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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
The Manhattan Strategic Park Plan was initiated in June of 1998, by the City of Manhattan, Kansas, through their Parks and Recreation Department. It is intended that a new mission statement, goals and strategies for the Parks and Recreation Department will be formalized, as well as guidelines for the establishment of a Parks and Recreation Foundation. It is further intended that strategies be formalized for both the acquisition and build-out of future park and recreation facilities. The strategies comprehensively address implementation of the major planning documents completed by the Parks and Recreation Department within the last 10 years. (Reference Map No. 1 “Current and Proposed Parks and Trails System” Chapter 2). These documents are as follows:

- The Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992
- The Aquatic Master Plan
- The Northeast Community Park Master Plan
- The Linear Trail Park Phase II Master Plan
- The City/University Bike Trail Master Plan
- The Park and Open Space Plan
- The Fairmont Park Master Plan

The Strategic Park Plan facilitated a creative and extensive public input process in order to identify (and verify) the needs of Manhattan's citizens with respect to the Parks and Recreation system. Several planning issues were identified internally by City Administration, and externally by the public through: working sessions with a specially appointed Strategic Planning Committee, four Community Meetings, 18 interviews with key community members, a public survey, and joint working sessions with the Parks and Recreation Advisory and Urban Area Planning Boards.

The recommendations of the Strategic Park Plan are designed to strengthen the efforts of the Parks and Recreation Department toward sustaining a high quality of life for residents, now and in the future; a precedent established by Manhattan's founders nearly 150 years ago.

STRATEGIES
The following summarizes the strategies of the Strategic Park Plan; hereinafter referred to as "The Plan".

MISSION STATEMENT
The Plan recommends that the following Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives be formally adopted:

Manhattan Parks and Recreation...
Our mission is to enrich life by providing opportunities for recreation, conserving the natural environment, and beautifying the city.

GOALS
1. Establish the strategies and means to acquire and conserve green space for future park development.

2. Be responsible stewards of the environment and our natural resources.

3. Be leaders in the delivery of recreational opportunities including offering quality programs in well-maintained facilities and natural environments.
OBJECTIVES
1. Establish a not-for-profit entity to assist in acquiring park land and developing facilities.

2. Identify and follow Parks and Recreation Conservation Standards for wildlife, native plants, urban trees, and open green space.


4. Advance inter-governmental and public/private partnerships.

5. Solicit ongoing public input regarding community needs.

PARKS AND RECREATION FOUNDATION
The Plan advocates the establishment of a Manhattan Parks and Recreation Foundation, as a nonprofit, tax exempt organization, tied to the Parks and Recreation Department through its Mission Statement. The purpose of the foundation is to facilitate donations/contributions of land, money, and in-kind goods and services for future development of the Parks and Recreation system. The Plan offers guidelines for the establishment of the organization, either in conjunction with the formation of a Greater Manhattan Community Foundation or as a separate entity, and recommends the authorization of the Parks and Recreation Department’s support as outlined in Chapter Four of this report.

PARK NATURALIST
The Plan recommends that the Parks and Recreation Department add a park naturalist to their staff. This individual would be responsible for assisting the Department in the creation of Parks and Recreation Standards for Conservation and Environmental Responsibility for Materials and Maintenance Practices. This individual would also be responsible for assisting with staff training and implementation of these standards.

PLAN PRIORITY ITEMS
The Plan identifies six Plan Priority Items currently needed within the Manhattan Parks and Recreation system. These needs were identified through the Public Process which included a Public Survey. Most of these items were originally cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992, and described as a current “deficiency” in the parks system. The needs have been validated and ranked throughout the process of The Plan, and thus are referred to as “Plan Priority Items”. The Plan Priority Items are as follows: (Reference Exhibit 1, “Example Action Plan/Timeline” in the Appendix of this report.)

- Phased construction of an Indoor Recreation Center with Indoor Swimming Facilities
- Land acquisition for future parks and open space. (Reference Map No. 3: “Land Acquisition Strategies” in Chapter Four of this report.)
- Phased improvements to the municipal outdoor pool facilities as identified in the Aquatic Master Plan.
- A phased build-out of the Northeast Community Park.
- Phased build-out of portions of Fairmont Park - specifically the nature-oriented park features and the Gateway Features.
- A phased build-out of the Linear Trail Park Phase II.

PLAN SUPPORT ACTIVITY ITEMS
The Plan identifies five Support Activity Items currently needed within the Manhattan Parks and Recreation system. Most of these items were cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992 as current deficiencies within the parks system. These needs were again validated and
ranked through the public input process of The Plan, and thus are referred to as “Plan Support Activity Items”. The Plan Support Activity Items are as follows: (Reference Exhibit “Action Plan/Timeline” in Chapter Four of this report.)

- Neighborhood Parks - 5-6 new parks located throughout the periphery of the City and in areas currently not within walking distance to a neighborhood or community level park facility, including some established neighborhoods. Improvements to existing neighborhood level parks should also be implemented as outlined in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, and on an as-needed basis.
- Phased development of Parks and Recreation Department's role in the City/University Bike Trail, as identified in the City/University Bike Trail Master Plan.
- Phased development of the secondary trails of the Linear Trail Park Phase II, as identified in the Master Plan.
- Phased development of a Skate Park designed to facilitate roller-blade and skate board activities.
- Phased land acquisition and improvements for parkways and entryways as recommended in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan*.

* It is suggested that the concept of adding a Boulevard Division, separately funded, and possibly under the joint auspices of the Parks and Recreation Department and the Public Works Department be considered.

FUNDING
The most important planning issue of the Strategic Park Plan is funding. Since 1992, the Parks and Recreation Department has accomplished some of the goals of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, but are still facing some deficiencies. Funding for large projects and land acquisitions is not adequate through the Capital Improvements Program. Therefore, The Plan recommends that the existing Parks and Recreation Department funding be augmented by a source of special funding through a 1/4 - 1/2 cent sales tax increase, or Bond Issue, coupled with additional funding through a combination of Partnering efforts, Capital Improvement Program allocations, User Fee increases, Donations and Grants. This funding will serve to rectify immediate capital improvement needs, fund future capital improvement needs, and ensure adequate maintenance and operation as the park system grows. A sales tax increase was the public’s preferred funding mechanism as evidenced by survey results. (See Chapter Three).

The City Finance Department projects that a 1/2 cent sales tax increase designated at 70% for capital improvements, and 30% for operations and maintenance costs would generate approximately $2.7 million per year and retire the funding of $10 million of Plan Priority projects within six years, at a cost of $11.34 million. Beginning in the year 2007, debt would again be incurred for completion of the final phase of the Plan Priority projects. This debt would be retired in year 2014. Reference the “Example Action Plan/Timeline” exhibit in the Appendix of this report.
CONCLUSION
The Strategic Park Plan is intended to provide implementation strategies for the recommendations offered in the 1992 Comprehensive Park Master Plan. It does not nullify any portion of it, rather it verifies and updates the needs established, offers priorities for build-out and land acquisition, and strategies for implementation of other recommended enhancements to the parks system for the next 15 year period.

The final recommendations were presented to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board July 12, 1999. At the conclusion of this meeting, a formal motion was made to approve the Strategic Park Plan. Attendees voted unanimous support.

The survey of public opinion clearly demands visionary action. Approximately 64% of the respondents polled to prioritize projects based on self interests responded differently when polled on the basis of community benefit. We believe this is a clear mandate for visionary leadership and a keen awareness of public need with respect to parks and recreation facilities. The Plan, and its planners including the Strategic Planning Committee advocate that the recommendations contained herein be approved and acted upon in the most expeditious manner possible.
Chapter
1

INTRODUCTION

The doctors, lawyers, businessmen, and their families who founded Manhattan nearly 150 years ago, left prominent positions in New England in the interest of a free land. It was their belief that the issue of Slavery vs. Freedom would be settled once and for all on the prairies of Kansas. An account by Mrs. Ellen Goodnow described their movement as not one for self-betterment, but rather for the purpose of establishing a center for education, morality, and religion, unparalleled by any other state in the union. The early emphasis on the cultural objectives for which it was founded sets Manhattan apart from the typical frontier settlement of the mid 1800's. Many of the strategies for the town’s establishment were planned over a year prior to the actual emigration, and even prior to the selection of the township. This early planning and attention to detail, serves to exhibit a shared desire of Manhattan’s forefathers to ensure a high quality of life for their ensuing community.

Shortly after his emigration to Kansas, Abraham Barry, an engineer from Northampton, Pennsylvania, was commissioned by the Boston Town Association, to survey the prospective site of what was later to become the City of Manhattan, Kansas. Barry’s original City Plat of 1855 served to express the cultural objectives for which Manhattan was founded in that it comprehended a finished community where the social, intellectual, and moral needs of the people were anticipated. Though only six or eight houses existed at the time, the 1855 plat included schools, churches, a cemetery, and such visionary elements as a college, libraries, and literary societies.
One of the most remarkable elements of the plat is the inclusion of a 45 acre city park, a number of market squares scattered throughout the city, and design guidelines for a system of streets and avenues complete with a street tree planting program, greatly resembling what we would term today a *park and boulevard* system. According to records, Barry specified that streets be a minimum of 60 feet in width permitting one row of parking on each side. Every seventh street in both the north/south and east/west orientation was to be constructed as an *avenue*, with a minimum width of 100 feet to facilitate double parkings. A single row of street trees were to be planted on each side of streets, and a double row planted on each side of avenues. The double row of street tree plantings could eventually be reduced to a single row if widening of the avenues became necessary. According to an article published by the Riley County Genealogical Society, Barry’s plan led to Manhattan being referred to as the “City of Trees”.

