>City Auditorium</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Festival</td>
<td>City Auditorium</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Potluck</td>
<td>KSU Union/Ahearn</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Games</td>
<td>Putt Putt</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Putt Putt</td>
<td>Douglass Center</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Activities</td>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Programs</th>
<th>Community Building</th>
<th>1,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wee Wigglers (preschool)</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Classes</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pottery</td>
<td>Roundhouse</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Classes</td>
<td>Park Stage</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Theatre</td>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in the Park</td>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Band</td>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Apple Folklife &amp; Craft Show</td>
<td>City Park Stage</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>City Auditorium</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppet Theatre</td>
<td>Manhattan Middle School</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Theatre Practice</td>
<td>McCain Auditorium</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of groups using City facilities on a regular basis.

**Groups using parks and facilities in parks.**

- KSU Block and Bridle
- March of Dimes
- Manhattan Lions Club (Easter Egg Hunt)
- Senior Olympics
- Manhattan Marlins Swim Team
- Cub Scout Clubs
- Alpha Chi Omega
- Kappa Kappa Gamma
- Greek Games (Fraternity & Sorority)
- Manhattan High School Club
- Elementary Schools' Field Days
- Kansas Association of the Deaf Reunion
- Family Reunions
- American Business Women Association
- Amateur Radio Field Day
- KSU - Blue Key
- Manhattan Cross Country Team
- KSU Cross Country Team
- St. Patrick's Day Parade and Road Race
- Manhattan High School Tennis Team
- Wamego Tennis Team
- Optimist Club (ball diamonds)
- Manhattan High School Baseball/Softball Teams
- Traveling Baseball Teams
- Riley County Police Department
- Manhattan High School Music Department
- Manhattan High School P.E. Classes

**Groups using City Auditorium and Community Building.**

- Manhattan Christian College
- Manhattan Middle School
- Pawnee Mental Health
- Wamego Bible Baptist School
- Living Word Christian School
- Kiwanis
- Sertoma
- 4-H
- Kansas Association for the Handicapped
- Randi Dale
- African Student Union
- Kansas State Table Tennis Club
- Angel 95
- Boy Scouts of America
- American Legion
- Fraternities and Sororities
- Carson's All Star Baseball Team
- Manhattan Alliance
- Lucky High
- Riley County Police Department
- Optimist Club

Volleyball, Basketball, Concerts
Basketball Games and Practices
Volleyball
Basketball & Volleyball Games/Pract
Basketball & Volleyball Games/Pract
Pancake Feed
Pancake Feed
Volleyball Tournament
Concert
Craft Show
Cultural Show
Table Tennis Tournament
Concert
Scout Show
Concert
Body Pyramid Practice
Practice
Chili Feed
Basketball Tournament
Police Training
Basketball League
List of recreation facilities in Manhattan, outside of City facilities, and what is offered:

PRIVATE RECREATION FACILITIES
REQUIRING MEMBERSHIP & DUES

1. Cottonwood Racquet Club
   - tennis, racquetball, fitness

2. Nautilus
   - tennis, racquetball, fitness

3. Manhattan Country Club
   - golf, tennis, swimming

4. KSU Rec Complex/Intramurals
   - fitness, open gym, sports

5. KSU Natatorium
   - swimming

6. Manhattan Athletic Club
   - fitness

7. Hardbodies
   - fitness

8. The Ladies Club
   - fitness

9. Manhattan Holiday Inn
   - some private swim classes

10. Little Apple Gymnastics
    - 2305 Skyview Lane

RECREATION FACILITIES
OPEN TO PUBLIC

1. Stagg Hill Golf Club
   - golf

2. Putt Putt Golf
   - miniature golf

3. Wildcat Lanes
   - bowling

4. USD 383 Schools
   - intramurals, open gyms

5. KSU Union
   - bowling, indoor games of leisure

6. Fast Eddy's Tavern
   - leisure games, pool, etc.

7. Bleachers Tavern
   - leisure games, pool, etc.

8. Tuttle Creek Dam
   - boating, fishing, water sports

9. Tuttle Creek Trap Park
   - trap shooting

10. Heartland Gymnastics Center
    - Town Center Mall

11. UFM
    - ceramics/pottery/woodworking

12. Skate Plaza
    - 400 Tuttle Creek Blvd.

13. McCain Auditorium
    - performances
4.3 Accessible Route

(a) Clear Floor Space

(b) Forward Approach

(c) Parallel Approach

(d) Clear Floor Space in Alcoves

(e) Additional Maneuvering Clearances for Alcoves

Fig. 4
Minimum Clear Floor Space for Wheelchairs
4.3 Accessible Route

(a) High Forward Reach Limit

NOTE: x shall be ≤ 25 in (635 mm); z shall be ≥ x. When x < 20 in (510 mm), then y shall be 48 in (1220 mm) maximum. When x is 20 to 25 in (510 to 635 mm), then y shall be 44 in (1120 mm) maximum.