Nearly 150 years later, the visionary elements expressed in the original City Plat are very real and thriving elements in Manhattan. The City, and particularly the Parks and Recreation Department, has maintained the same level of commitment established by Manhattan’s forefathers to ensure an exemplary quality of life for their residents.

The original plat of 1857, set the foundation for the establishment of a Park and Recreation Department, which has grown now to include over 1,000 acres of parkland and greenspace throughout the City. With a current population of over 42,000 people (up from 37,712 in 1990), Manhattan has continued to enjoy a solid and steady growth rate spurring on-going development, and thereby ever-increasing the need for a diverse range of leisure services and facilities.

In order to effectively plan for future growth, the City has initiated a number of significant planning documents, two of which are particularly relevant to this study and completed in the last ten years include: the 1991 Comprehensive Urban Land Use Plan, and the 1992 Comprehensive Park Master Plan. These documents have served to guide on-going development of the City, and the Parks and Recreation system in the tradition of Manhattan’s forefathers.

Resources used in compiling the introduction include:

*Riley County, Kansas Officials and Their Families, 1855 - 1900. An Historical and Genealogical Account*, J. Harvey Litrell, Riley County Historical Society, Manhattan, Kansas 1996.


Historic photos courtesy of the Riley County Historical Society.
PROJECT HISTORY AND RELEVANCE

URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN OF 1991
As stated in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan of 1991, “Parks and recreation facilities are a major asset to any community. Proof of this fact is that every time cities across the country are ranked, recreation is a major category that is ranked”.

The Land Use Plan further states that “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 steepness or poor drainage, to be protected from a harmful private use.”

The information obtained through an extensive public input process identified parks and open space as an important issue for the City. Thus, the Parks and Recreation Department initiated the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan of 1992 to further address specific guidelines necessary for long-range development of Manhattan’s park system.

COMPREHENSIVE PARK MASTER PLAN OF 1992
The Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992 was prepared by the planning team of Oschner Hare & Hare, and Bruce McMillan, AIA, Architects. The purpose of the plan was to provide long-range guidance for the development of parks, recreational facilities, and open space for Manhattan. The Plan followed on the heels of the 1991 Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which identified integrated goals and objectives to guide community actions and accomplish community objectives. The goals and objectives established in the Land Use Plan were reviewed and adapted to reflect the more specific parks and recreation conditions which were surveyed in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. Thus the Comprehensive Park Master Plan set a direction for parks and recreation planning for a ten year period, and addressed the following objectives:

- 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.

The Comprehensive Park Master Plan includes numerous components: an extensive Public Input Process, a Demographics analysis, a Parks and Facilities Inventory, an inventory of available Indoor Recreational Facilities, a Land Development Pattern analysis, and an analysis of Operations, Maintenance, and Administration. The following recommendations described in the Plan Element section of the report, have guided development of the parks and recreation system since 1992. These recommendations are outlined below:

PLAN PRIORITY ELEMENTS
The Land Development Patterns cited in the Master Plan predicted growth along the western and northern areas of the City, particularly west of Seth Child Road, and north of Kimball Avenue. Coupled with the information obtained from the Parks and Facilities Inventory, the planning team was able to recommend the number of parks and recreation facilities that would be needed to meet the needs of the growing population and to respond to deficits current at the time of the study. The items identified are as follows:
Neighborhood and Community Level Parks
Responding to growth: Two (2) Neighborhood Parks to be considered in the possible locations of: Stagg Hill area, Little Kitten Creek area, north of Kimball Avenue and west of Kansas State University, and/or the Eureka Valley area of the northwest.

Responding to deficiencies: At the time of the study, Manhattan was deficient in acreage for Neighborhood level parks by 67 acres (or six to eight parks) at the perimeter of the city and particularly in the Stagg Hill area and the northern areas. In order to bring the Neighborhood level parks system up to current standards, the addition of six neighborhood parks was recommended, as well as improvements to the existing Neighborhood parks in the central parts of the city. The city was cited to be deficient by 40 acres, or one Community level park, which would preferably be located in the northeast district of the city. Recommendations for improvements to the existing Community level parks were also made.

Greenspace and Natural Area Parks
The plan recommended increasing the number and usability of Manhattan's Greenspace and Natural Area parks which include the Linear Trail Park Development. In order to increase the number of these components it was recommended that sensitive natural areas be identified, and protection mechanisms and/or acquisition schedules be determined to insure adequate protection in advance of development pressure. The areas along the Eureka Valley bluffs, and the Hackberry & Pawpaw Glen bluffs were specifically cited. Water Corridors such as the Little Kitten Creek, Wildcat Creek, the Shrubon Urban Wilderness Area, and the Eureka Valley Oxbow projects are additional areas identified as unique environments having been determined to be important to the community.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails
The plan recommended that the pedestrian and bicycle trail system be expanded to provide the means of alternative transportation throughout the center of the city (as well as completion of the northern half of the perimeter Linear Trail Park).

Indoor Recreation Facility
Based on the deficiencies cited in the Indoor Recreation Facilities Inventory, the plan recommended the development of an Indoor Recreation Facility to provide for year-round swimming, space for arts and crafts programs, non-league sports, classrooms, and community space facilities.

PLAN SUPPORT ACTIVITIES
Secondary to the priorities listed above, the plan recommended a series of Plan Support Activities in order to ensure development of a well-rounded comprehensive parks and recreation system. These activities include:

Parkway and Entryway System
The development of a Parkway and Entryway system. Parkways were noted as an effective way to structure land use patterns within a community as well as add aesthetic enhancement. As an initial step toward a city-wide parkway system, the plan identifies the establishment of entryways as an immediate priority. Specific recommendations for new entrance signs and appropriate landscaping were recommended for the following primary entrances and corridors:
- K-177 Bridge Area
- U. S. 24
- Tuttle Creek Boulevard (Marlatt Street to Kimball Avenue intersection)
- Seth Child Road
- Fort Riley Boulevard
Street Tree Planting and Boulevard Improvement Program
The plan recommended continuation and enhancement of the Street Tree Planting and Boulevard Improvement Program. The plan also recommended an Urban Forestry Master Plan be developed and implemented to ensure proper management of street tree objectives for the community.

FUNDING
The Comprehensive Park Master Plan cited that the capital spending patterns of the Manhattan Parks and Recreational Department were reasonable for a city of Manhattan's size. Consequently, the recommendations for target funding were based on the 1992 funding level. The plan offered recommendations regarding a re-distribution of Capital Funding for both the implementation of the Plan Priority Elements as well as the Support Priority Activities. The re-distribution specified that funding and attention should be allocated in equal percentages for Greenspace and Linear Park Development, Indoor Facilities, Community Parks, and Neighborhood Parks. It was further stipulated that at least 50% of the money allocated for Greenspace and Linear Park projects over the planning period be targeted for acquisition and development of new greenspace and trail areas.

The Comprehensive Park Master Plan recommended minor adjustments to funds for parks and recreation projects, and equipment and administrative capital costs. Funding for the Sunset Zoo was recommended to stay at the current level.

Increased costs for operational and program funding, personnel, equipment, and maintenance, arising from expanded facilities and programs should be considered in any future capital campaigns or budget reviews.

PARTNERING
The plan offered recommendations regarding the implementation of the Partnership Concept; to extend the delivery of parks and recreational facilities to other appropriate agencies and organizations in the community. The organizations and agencies mentioned include: Manhattan School District, Non-Profit and Civic Organizations, Land Developers, the Urban Area Planning Board, and the Kansas Department of Transportation.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
The plan recommended the establishment of Guidelines for the Evaluation and Design of Future Facilities as a means to enhance the image of Manhattan and its park system. The guidelines include a Site Selection Checklist to better evaluate potential park sites and natural areas for their appropriateness to the park system, and recommendations for modifications to park facilities to meet the design standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act which became effective in January of 1992.

CONCLUSION
The Comprehensive Park Master Plan, now into its ninth year of the planning period, has served the City of Manhattan, Kansas well in guiding development of the Parks and Recreation system. The Parks and Recreation Department has made significant progress in the planning of improvements and future development of park and recreation facilities, closely following the recommendations of the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan. A nine year effort of park facility master plan preparations, park development, land acquisitions, and improvements to existing park facilities and programs, have resulted in a better quality of life for the Manhattan community. Chapter Two of this report identifies the accomplishments of the Parks and Recreation Department with respect to the recommendations made in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan.
THE STRATEGIC PARK PLAN OF 1999

With the ten year planning period nearing closure, the Parks and Recreation Department realized the need for the verification of priorities, as well as the establishment of specific strategies for acquisition of future park and open space land and build-out of future parks and recreation facilities. In order to address this need, the planning team of Theis Doolittle Associates, Brent Bowman & Associates, and Fletcher Simmons was selected to prepare a Strategic Park Plan for the Manhattan, Kansas Parks and Recreation Department. Originally recommended in the final reports of both the 1992 Comprehensive Park Master Plan and the subsequent Parks and Open Space Plan of 1995, the Strategic Park Plan is intended to offer strategies that will address these needs over the next 15-20 years. The objectives of the Plan are outlined below:

Objective One: Analysis of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, and subsequent Park and Recreation Facility Master Plans completed since that time. The needs identified in each, as well as the current status of recommendations offered, will be updated with information obtained through the course of this study.

Objective Two: The plan will address a new Mission Statement, goals and strategies for the Manhattan Park and Recreation Department.

Objective Three: The Plan will involve a creative public input process utilizing several formats: Community Meetings, Individual Interviews, Public Surveys, and on-going involvement with a Strategic Park Planning Committee assigned for the project.

Objective Four: The Plan will offer recommendations regarding preferred geographic locations for future park and recreation facility development. These recommendations will be made based on analysis of development feasibility and feasibility of real-estate acquisition. A map of the project area will be created which describes, in general, the areas slated for future park land acquisition. This map will serve as a guide for both the City of Manhattan, and the future Park and Recreation Foundation with respect to land acquisition.

Objective Five:
The Plan will offer recommendations regarding the establishment of a Park and Recreation Foundation as a vehicle to achieve tax exempt or tax-favorable status for future land purchases, acquisitions, and/or donations.
MISSION STATEMENT, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF MANHATTAN PARKS AND RECREATION

One of the first tasks of the planning team and the Strategic Park Planning Committee involved a critical assessment of the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Mission Statement. A work session devoted to this effort included an open discussion where committee members were asked to comment on the Mission Statement. The original Mission Statement for the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department consists of 41 words as follows:

"The mission of the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department is to establish, preserve, and manage public parks, greenways, and recreation facilities and to create recreational, cultural, educational, and leisure opportunities to benefit and enhance the quality of life in this community."

The Committee concluded that the length and content of the original Mission Statement were no longer appropriate. The 41 words of text virtually precluded its memorization, which was generally believed by the Committee to be unfortunate. It was also generally believed that it did not express the priorities established and adopted in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan and the realization of the recommendations therein. Consequently, a new Mission Statement was conceived, and supporting goals and objectives developed to better express the intent of the Parks and Recreation Department.

The resultant Mission Statement consists of 23 words, and is as follows:

*Manhattan Parks and Recreation...*

*Our mission is to enrich life by providing opportunities for recreation, conserving the natural environment, and beautifying the city.*

The new Mission Statement identifies WHO the organization is, WHAT the organization does, and WHY the organization does it. It further expresses motivation, a valid general direction, and a valid image that can continue to guide the Parks and Recreation Department through the next planning period.

The planning team and Committee further identified the supporting goals and objectives for the new Mission Statement based, in part, on the objectives of the Strategic Park Plan. It was agreed that goals should define the desired end result, or strategic position to be obtained following the effort of the Strategic Park Plan, be a statement of long-term (3-5 years) measurable outcome, describe what is to be accomplished, be subjective yet stimulate clear objectives, and avoid generalities. Conversely, the committee agreed that objectives should be real or actual, express the means of reaching the goals, and be measurable. The resultant goals and objectives are as follows:

GOALS

1. Establish the strategies and means to acquire and conserve green space for future park development.

2. Be responsible stewards of the environment and our natural resources.

3. Be leaders in the delivery of recreational opportunities including offering quality programs in well-maintained facilities, and natural environments.
OBJECTIVES

1. Establish a not-for-profit entity to assist in acquiring park land and developing facilities.

2. Identify and follow Parks and Recreation Conservation Standards for wildlife, native plants, urban trees, and open green space.

3. Follow established Parks and Recreation Environmental Responsibility Standards for materials and maintenance practices.

4. Advance inter-governmental and public/private partnerships.

5. Solicit ongoing public input regarding community needs.

Griffith Park
Chapter 2

ACCOMPLISHMENTS 1992 - PRESENT

With the guidance of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992, the City of Manhattan's Parks and Recreation Department has made significant progress in the planning of improvements and future development of park and recreation facilities. The following section identifies the specific correlations between recommendations made in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, and the progress made over a nine year period. The analysis follows the format established in Chapter One, subsection; Comprehensive Park Master Plan. The Appendix of this report includes more detailed summaries of each Master Plan effort. Refer to Map No. 1 "Current and Proposed Parks and Trails System", at the end of this chapter, and the updated Comprehensive Park Master Plan - Table 4 in the Appendix.

PLAN PRIORITY ELEMENTS

Neighborhood and Community Level Parks, Greenspace, and Natural Area Parks

Stagg Hill Neighborhood Park was acquired and developed during the course of the Comprehensive Park Master Planning period. The design development of the park was a joint effort between the Parks and Recreation Department and the neighborhood. This accomplishment responds to the recommendation to add neighborhood level parks within the growth areas of the city. Additional information about Stagg Hill Park is included in the Appendix.

Sojourner Truth Neighborhood Park was acquired and developed during the planning period. This facility responds to the deficiency cited with respect to established areas of the city not served by a neighborhood level park facility or within walking distance (1/2 mile) of a community park with neighborhood park type facilities. The design and development of the park was made possible through a joint effort between the Parks and Recreation Department and the Southside Neighborhood Association. Additional information about Sojourner Truth Park is included in the Appendix.

An 80 acre site was acquired in 1997 for the future Northeast Community Park. The site has been used predominately for agricultural purposes, and is currently being leased for such use until funding is available for park development. The property was purchased through annual allocations from the Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program. This accomplishment responds to the recommendation that a community level park facility be added to rectify the deficiency cited in the northeast district. A park master plan was completed in 1998 by Parks and Recreation staff, involving an extensive public input process. Due to the planned features of the park which include nature trails, an arboretum, restored prairie and a nature center, this park also responds to the need for more nature-oriented park facilities. It is also planned that the park will tie into the proposed northern loop of the Linear Trail Park, as was also recommended. Additional information about Northeast Community Park is included in the Appendix.

The initiation of the Master Plan for Fairmont Park is the result of an opportunity arising from the flood of 1993. The FEMA buy-out of 63 acres of devastated residential sites in the Fairmont area, enabled the subsequent acquisition of the property by Riley County to augment the adjacent 40 acres of parkland already owned by the City. In 1997, a Master Plan for the park was completed through a joint effort between the City of Manhattan, Riley County, and the Manhattan School District. Fairmont Park responds to three recommendations offered in the
Comprehensive Park Master Plan: 1.) because of its size (110 acres) it is considered a Community level park despite the fact it is not owned entirely by the City, 2.) due to the inclusion of a trail system through the riparian habitat of the Kansas River; the park responds to the need for more nature-oriented park facilities, 3.) and finally, its adjacency to the K-177 bridge will ultimately enhance the eastern gateway to Manhattan. Additional information about Fairmont Park is included in the Appendix.

The Parks and Open Space Plan was completed in 1995, in order to assess the park and open space needs of the residents of Manhattan, as well as financing and acquisition methods. The study serves to verify the community's desire to maintain open space both within and beyond the city limits of Manhattan. It offers several recommendations for future land acquisitions through partnering, enforcing land development fees on subdivision developers, and possible privatization of smaller neighborhood parks. This accomplishment responds to the recommendations made in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan regarding land acquisition for future park and open space both within, and beyond the city limits of Manhattan.

The results of this study, particularly the identification of operational models to encourage partnering with Developers, have resulted in the establishment of a process for Parks and Recreation Department staff to work with Developers throughout the pre-development and planning phases. This process is described in a document titled "Process for Working with Developers", a copy of which is included in the Appendix of this report.

On-going planning activities for Warner Park have occurred throughout the last nine years. Warner Park is an 82 acre park located in the southwest part of Manhattan. The park is in a natural setting and has trails and a picnic shelter accessible only by pedestrians unless special permission is granted by the Parks and Recreation Department for vehicular access. Because of this, the park responds to the need for more nature-oriented park facilities acknowledged in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan.

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board has recently completed a year-long Community Input Process to determine the ultimate use of this park. The character of the park as it exists today, was the consensus reached through that Community Input Process. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board will continue to evaluate Warner Park with the community as the area surrounding Warner Park develops.

Improvements to Existing Park and Recreation Facilities

The Aquatic Master Plan of 1997, represents an in-depth analysis of the four existing municipal pool facilities, and offers recommendations regarding repairs, replacements, improvements, and expansions relevant to them. It also offers a series of recommendations that address other aquatic needs within the City, which include additional pool facilities both indoor and outdoor. This accomplishment responds to two recommendations cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan; the need for an indoor swimming facility, and the need for improvements to rectify deficiencies of existing park and recreation facilities.

Improvements to Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities have been numerous over the last eight years. These include the addition of 5 park shelters, 42 picnic tables, 6.6 miles of trails, a baseball complex at Eisenhower Park, 4 youth and 3 adult baseball fields, 3 basketball courts, 2 pedestrian underpasses, 2 low water bridges, 2 railroad bridge renovations along the Linear Trail Park, and light fixture and pole replacements at 6 tennis courts and 8 ballfields. These improvements were completed in response to deficiencies cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails
A Master Plan was completed for Phase II of the Linear Trail Park in 1998. The Plan completes the northern half of the perimeter loop around the City of Manhattan, and provides linkages to school sites, commercial areas, and places of special interest within and around the City, as recommended in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. In addition, each trail segment was specifically routed to expose users to some of the most enjoyable landscapes and vistas of the area, thus responding to the need for more nature-oriented park facilities.