(b) Maximum Forward Reach over an Obstruction

Fig. 5
Forward Reach
4.3 Accessible Route

4.3.3 Width. The minimum clear width of an accessible route shall be 36 in (915 mm) except at doors (see 4.13.5). If a person in a wheelchair must make a turn around an obstruction, the minimum clear width of the accessible route shall be as shown in Fig. 7.

4.3.4 Passing Space. If an accessible route has less than 60 in (1525 mm) clear width, then passing spaces at least 60 in by 60 in (1525 mm by 1525 mm) shall be located at reasonable intervals not to exceed 200 ft (61 m). A T-intersection of two corridors or walks is an acceptable passing place.

4.3.5 Head Room. Accessible routes shall comply with 4.4.2.

4.3.6 Surface Textures. The surface of an accessible route shall comply with 4.5.

4.3.7 Slope. An accessible route with a running slope greater than 1:20 is a ramp and shall comply with 4.8. Nowhere shall the cross slope of an accessible route exceed 1:50.
4.4 Protruding Objects

4.4.1 General. Objects projecting from walls (for example, telephones) with their leading edges between 27 in and 80 in (685 mm and 2030 mm) above the finished floor shall protrude no more than 4 in (100 mm) into wells, halls, corridors, passageways, or aisles (see Fig. 8(a)). Objects mounted with their leading edges at or below 27 in (685 mm) above the finished floor may protrude any amount (see Fig. 8(a) and (b)). Free-standing objects mounted on posts or pylons may overhang 12 in (305 mm) maximum from 27 in to 80 in (685 mm to 2030 mm) above the ground or finished floor (see Fig. 8(c) and (d)). Protruding objects shall not reduce the clear width of an accessible route or maneuvering space (see Fig. 8(e)).

4.4.2 Head Room. Wells, halls, corridors, passageways, aisles, or other circulation spaces shall have 80 in (2030 mm) minimum clear head room (see Fig. 8(a)). If vertical clearance of an area adjoining an accessible route is reduced to less than 80 in (nominal dimension), a barrier to warn blind or visually-impaired persons shall be provided (see Fig. 8(c)).

(b) Walking Perpendicular to a Wall

Fig. 8
Protruding Objects
4.3 Accessible Route

4.3.8 Changes in Levels. Changes in levels along an accessible route shall comply with 4.5.2. If an accessible route has changes in level greater than 1/2 in (13 mm), then a curb ramp, ramp, elevator, or platform lift shall be provided that complies with 4.7, 4.8, 4.10, or 4.11, respectively. Stairs shall not be part of an accessible route.

4.3.9 Doors. Doors along an accessible route shall comply with 4.13.

4.3.10* Egress. Accessible routes serving any accessible space or element shall also serve as a means of egress for emergencies or connect to an accessible place of refuge. Such accessible routes and places of refuge shall comply with the requirements of the administrative authority having jurisdiction. Where fire code provisions require more than one means of egress from any space or room, then more than one accessible means of egress shall also be provided for handicapped people. Arrange egress so as to be readily accessible from all accessible rooms and spaces.
4.6 Parking and Passenger Loading Zones

Vehicle pull-up space, then a curb ramp complying with 4.7 shall be provided. Vehicle standing spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 in all directions.

4.6.6 Vertical Clearance. Provide minimum vertical clearances of 114 in at accessible passenger loading zones and along vehicle access routes to such areas from site entrances. If accessible van parking spaces are provided, then the minimum vertical clearance should be 114 in.

4.7 Curb Ramps.

4.7.1 Location. Curb ramps complying with 4.7 shall be provided wherever an accessible route crosses a curb.

4.7.2 Slope. Slopes of curb ramps shall comply with 4.8.2. The slope shall be measured as shown in Fig. 11. Transitions from ramps to walks, gutters, or streets shall be flush and free of abrupt changes. Maximum slopes of adjoining gutters, road surface immediately adjacent to the curb ramp, or accessible route shall not exceed 1:20.