A Master Plan was completed for a City/University Bicycle Trail in 1997, in response to the recommendation to create a safe, convenient, and fun environment to bicycle for personal transportation and recreation within Manhattan. The Master Plan was initiated by a joint effort between The City of Manhattan Parks and Recreation and Kansas State University. The routing of the Phase II Linear Trail Park was coordinated with the City/University Bicycle Trail in order to provide several connection points throughout the City.

Indoor Recreation Facility

A budget allocation was approved in 1998 for preparation of a Program and Planning Study of an Indoor Recreation Facility to be completed in 1999. In addition, the Parks and Recreation Department is exploring other opportunities to meet the needs of the community for an indoor swimming facility within the indoor recreation facility. Both aspects of indoor recreation were recommended in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

PLAN SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Parkway and Entryway System

The Gateway to Manhattan Plan was completed in 1998, as a proposed amendment to the 1991 Urban Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Plan was initiated by a joint effort between the City of Manhattan and Riley County, and includes the recommendation of additional parkland acquisition adjacent to the City-owned property in the Fairmont district. The Plan addresses two major entrance ways into Manhattan; K-177 which includes the hilltops of both the Konza Prairie and Flint Hills, and Highway 18 with the Flint Hills on one side and the Kansas River Floodplain on the other. The Gateway to Manhattan Plan focuses on the typical planning issues of providing appropriate level of services for development within the project area, and the more aesthetic goals of protecting and conserving the natural and rural character of the native landscape, and preserving important vistas. Thus, this accomplishment responds to two recommendations offered in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan: the establishment of City entryways and parkways as an immediate priority including both the K-177 Bridge and Highway 18, and the desire to conserve the unique native landscapes and vistas of the Manhattan area.

Street Tree Planting and Boulevard Improvements have remained an on-going project of the Parks and Recreation Department. The annual budget for the Parks and Recreation Department has specific allocations for both of these efforts which include the planting of approximately 250 street trees annually. They are currently responsible for over 20,000 trees throughout Manhattan. In addition, the landscape plantings for the recently completed K-177 Bridge, is in process of being completed at the southern entranceway to Manhattan.

FUNDING
Funding for the various accomplishments described in this Chapter have derived from the annual Parks and Recreation Department funds of the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). No other special funding mechanisms have augmented their implementation.

The Comprehensive Park Master Plan recommendation to equalize funds between the Plan Priority Elements and Support Priority Activities, has been used as a guide in the actual distribution of funds
throughout the planning period. The City has targeted funds relative to the priority of the activity over the last eight years.

PARTNERING
The Parks and Recreation Department has been successful in advancing the partnering concept with the Manhattan School District, Riley County, Kansas State University, and other civic and community organizations, as evidenced by the joint efforts described in this Chapter.

In addition, in 1998 alone, 18 grants were applied for, and 13 awarded, generating approximately $161,000. It is important to note that the quantity of grants applied for and granted varies considerably from year to year.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
The Parks and Recreation Department continues to enhance the image of Manhattan and its park system. The accomplishments described in this Chapter represent a commitment to the utilization of quality design, materials and construction appropriate for new development. The Site Selection Checklist has been used extensively throughout the planning period, as a means for evaluating potential park sites and natural areas, as well as evaluating the potential for property proposed for dedication. (A copy of the Checklist is included in the Appendix).

The Parks and Recreation Department has implemented improvements to all park facilities in order to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. These improvements have been accomplished during the planning period. Accessibility continues to be a priority item for all new park development.

CLOSING
With the ten-year planning period nearing completion, it is evident that funding for significant additional park land acquisition, build-out, and equipment and administrative capital costs for the larger planned parks and recreation facilities will be needed in order to address the "deficiencies" cited in the Comprehensive Park Plan.

The Park and Facilities Inventory included in the Comprehensive Park Plan describes the structure of the Manhattan Parks and Recreation System and comparative analysis of the existing park system with the programming standards established by the National Recreation and Park Association. Table 4 - Park System Programming Standards on page 21, illustrates the ratio of acres of parkland per thousand persons recommended by the standard. It further identifies the Existing Parkland Acres and Target Acres for Manhattan in each of the park level categories including: Neighborhood Level Parks, Community Level Parks, Recreational Parks, and Natural Area Parks. In order to update this analysis with the accomplishments described in this chapter, a revised version of Table 4 has been included in the Appendix of this report.

The accomplishments of the Parks and Recreation Department from 1992 to present have direct correlation with the recommendations offered in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992. These have and will result in a better quality of life for the Manhattan community. One of the purposes of the Strategic Park Plan, is to validate the priority projects through a public input process, and identify strategies to acquire additional financial support for the implementation of these larger capital improvement projects. These issues are addressed in Chapters Three and Four of this report.
Chapter 3

THE PUBLIC PROCESS

VALIDATION OF NEEDS AND IDENTIFICATION OF PLANNING ISSUES

INTRODUCTION
Chapter Three describes the extensive public input process utilized throughout the development of the Strategic Park Plan. This process included continual involvement with a specially-appointed Strategic Planning Committee, Community Meetings, Individual Interviews, a Survey of Manhattan residents, and input received from both the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and the Urban Area Planning Board. It also included interviews with representatives from several foundations throughout the country in order to gain insight in the possible establishment of a Parks and Recreation Foundation for Manhattan.

Each method of public input was designed to offer specific information from which to draw upon in the development of the Planning Issues and Strategies of the Strategic Park Plan, covered in Chapter Four of this report.

It should not go without saying that the visionary elements of the Strategic Park Plan could not have been solidified without the dedication and foresight of the Committee, Board Members, and general public. The request was given to be visionary, and the public responded as such. The following sections describe the intent and results of each method of public input.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

On July 23, 1998 a meeting of the newly appointed Strategic Planning Committee was held to introduce the planning team and to review the Project Approach. The Strategic Planning Committee members met regularly throughout the course of the Strategic Park Plan process in order to discuss and guide the development of the plan. The following dedicated committee members have been involved in the development of a new Manhattan Parks and Recreation Mission Statement, the structuring and goal-setting for the public input process, identification of the planning issues, and the development of the final recommendations:

Richard Allen, Park Planner
Jim Colley, Recreation Superintendent
Don Combs, Community Representative
Wayne Corn, Community Representative
Terry DeWeese, Director, Parks and Recreation
Jerry Dishman, Parks Superintendent
Jerry Reece, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
Jerry Reynard, Urban Area Planning Board
COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Four meetings, on four separate occasions and locations, were designed to provide an opportunity for Manhattan residents to voice their priorities regarding the development of future park and recreation facilities, and the possible funding mechanisms associated with each. Meeting Minutes of each session are included in the Appendix of this report.

VALIDATION OF NEEDS

The results of the four Community Meetings served to validate the needs identified in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992. These include: more neighborhood and community level park facilities, more nature-oriented and open space park facilities, pedestrian and bicycle trails, indoor recreation including swimming, and improvements to existing facilities. Comments made which validate these needs are summarized below:

- Hire a Parks and Recreation Naturalist to direct maintenance operations of natural park and open space land, particularly Warner and Marlatt Parks.
- Keep development at Fairmont Park minimal because of its lack of accessibility. The nature-oriented aspects of the Master Plan such as trails through the riparian habitat, and the canoe launch, are the preferred areas of focus.
- The need for an indoor recreation facility and indoor swimming facility is still valid. Participants cited facilities in Battle Creek, Michigan, Fairbanks, Alaska, and Rockville, Maryland as models. Participants also cited the opportunity to partner with the National Guard Armory on this effort.
- Nature-oriented parks are a very needed component of the Parks and Recreation System.
- Finishing the loop of the Linear Trail Park and rectifying the safety hazards of crossing Kimball and Browning, and Tuttle Creek are priority issues.
- Larger ice-skating facilities are needed at City Park to accommodate ice hockey.
- The northeast community strongly supports implementation of the Northeast Community Park, due to the deficiency of parkland in their district. Participants further stated that a second park facility would be necessary in the northeast district within the next 15 years due to growth projections.
- The Partnering Concept was stressed particularly with the Manhattan School District.

NEW IDEAS

Several new ideas evolved throughout the discussions. The following summarizes the comments made:

- The request from numerous middle school and high school age participants for a Skate Park to facilitate roller-blades and skate boards became a major discussion point of each meeting. Participants noted several recently completed skate parks within the state including: Wichita, Lawrence, and Salina. Consequently, Parks and Recreation Department staff initiated a special follow-up public meeting to address this issue. The meeting was attended by 146 area youth and their parents or guardians.
- A better location for Farmer’s Market was mentioned as a possible area of focus.
- Reference was made to what a participant described as a state-of-the-art two-acre playground facility at the Cosmopolitan Park in Columbia, Missouri. She cited that a similar facility in Manhattan would be a huge benefit to area youth.
- The need for a new public golf course was cited.