Fig. 10
Access Aisle at Passenger Loading Zones

4.6.5 Passenger Loading Zones. Passenger loading zones shall provide an access aisle at least 60 in (1525 mm) wide and 20 ft (6 m) long adjacent and parallel to the vehicle pull-up space (see Fig. 10). If there are curbs between the access aisle and the

Adjoining slope shall not exceed 1:20

Fig. 11
Measurement of Curb Ramp Slopes

(a) Flared Sides

(b) Returned Curb

Fig. 12
Sides of Curb Ramps

If X is less than 48 in, then the slope of the flared side shall not exceed 1:12.
4.6 Parking and Passenger Loading Zones

4.6.1 Minimum Number. Parking spaces required to be accessible by 4.1 shall comply with 4.6.2 through 4.6.4. Passenger loading zones required to be accessible by 4.1 shall comply with 4.6.5 and 4.6.6.

4.6.2 Location. Parking spaces for disabled people and accessible passenger loading zones that serve a particular building shall be the spaces or zones located closest to the nearest accessible entrance on an accessible route. In separate parking structures or lots that do not serve a particular building, parking spaces for disabled people shall be located on the shortest possible circulation route to an accessible pedestrian entrance of the parking facility.

4.6.3* Parking Spaces. Parking spaces for disabled people shall be at least 96 in (2440 mm) wide and shall have an adjacent access aisle 60 in (1525 mm) wide minimum (see Fig. 9). Parking access aisles shall be part of an accessible route with the building or facility entrance and shall comply with 4.3. Two accessible parking spaces may share a common access aisle. Parked vehicle overhangs shall not reduce the clear width of an accessible circulation route. Parking spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 in all directions.

EXCEPTION: if accessible parking spaces for vans designed for handicapped persons are provided, each should have an adjacent access aisle at least 96 in (2440 mm) wide complying with 4.3, Ground and Floor Surfaces.

4.6.4* Signage. Accessible parking spaces shall be designated as reserved for the disabled by a sign showing the symbol of accessibility (see 4.30.5). Such signs shall not be obstructed by a vehicle parked in the space.

---

Fig. 8(0)
Carpet Tile Thickness

Fig. 8(g)
Gratings

Fig. 8(h)
Grading Orientation

Fig. 9
Dimensions of Parking Spaces
CITY OF MANHATTAN

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1994

TO: Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Members

FROM: Terry DeWeese, Director of Parks & Recreation

SUBJECT: Annual Review of Comprehensive Parks Master Plan

This meeting will be the first for an annual review of our Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. The review is a public process to gain input on how our plan is working and if we need to make any changes in the direction our department is going. Listed below are some of the objectives we have achieved that are in our Master Plan and also what is planned for the immediate future.

Please give me a call if you have any questions prior to the meeting.

I. PAST PROJECTS

A. Linear Park Trail
   1. Section of trail from South Manhattan to Pecan Circle
   2. Low water bridge at South Manhattan
   3. Railroad bridge renovations
      a. Poliska Lane at Wildcat Creek
      b. Seth Child bridge at Wildcat Creek
      c. Abandoned railroad from Poliska to KPL

B. Zoo Projects
   1. Maintenance/Keeper building
   2. Habitat building renovation
   3. New concession building
   4. New entrance ramp

C. CiCo Park
   1. New outfield fences on all fields
   2. Internal complex concrete work to improve drainage
   3. New storage building
   4. New sportsfield lighting

D. City Park
   1. New landscape planter at 11th & Poyntz
   2. New backstop fences on Baker and Miller fields
   3. Current Miller field drainage improvements
   4. Pressboxes
II. FUTURE PROJECTS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

A. Linear Park
   1. Fort Riley underpass project
      a. Funded by ISTEA
         1. Federal Government pays 80%
         2. Local dollars pay 20%
   2. Low water bridge behind the Holidome
   3. Railroad right-of-way from Poliska Lane to Village Plaza

B. Stagg Hill Park
   1. 2.1 acre park
   2. Located off Irene & Gillespie
   3. Amenities include
      a. Playground
      b. Walking trail
      c. Open space

C. Sunset Zoo Quarantine and Winter Holding Building
   1. Will allow animals to be held for waiting period
   2. Will allow for the storing of animals for winter