FUNDING
Each Community Meeting included discussion regarding supplemental funding mechanisms for Parks and Recreation Facilities. The following summarizes the comments made:

- Look for dollars within the community - invested interest.
- Seek Hunter/Fisherman Grants for the preservation of nature and wildlife.
- Support for another Quality of Life Bond Issue was reported by several participants, however others stated that taxation is not the best method for funding of Parks and Recreation projects (the participants of the later statement offered no other recommendations).
- General support for the establishment of a Parks and Recreation Foundation was offered.
- Seek volunteer efforts for support of parks. Maybe establish a Friends of the Park organization.
- If a Bond Issue is recommended, prepare the necessary information to exhibit the tax implications of various scale projects in relation to a typical homeowner's share. It is usually perceived as "reasonable" if properly presented which will greatly enhance support.
- Pursue funding for Youth Programs and focus on the benefits of indoor recreation on youth behavior.
- What about an earnings tax?
- Focus on the benefits of youth recreation - it's our future - raise sales tax.
- Special programs such as "Ithica, New York Dollars" were mentioned as potential supplemental income for parks. A specific percentage of every dollar spent with participating merchants goes back to the Parks and Recreation Department.
- Research possible privately-funded commercial components to a public recreation center, such as an indoor soccer facility or other.
- Some participants voiced skepticism regarding the distribution of park funds being balanced throughout the City. Some participants suggested this be done on the basis of the distribution of the youth in the community - others disagreed because parks should be for everyone.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS OF KEY COMMUNITY MEMBERS

"Park land is critical to the City... we need to be forward-thinking."  Burke Bayer

Eighteen interviews were conducted with a diverse group of Manhattan community leaders. These individuals were asked to comment on the relevance of the establishment of a Park and Recreation Foundation as well as other issues surrounding the future development of the Park and Recreation system. Interviewees are as follows:

Pat Alexander, Security National Bank  Pat Keating, Investments/Insurance
Burke Bayer, Bayer Construction  Stacy Kohlmeier, KPL
Becky Blake, Chamber of Commerce  Bob Krause, KSU
Ann Browne, Business Owner  Jim McCullough, Developer
Jan Gartou, Environmentalist  Clark Reinke, Manhattan School District
Gary Greer, City Manager  Stephanie Rolley, KSU Landscape Architect
Dan Hardin, Riley County  Bill Varney, Accountant
Kent Glasscock, State Representative/Developer  Richard Wartell, KMAN Radio
Tim Keane, KSU Landscape Architect  Don Wissman, retired DPRA
Individual comments received through the interview process are listed below and grouped by category as follows:

GENERAL STRATEGIES
- Parks and Recreation is a part of the Quality of Life assessment in Manhattan and it ranks fairly high.
- The population is aging here.
- Two critical issues are: providing connections between parks (linear trail), and acquiring more green space.
- Plan for incremental progress.
- There is probably a bigger need for an Indoor Recreation/Community Center than most other proposed projects.
- Small neighborhood parks are a desirable component of the parks system.
- There continues to be a need for practice fields. Perhaps encouraging partnering with private property owners is the key toward resolution.
- The National Guard Armory is a potential partner with respect to Indoor Recreation. The Chamber is researching this.
- "There are kids on the "edge" here." Get kids engaged in real projects and you will see them rise to the occasion - if it's worthwhile.
- Education focus in our parks is an important trend - Y.E.S. Fund - should explore partnering for some of these grant dollars. Also research interface with KSU and tie into their Teacher Preparation Program - use this to enhance education role of specific parks and programs.
- I like the visionary aspect of this plan. The old attitude about being progressive has changed here - perhaps due to the threat of Ft. Riley closing.
- We are lacking in parks in the northeast district.
- Can't walk to Fairmont.
- Get some neighborhood parks on the west side now.
- Land for future parks outside the city limits should be large.
- Need to make a decision whether we are going to succumb to vehicles or encourage bikes/walking.

FOUNDATION AND GENERAL FUNDING
- The public is apt to have a lot more confidence with respect to donations of land and money with a foundation board versus a public entity.
- Trusts and wills - people are looking for places to put their money.
- Conserve land west of Manhattan before developers get there.
- Land banking is legal for a foundation.
- "I am a strong advocate of park land."
- The foundation is a great idea - most people already feel they are donating to the government - the foundation gets away from the notion of tight governmental control.
- An information piece will be key for the foundation - it should focus on Benefits, and Objectives.
- The foundation should stay out of the operational aspects of the Parks and Recreation Department and clearly state this in the information piece.
- Two interviewees cited personal experiences where donations for public use would have been expedited and better facilitated through a foundation.
- Explore the potential for the City to have a non-terminating 1/4 cent sales tax increase - it may not be possible. (Otherwise the increase will expire in 5 years).
- Foundation concept is great.
- There is something about a foundation that is appealing - nobody profits - no conflict of interest. Older citizens would feel that donating land for future parks and open space would be a good way to give back to the community.
- If another Quality of Life Bond Issue is considered - identify a clear sense of purpose, and identify the elements people feel they can use.
Regarding the foundation - 3 Key things:
1. Board Members must believe in the Mission.
2. They must know people who have land and resources.
3. They should be ambassadors.

Someone on the foundation needs to be assigned the duty of accountability/responsibility for management. This could be a Trust Department in a bank or an accounting firm.

Also needed is a Custodian - someone to call the meetings and remain abreast of progress.

The fiduciary responsibility is key to the foundation’s on-going success.

Foundation as arm of the City? Yes. Acting on behalf of Parks and Recreation? No. Foundation needs to be under auspices of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. It sounds like an elite group of people already guiding decisions.

NATURE-ORIENTED FACILITIES

- Kansas Wildscape Program fits in well with the desire for nature parks. 125 schools in Kansas are currently participating, where a plot of school ground is dedicated to nature.
- Our community is short on natural areas - “plain imagination parks” where kids just go (not organized recreation). The trails fit in to this category, however what they offer is a more active solitude.
- We need opportunities within the urban area for a quiet, meditative environment.
- “Important to draw nature back into our community.”
- Natural areas planned in the Northeast Community Park don’t make sense; it’s farmland.
- A possible misunderstanding exists regarding the intended use of Warner Park. The interviewee believes the original intent was to have active programming, however others believe it was to be natural.

BOULEVARDS AND GATEWAYS

- There was once a median strip on Poyntz.
- We need gateways.
- Focus on gateways.
- Boulevard Plan is very much needed. It would drive development and be a strong asset to the City. Identify three existing, and some future roads to become boulevards. This includes major roads into the City. The boulevard plan should make connections to parks and trails.

CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- Conservation easements - School House needs to be preserved - this is a gateway.
- Overall environmental resources of Manhattan should be mapped. Map should reflect an inventory of natural resources and needs. Utilize expertise of KSU faculty and students.
- “Keats Road is the last decent entry we’ve got”. Conservation easements are a good idea.
- A priority should be put on the preservation/restoration of any corridors we already have. Connections to them should be made.
- Open space relates to storm drainage. This kind of conservation is mutually beneficial for the City’s infrastructure and quality of life.
- A naturalist on staff is a good idea.
- Conservation easements should be established. (The interviewee was impressed with the county’s foresight to purchase land for Seth Child Road many years ago.)
- Hire a naturalist to focus on Environmental Education and Ecology.
PUBLIC SURVEY

Approximately 668 people responded to the survey questionnaire which was mailed to 1,250 Manhattan residents. Respondents were offered a $2.00 discount on their water bill. The survey results have been tabulated and analyzed with the assistance of KSU Professor of Sociology and Population Studies; Leonard Bloomquist. The Survey Questionnaire is included in the Appendix of this report.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS
The first question was designed to receive information regarding the geographic location of survey respondents. Graph One on the following page illustrates the results. It is important to note that a clear majority of respondents reside in the “West” zone of the City, a zone cited as a projected growth area of Manhattan in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. (Refer to Map 2 “Five Geographic Zones of Survey Respondents” for the specific boundaries of each.)

AGE OF RESPONDENTS
Graph Two illustrates the respective age group of survey respondents. Important to note is the nearly equal percentages of persons between 36 and 45, 46 and 55, and those over 65 years of age. The percentages of persons between 25 and 35, and 56 and 65, were also near-equal.

It is important to note that due to the survey method chosen the identification of youth respondents is not clearly provided. This survey solicited household response in which case it is assumed that while the responses may have been made by an adult head of household (being the recipient of the water bill), they generally would include the opinions of the youth within that household.

It is generally experienced that persons under 25 years of age are less apt to respond to surveys of this type and therefore the lower percentage of this age group is not unusual. In this particular case, those under 25 years of age are less likely to own their own homes, and consequently would not receive the survey through a water billing vehicle.

LOCATION AND AGE CROSS-TABULATION
A cross-tabulation of respondent age and location offers additional information on the age distribution with respect to the five zones of Manhattan. The results are illustrated on Graphs Three through Seven of the following page.

The survey illustrates that the majority of survey respondents under 25 years of age reside within the Campus, East and South districts of the City as would be anticipated. Heads of households that are under 25 years of age are probably less likely to live in the West and Southwest districts due to higher real-estate costs, and lack of student and lower income housing whether single or multi-family.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
The survey questionnaire included several demographic-related questions. The information obtained is summarized below:

- 85% of survey respondents own their homes.
- 85% of survey respondents expect to live in Manhattan five years from now.
- 75% of survey respondents have lived in Manhattan for over five years.
- 10% of survey respondents are currently attending Kansas State University.
- 40.8% of survey respondents have households of two individuals, 5.9% have households of five, 2.1% have households of over five, and the percentages of remaining respondents are equally distributed between one-member, three-member, and four-member households.
CROSS TABULATIONS OF RESPONDENTS' AGE WITH GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

GRAPH NO. 3 - RESPONDENTS' AGE IN WEST DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH NO. 4 - RESPONDENTS' AGE IN CAMPUS DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH NO. 5 - RESPONDENTS' AGE IN EAST DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH NO. 6 - RESPONDENTS' AGE IN SOUTH DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH NO. 7 - RESPONDENTS' AGE IN SOUTHWEST DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIORITY OF PROPOSED PROJECTS
The survey questionnaire included a listing of Parks and Recreation Department sponsored projects that are being considered for future study, build-out or acquisition. Two questions were designed to solicit input on the prioritization of these.

In response to “What item would you rank most important?”, survey respondents ranked the following projects in descending order of preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph NO. 8 on the following page illustrates a cross-tabulation of these prioritized projects with the geographic location of respondents. Important to note is the fact that the only zone that did not rank the Indoor Pool Facility as the top priority is the East zone. The East zone respondents clearly show their preference for the Northeast Community Park which received 39.1% of their votes.

Graph NO. 9 on the following page illustrates a cross-tabulation of these prioritized projects with the age of respondents. Important to note is the fact that the only age group that did not rank the Indoor Pool Facility as the top priority is the Under 25 group. The Under 25 group preferred the City University Bicycle Trail. Both the Fairmont Park and Northeast Community Park projects show a strong constituency in the Under 35 age group. Also important to note is the importance of the Indoor Recreation Center and Indoor Pool Facility to the citizens over 65 years of age. The Linear Trail Park appeals to a wide age group constituency (25 - 65 years old), and Land Acquisition appeals most to those over the age of 46.

In response to “What item do you believe the entire community would rank most important?” survey respondents ranked the following projects in descending order of preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph NO. 10 on the following page illustrates a cross-tabulation of these prioritized projects with the geographic location of respondents. This tabulation shows that the Indoor Recreation Center received the highest support from the West and East zones. Land Acquisition received a fairly equal distribution of votes throughout the five zones, highest in the South and Southwest. The Outdoor Pool ranked highest in the Campus zone. The Indoor Pool Facility ranked the highest in the Southwest zone, tying with Land Acquisition.

Graph NO. 11 on the following page illustrates a cross-tabulation of these prioritized projects with the age of respondents. The Indoor Recreation Center was the highest ranked project in the 25 - 35, 36 - 45, and 46 - 55 age groups, and ranked in the top three of the remaining age groups. The Over 56 age groups shifted their focus to Land Acquisition, with Outdoor Pool Improvements and Indoor Recreation Center in both top three rankings.
### Graph No. 8

**Most Important to Respondent by City District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Enhancement Project</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>Indoor Swimming Facility</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph No. 9

**Most Important to Respondent by Age Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Enhancement Project</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 45</th>
<th>46 - 55</th>
<th>56 - 65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>Indoor Swimming Facility</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRAPH NO. 10

### MOST IMPORTANT TO COMMUNITY BY CITY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>ENHANCEMENT PROJECT</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>SOUTHWEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>Indoor Swimming Facility</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GRAPH NO. 11

### MOST IMPORTANT TO COMMUNITY BY AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>ENHANCEMENT PROJECT</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 45</th>
<th>46 - 55</th>
<th>56 - 65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>Outdoor Pool Improvements</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>Indoor Swimming Facility</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>Fairmont Park</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Northeast Community Park</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Linear Trail Park Phase II</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>City/University Bicycle Trail</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFERRED FUNDING MECHANISMS
Survey respondents were also asked to prioritize potential funding mechanisms for the projects identified.

- 54.7% of survey respondents prefer a sales tax increase.
- 22% of survey respondents prefer an increase of property tax through Bond Issue.
- 21% of survey respondents prefer an increase of property tax through the Capital Improvement Program.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS
The survey was intended to provide information on the ranking of desired parks and recreation projects and the preferred method of funding in order to implement them. The analysis of the public survey responses was conducted by the Planning Team assisted by Leonard Bloomquist, Professor of Population Studies, Department of Sociology of KSU.

Utilizing a conservative method of evaluation, Leonard Bloomquist regards the survey for the Manhattan Strategic Park Plan as one of high quality, based on the straightforwardness of the questions, clarity of instructions, and overall length of the survey. He further recognizes that the survey has a Margin of Error of approximately 6%, which is considered a good rating. This rating is based on a system incorporating three variables: sample size, response rate, and overall distribution of response with respect to each question. Had a less conservative rating system been utilized, (one based on only sample size and response rate), he estimates this survey would have a Margin of Error of 2%.

Perhaps the most interesting issue to note is that approximately 64% of respondents when polled for the prioritization of projects based on self interests, responded differently when polled on the basis of overall community need. This was an important consideration in the ranking of prioritized projects. In order to analyze the survey responses to questions 8 and 9 several cross-tabulations were created between priority projects and age and location of respondent.

The information received from the survey process, coupled with findings from the other public input served as a valuable resource in identifying Strategies regarding future Parks and Recreation Development. (The Strategies are described in Chapter Four of this report.) The following represents what is believed to be an accurate representation of community needs (in prioritized order):

1. Indoor Recreation Center/Indoor Swimming Facility
2. Land Acquisition
3. Outdoor Pool Improvements
4. Northeast Community Park
5. Fairmont Park
6. Linear Trail Park Phase II

PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD AND THE URBAN AREA PLANNING BOARD

On December 14, 1998, a joint working session with the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and the Urban Planning Board was held in order to receive input on the final report for the Strategic Park Plan project. An information packet was distributed to board members in advance of the meeting, and the planning team reviewed drafts of each component of the Plan at the meeting. The goal of the joint meeting was to realize active participation of both boards in the shaping of the final recommendations.
General support for the establishment of a Parks and Recreation Foundation was expressed by the group. Participants noted that though the foundation will focus on land acquisition, it should not preclude City funding also being used for this purpose, whether from the CIP budget or a sales tax increase. The plan to utilize combined resources for land acquisition would propagate a public/private land acquisition partnership which is perceived as desirable. It was also noted that the Strategic Park Plan should avoid too many stipulations regarding the foundation, and should make it clear that the foundation will accept both land and money for build-out. The foundation should be persistent, be advocates, and have on-going activities.

Funding was cited as a major planning issue of this effort, however the dictat of the specific funding mechanism was noted to be beyond the responsibility of the Strategic Park Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the advantages and disadvantages of both property tax increases and sales tax increases. The fact that competition exists for these funding mechanisms was cited. The group agreed that a method for a continuous dedicated tax for the parks and recreation system is ultimately desired.

Coordination with other planning studies was also a concern of the group. With the Transportation Study currently underway, participants noted the need to focus on remote parks and recreation facilities and how children are to get there. Concerns of open space and sprawl were also expressed, more specifically; “we are not just designing parks, we’re designing a city”. Reference was made to the Land Acquisition Strategies Exhibit, and the recommendation offered that it better illustrate a direction for growth so that all the features of the City work together and can be managed.

The group also commented on themes carried over from the recommendations made in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. These include the benefits of public/private partnerships with the county and school district, and the reminder that deficiencies still exist in the established districts of the City particularly with respect to neighborhood level parks. It was acknowledged that we should look outside, but also continue to find opportunities within the established districts.

The final recommendation from the group was that the Strategic Park Plan be considered a "work in progress", to be re-visited from time to time.

RESEARCH OF COMPARABLE FOUNDATIONS

Through the course of the Strategic Park Plan several foundations and land trust organizations throughout the country were researched. These organizations are all associated with public entities such as Parks and Recreation Departments, States, Counties, and Cities. The purpose of the research was to gain insight in the common denominator issues such as: by laws, quantity of board members, associated volunteer organizations, fundraising, etc. Each organization is unique with respect to their mission and scope of services, which were created to respond to needs identified within the service area of the public entity.

The information obtained through this study was used in the recommendations offered for the establishment of a Manhattan Parks and Recreation Foundation. Representatives from: the San Antonio Parks Foundation of San Antonio, Texas, the Parks and People Foundation of Baltimore, Maryland, the Idaho Foundation for Parks & Lands, the Trust for Public Lands, the Land Trust Alliance, and the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation were interviewed. The Appendix of this report summarizes the information obtained.
CONCLUSION

The public input received through each of these methods has served this project well toward the identification/verification of the Strategic Planning Issues, and development of the final recommendations of the Strategic Park Plan. The information received accomplished several important objectives:

- The acknowledgment that both the image of Manhattan, and quality of life of its residents are enhanced by the efforts of the Parks and Recreation Department.
- Verification that the needs and priorities made in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan of 1992 remain valid in the eyes of the general public, and that the accomplishments made thus far toward implementation of the recommendations are appropriate.
- Support exists for implementation (build-out) of the majority of planned future development and improvement projects proposed during the planning period.
- Support exists for the establishment of a Parks and Recreation Foundation.

Chapter Four of this report identifies the Strategic Planning Issues that have resulted from this process, as well as the recommended Strategies that address each.
Chapter 4

PLANNING ISSUES AND STRATEGIES

The Strategic Park Plan identifies major planning issues and the strategies designed to respond to each. The planning issues were identified both internally by Parks and Recreation Department staff and externally through the public input process documented in Chapter Three of this report. The following describes the Planning Issues and resultant Strategies of the Strategic Park Plan, hereinafter referred to as "The Plan".

MISSION STATEMENT
The planning process identified that the Mission Statement should be more descriptive of the organization’s primary purpose, and brief enough to be memorable. Additionally, the need for updated goals and objectives was acknowledged.