D. Regulation Baseball Field at the New Northeast Middle School Site
   1. Partnership between City and School District

E. Primate Conservation Center
   1. Design by Stan Howe & Associates
   2. Zoo is in the process of funding project

F. Community Park in Northeast Part of Manhattan

G. Southside Neighborhood Park

H. Expansion of our Park Maintenance Facility

III. ADA IMPROVEMENTS

A. Parks and Recreation Department has completed several projects within the current facilities
   1. Added accessible restroom at Parks & Recreation Office
   2. Have restrooms accessible at the following facilities:
      a. Pavilion at City Park
      b. New restroom at Sunset Zoo
      c. All three buildings at Anneberg Park
      d. CiCo baseball fields
      e. Griffith Park
      f. Douglass Center gym and annex
      g. Community Building
      h. Northview pool
      i. CiCo pool
3. Added accessible parking
   a. Anneberg Park
   b. CiCo Park
   c. Griffith fields
   d. Northview Park
   e. Douglass Community Center

B. We will be conducting a facility assessment of the rest of the facilities

IV. PARTNERSHIPS (Examples)

1. Rowing Club
2. Cottonwood Racquet Club
3. Civic Theater
4. KSU
5. USD #383

TD/dd
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CITY OF MANHATTAN

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

February 20, 1998

TO: Parks and Recreation Advisory Board

FROM: Terry DeWeese, CLP, Director of Parks and Recreation

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Parks Master Plan

On Monday, February 23, 1998, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board will be receiving public comment and recommending any changes the Board would like to see made to the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. If there are any changes, then the recommendations will go to the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board for consideration.

Attached is a memo that outlines the project accomplishments in 1997 and projections for 1998. Please contact me if you have any questions.

TD/dd
CITY OF MANHATTAN

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

February 20, 1998

TO: Terry DeWeese, CLP, Director of Parks and Recreation

FROM: Richard Allen, Park Planner

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Parks Master Plan Project Update 1998

1. Past projects started or substantially completed in 1997:

   A. Anneberg Park

      1. Planters

   B. CiCo Park

      1. Blue field fence improvements
      2. Viewing covers
      3. Landscaping east drainage ditch
      4. Utility Master Plan

   C. City Park

      1. Wood play equipment
      2. Fence improvements at Wilson Field
      3. Utility Master Plan

   D. Douglass Center

      1. New windows
      2. New roof - gymnasium
      3. Pool study
E. Griffith Park
   1. Fence improvements
   2. New irrigation system
   3. Field was graded and seeded

F. Northview Park
   1. Backstop improvements
   2. Pool study

H. Northeast Community Park
   1. Completed Master Plan and Report

I. Sunrise Cemetery
   1. Plot new section of lots

J. Truth Park
   1. Landscaping
   2. Drinking fountains
   3. Signage
   4. Dedication

K. Sunset Zoo
   1. Chimp Exhibit
   2. Otter Exhibit
   3. Utility Master Plan
   4. Chimp Exhibit dedication

L. Eisenhower Baseball Complex
   1. Construction of practice fields
   2. Pressbox
   3. Utility Master Plan
   4. Dedication
M. Linear Park Trail

1. Trail Master Plan for northern section
2. Gary Avenue extension
3. Fort Riley Underpass Section of Trail
4. Blue River Ramp Area dedication
5. Parking lot on Hayes Drive

N. K-177 Entryway Landscaping

1. Landscaping complete
2. Maintenance agreement in place

2. Future park and projects in the planning process:

A. Warner Park

1. Repair Roads
2. Place concrete under shelters
3. Add signage

B. Anneberg Park

1. Build a shelter for field #5 and #6
2. Replace backstops on fields #1, #2, #3, and #4 at Twin Oaks main complex
3. ADA playground

C. Linear Park

1. Sidewalk between Linear Park on Casement to Harvey Drive
2. Add drinking fountains on Linear Park

D. Douglass Center

1. Phase I of new air condition and heater system

E. Park Study

1. Prepare Strategic Plan for park system
F. Sojourner Truth Park
   1. Complete park development

G. Sunrise Cemetery
   1. Completion of waterlines

H. Northeast Community Park
   1. Complete Master Plan Report
   2. Prepare grading plan for park

I. Sunset Zoo
   1. Colobus exhibit
   2. Amphitheater
   3. Landscape and lights for zoo

RA/dd