STRATEGY No. 1: It is recommended that the following revised Mission Statement, Goals, and Objectives for the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department be formally adopted:

*Manhattan Parks and Recreation...*
*Our mission is to enrich life by providing opportunities for recreation, conserving the natural environment, and beautifying the city.*

GOALS

1. Establish the strategies and means to acquire and conserve green space for future park development.

2. Be responsible stewards of the environment and our natural resources.

3. Be leaders in the delivery of recreational opportunities including offering quality programs in well-maintained facilities, and natural environments.

OBJECTIVES

2.1 Establish a not-for-profit entity to assist in acquiring park land and developing facilities.

2. Identify and follow Parks and Recreation Conservation Standards for wildlife, native plants, urban trees, and open green space.


4. Advance inter-governmental and public/private partnerships.

5. Solicit ongoing public input regarding community needs.
PARKS AND RECREATION FOUNDATION
Through the planning process it was identified that donations/contributions to the Parks and Recreation Department are not easily facilitated in the current system. In both the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, and the Parks and Open Space Plan, the concept of establishing a Parks and Recreation Foundation was recommended in order to better facilitate these transactions.

STRATEGY NO. 2: The Plan further advocates for the establishment of a Manhattan Parks and Recreation Foundation, as a nonprofit, tax exempt organization, tied to the Parks and Recreation Department through its Mission Statement. The concept of such a foundation received strong support as evidenced by the comments made at the community meetings, and individual interviews conducted in this study.

The benevolent character of the foundation, so necessary for its success, will rest on its ability to collaborate with and advocate for the vision of Manhattan’s Parks and Recreation system, as documented in The Plan and as modified through the years. Therefore, more than just a fiduciary role, it is recommended the Foundation be established as a multi-purpose organization with the following objectives:

- The Foundation shall facilitate donations/contributions of land, money, and in-kind goods and services for future development of the Parks and Recreation system.

- The Foundation shall collaborate with the Parks and Recreation Department in the acquisition of desirable land for future parks and open space, or for trade or investment to ultimately facilitate the same.

- The Foundation shall serve as advocates of the Parks and Recreation System, and the vision established in the Strategic Park Plan.

It is important to note that while the Foundation may acquire land through donations/contributions, it does not preclude the need for funds to be available to the Parks and Recreation Department in order to facilitate discounted purchases, as well as timely purchases due to development pressures. In other words, the establishment of a Foundation does not preclude the Parks and Recreation Department’s need of financial resources for land acquisitions.

The Plan includes guidelines for the start-up of the Parks and Recreation Foundation which includes responsibilities of both the Parks and Recreation Department and the Foundation. These guidelines are included in the Appendix of this report.

Through the course of this research, it became apparent that work by several Manhattan community members was already underway toward the establishment of a Greater Manhattan Community Foundation. In light of this, City Commissioners requested that this Plan identify the feasibility for one or both organizations to provide the vehicle for achieving the goals described above.

If the Greater Manhattan Community Foundation is established, the recommendations herein are not rendered invalid - it simply means that in lieu of establishing a Parks and Recreation Foundation as a Private Foundation, it is established as a Supporting Organization of the Community Foundation. In fact this option may offer tax benefits and administrative efficiencies not otherwise possible.

The Parks and Recreation Foundation as a Supporting Organization does not preclude the ability for it to retain its own identity, Board of Directors, and trust account in the Parks and Recreation Foundation name. This may in fact be required since the tax laws relevant to contributions and holdings of land assets by a Foundation are complex with respect to maintaining a 501c3 status. Additionally, the Board responsibilities to appropriately conserve, preserve, and maintain land holdings could be cumbersome for a Community Foundation Board, and perhaps more appropriately
handled by a board specific to this purpose. This would also facilitate the ambassadorship and advocacy aspects helpful in achieving the vision of the Strategic Park Plan.

PARK NATURALIST
The desire for more nature-oriented park facilities has been repeatedly cited at public meetings, and the need was documented in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. Several existing Manhattan parks fit into this category, however the manner in which these lands are being maintained has become controversial.

Current with nationwide awareness, the citizens of Manhattan are sensitive to environmental issues, and the conservation of natural habitats and resources. Hence, the need is identified to establish specific Park and Recreation Conservation Standards, and Environmental Responsibility Standards for Materials and Maintenance Practices.

STRATEGY NO. 3: The Plan recommends that the Parks and Recreation Department add a park naturalist to their staff. This individual would be responsible for assisting the Department in creating the Parks and Recreation Standards for Conservation, and Environmental Responsibility for Materials and Maintenance Practices. This individual would also be responsible for assisting with staff training and implementation of these standards.

The following identifies some of the recommended established conservation and environmental standards of which partial or full adoption should be considered:

| Maintenance and Operations: | NRPA,  
|                           | Kansas Wildlife and Parks,  
|                           | other municipalities  
| Park Building Materials: | AIA Environmental Resource Guide  
| Conservation: | Trust for Public Land  
|               | Land Trust Alliance  
|               | Kansas Wildlife and Parks  
|               | Forest Extension Service  
|               | University research sources  
|               | other municipalities  

PLAN PRIORITY ITEMS
As identified in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan and verified in The Strategic Park Plan, Manhattan has a demanding constituency regarding ever-increasing and diversified park and recreation facilities and programs. Existing funding cannot provide expansion and significant improvement projects in as expeditious a manner as is desired by the public. Consequently, the Strategic Park Plan included a prioritization process in order to validate the community’s support of the recommendations made in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan.

STRATEGY NO. 4: The Plan identifies six Plan Priority Items currently needed within the Manhattan Parks and Recreation system. Each of these items (with the exception of Fairmont Park) was first cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992, and described as a current “deficiency” in the parks system. The needs have been validated and ranked throughout the process of The Plan, and thus are referred to as “Plan Priority Items”. They are as follows: (Reference Exhibit 1 “Example Action Plan/Timeline” in the Appendix).
INDOOR RECREATION CENTER WITH INDOOR SWIMMING FACILITIES
The Indoor Recreation Center Study currently underway will include an assessment of the need for both an indoor recreation facility and indoor swimming facility. It will also offer recommendations on the amount of land needed, the architectural program, and projected costs for the development.

LAND ACQUISITION
The Plan recommends that funds be allocated in the enhanced Parks and Recreation Department budget for the acquisition of land for future parks and open space. Map No. 3; the “Land Acquisition Strategies”, included in this chapter, illustrates strategic areas of focus for all of the Parks and Recreation facilities under consideration and as recommended in the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan.

The Plan advocates that a planning process continue to take place with Developers of new properties in the interest of more and higher quality public use space and more green space. As identified in the Parks and Open Space Plan, the acquisition of future park land is one area that potential partnering efforts with Developers could be realized. The process outlined in the Park and Open Space Plan was approved jointly by the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board, the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, and the City Commission. The current process that is being followed provides several opportunities for staff involvement to ensure implementation of park plans and policies of the City. This process is outlined in a document titled “Process for Working with Developers” a copy of which is included in the Appendix.

The Plan further recommends that incentives be offered to ensure that the Developer as well as the City receive something out of the process. Possible incentives might include negotiation of requirements such as densities, street widths, setbacks, sidewalks, landscaping, lighting, and amenities, similar to the process in place for P.U.D. approvals. In order to initiate these types of negotiations, it is recommended that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board in cooperation with the Urban Area Planning Board, assess the City's Subdivision Regulations and identify appropriate incentives that may encourage developers to set-aside property for parks and natural areas.

To ensure strategic land acquisitions the Plan recommends that the City begin compiling information for an inventory of available and desirable park land within and outside of the City for future parks and open space. The GIS Mapping service currently available to the Parks and Recreation Department will be key to documentation of this inventory. The intent being that land would be purchased as funds permit. The selection of specific sites for acquisition would be done by Parks and Recreation staff utilizing:

1. The Site Selection Guidelines already established (a copy of which is included in the Appendix of this report).
2. The recommendations contained in the Strategic Park Plan.

Identification of specific parcels for acquisition at this time is not recommended due to hardships upon owners and risk of inflated property costs.
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OUTDOOR POOL IMPROVEMENTS
The Plan recommends phased improvements to the four municipal outdoor pool facilities as identified in the Aquatic Master Plan. This includes the possible replacement facility for the Northview Pool facility which will require land acquisition, as well as a possible expansion to CiCo Park, City Park and Douglass Park Pools.

NORTHEAST COMMUNITY PARK
The Plan recommends phased build-out of the Northeast Community Park. It is anticipated that the initial phases would include the infrastructure, grading, turf, playgrounds, practice fields, shelters, and toilet facilities.

FAIRMONT PARK
The Plan recommends phased build-out of portions of Fairmont Park; specifically the nature-oriented park features and the Gateway Features.

LINEAR TRAIL PARK PHASE II
The Plan recommends phased land acquisition and build-out of the Linear Trail Park Phase II, as identified in the Master Plan.

PLAN SUPPORT ACTIVITY ITEMS
STRATEGY NO. 5: The Plan identifies five Support Activity Items currently needed within the Manhattan Parks and Recreation system. Most of these items were cited in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan of 1992 as current deficiencies within the parks system; the exception being Fairmont Park. These needs were again validated and ranked through the public input process of The Plan, and thus are referred to as “Plan Support Activity Items”. The Plan Support Activity Items are as follows: (Reference Exhibit 1 “Example Action Plan/Timeline” in the Appendix).

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
The Plan recommends the land acquisition and development of 5-6 new Neighborhood Parks located throughout the periphery of the City and in areas currently not within walking distance of a neighborhood or community level park facility, including some established neighborhoods. Improvements to existing neighborhood level parks should also be implemented as outlined in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, and on an as-needed basis.

CITY/UNIVERSITY BICYCLE TRAIL
The Plan recommends phased development of the Parks and Recreation Department’s role in the City/University Bike Trail, as identified in the City/University Bike Trail Master Plan. As is currently underway, the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department in conjunction with the Public Works Department should continue to work toward implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan.

As a partnership effort between Kansas State University, it is further recommended that the capital costs for full implementation be determined, and a plan for cost-sharing and phased build-out be negotiated with KSU in order to realize a successful partnership effort.

LINEAR TRAIL PARK PHASE II
The Plan recommends phased development of the secondary trails of the Linear Trail Park Phase II, as identified in the Master Plan.

PARKWAYS AND ENTRYWAYS
The Plan recommends phased land acquisition and improvements for parkways and entryways as recommended in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan.*

STREET TREE PLANTING PROGRAM
The Plan recommends that the current level of attention and resources toward the Street Tree Planting Program be maintained.

* It is suggested that the concept of adding a Boulevard Division, separately funded, and possibly under the joint auspices of the Parks and Recreation Department and the Public Works Department be considered.

SKATE PARK
As documented in Chapter 3 of this report, a significant group of area youth as well as adult representatives came forward during the Community Meetings in order to promote the development of a Skate Park within the Manhattan community. Immediately, in response to this request, Manhattan City Administration established a Skate Park Committee made up of Parks and Recreation staff, interested youth, and adults in the community in order to research the feasibility of such a park.

The Skate Park Committee made a presentation to the Manhattan Parks and Advisory Board in December of 1998, where they were asked by the Board to develop a conceptual plan that would include financing, location, insurability, and projected cost for the project.

Through a successful collaborative effort between City Administration and the Skate Park Committee six meetings were held to develop the necessary information. The Skate Park Committee presented a Master Plan to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board at their April 5, 1999 Meeting, in which it was agreed that the Board would include $29,500 in the 2000-2005 Capital Improvements Program to fund 50% of the first phase of the Skate Park in 2000. The remaining $29,500 is to be raised by the Skate Park Committee.

FUNDING STRATEGIES
The single most important planning issue of the Strategic Park Plan is funding. The following planning issues were identified throughout the process of the Strategic Park Plan:

- Since 1992, the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department has accomplished some of the goals of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, but are still facing some deficiencies. Funding for large projects and land acquisitions is not adequate through the Capital Improvements Program. Current funding for capital improvement projects have been limited to the Special Park and Recreation Fund (proceeds from an alcohol tax), and the Park Development Fund (revenue from the general fund). With the planning period of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan nearing closure it is important to establish a reasonable time frame for the rectification of deficiencies. This includes land acquisitions, major improvements to existing facilities, and build-out of planned facilities.

- It is equally important to establish the means to fund future development and land acquisition.

- Coordination with other intergovernmental agencies enables the Parks and Recreation Department to be involved in recommendations and decisions regarding the City's future planning and development. However, as development pressures arise, their ability to seize opportunities for desirable land acquisitions is hindered by inadequate funds.

- As parkland acreage increases and as parks are developed, budgets have not been enhanced in order to adequately provide for the level of maintenance, operations, and staffing desired by the community.

- Bond issues have been successful in the past, however it is unknown how many times the public will ensure a successful outcome. It is also important to note bond issues are limited
to only capital improvement projects and offer no assistance in the additional resources needed for enhanced staffing, equipment and maintenance.

STRATEGY NO. 6: The Plan recommends that the City maintain their on-going level of funding support to the Parks and Recreation Department through the Capital Improvement Program and other park funds. The Plan further recommends that a special source of on-going funding be established to rectify immediate capital improvement needs, fund future capital improvement needs, and ensure adequate maintenance and operation as the park system grows. At present, the most obvious source of special funding is either through a sales tax increase or bond issue. The sales tax increase was clearly the public's preferred funding mechanism as evidenced by survey results (refer to Chapter Three - Survey).

In addition to the special funding mechanisms noted above, the Plan recommends that the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department continue to pursue Partnering efforts, increased Capital Improvement Program allocations, increased User Fees, Donations and Grants. These sources of funding would be used in combination with funding received through a sales tax increase or bond issue.

Several sources for Partnering efforts include: School District, Kansas State University, National Guard, and the Private Sector. The Plan further recommends that efforts toward Partnering for future Parks and Recreation projects be inclusive of the identification of roles and responsibilities of each partnering entity.

Several possible Grant opportunities include: The Outdoor Grant Program and Land and Water Conservation Funds through Kansas Wildlife and Parks, as well as TEA-21 Grants through the Department of Transportation and Nature/Education Program Grants available through a variety of charitable trusts and foundations.

The most critical deficiencies in the park system are included in the Plan Priority projects. It is recommended that funds received through special funding be utilized for phased implementation of each project, and address the Plan Support Activity Items collectively. If a sales tax increase is achieved, approximately 70% of the funds received would go toward the Plan Priority projects, while 30% of the funds would go toward the Operations and Maintenance Budget. As major park projects are completed, funds would be re-directed to emphasize Plan Support Activity Items as well as other park improvements and operations.

The benefits of a sales tax increase as a means for special funding of the strategies recommended in this report are threefold:

- Sales Tax is relatively easy to collect.
- Sales Tax reporting costs are fairly low.
- Sales Taxes generate substantial revenues for both capital improvements and operations and maintenance.

The City Finance Department projects that a 1/2 cent sales tax increase designated at 70% for capital improvements, and 30% for operations and maintenance costs would generate approximately $2.7 million per year and retire the funding of $10 million of Plan Priority projects within six years, at a cost of $11.34 million. Beginning in the year 2007, debt would again be incurred for completion of the final phase of the Plan Priority projects. This debt would be retired in year 2014.

Exhibit 1, "Example Action Plan/Timeline" in the Appendix of this report illustrates the strategies recommended, as well as example target dates for their implementation. The Plan recommends immediate financial planning to determine the type and level of taxation needed to achieve the recommended results.
CONCLUSION
The Strategic Park Plan is intended to provide implementation strategies for the recommendations offered in the 1992 Comprehensive Park Master Plan. It does not nullify any portion of it, rather it verifies and updates the needs established, offers priorities for build-out and land acquisition, and strategies for implementation of other recommended enhancements to the parks system for the next 15 year period.

The final recommendations were presented to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board July 12, 1999. At the conclusion of this meeting, a formal motion was made to approve the Strategic Park Plan. Attendees voted unanimous support.

The survey of public opinion clearly demands visionary action. Approximately 64% of the respondents polled, prioritized projects based on self interests. They responded differently when polled on the basis of community benefit. We believe this is a clear mandate for visionary leadership and a keen awareness of public need with respect to parks and recreation facilities. The Plan, and it’s planners including the Strategic Planning Committee advocate that the recommendations contained herein be approved and acted upon in the most expeditious manner possible.
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SOJOURNER TRUTH PARK
The property for the Sojourner Truth Park was acquired by the Parks and Recreation Department through an urban renewal program. The site is centrally located to the Southside neighborhood. The park design was completed by the Parks and Recreation Department in tandem with a series of meetings with the Southside Neighborhood Association. Participants were asked to identify neighborhood park needs, as well as offer comment on the resultant park layout and design.

One of the most unique and successful features of Sojourner Truth Park is an elaborate wildflower garden and arbor which anchor the north end of the site. Specific plants for the garden were selected for their butterfly-attracting qualities, as well as their adaptability and ease of maintenance. Other park components include a playground, and picnic areas, which were identified by the neighborhood as desired features for the park.

The park was dedicated in July of 1998 in honor of Sojourner Truth, a former slave who devoted her life to promoting education. The implementation of the improvements were made possible through a combination of volunteer labor of both the Parks and Recreation Department staff, and residents of the neighborhood, as well as paid Parks and Recreation man-hours. Some materials were donated and the balance absorbed in the annual Parks and Recreation budget.

STAGG HILL PARK
The property for the Stagg Hill Neighborhood Park was acquired shortly after completion of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan. Several lots within the Stagg Hill neighborhood were purchased from the developer and held in reserve for future development.

Park development was initiated and completed in 1998, following a series of neighborhood meetings in which residents identified the neighborhood park needs. The resultant design, completed by Parks and Recreation staff, incorporates the features desired by the area residents. Development of the park was funded through appropriations made in the annual Capital Improvement Program budget of the Parks and Recreation Department.

FAIRMONT PARK MASTER PLAN
The Master Plan for Fairmont Park was completed by Landplan Engineering in January 1998. The master plan and the ultimate development of the park will be a joint effort between the City of Manhattan, Riley County, and the Manhattan School District.

Fairmont Park is comprised of 110 acres located at the northeast intersection of K-177 and the Kansas River. The property is chiefly located within the Kansas River flood plain and in fact the availability of 63 of the 110 acres is the result of a FEMA buy-out process following the devastating flood of 1993, which devoured most of the residential development in the area. Several residents chose not to participate in the buy-out agreement, and thus have remained in their homes, which will ultimately be surrounded by park development.

Since the site is only partially within the limits of the City, it is lacking in utility services including sanitary sewer and electricity. The master plan recommends utilizing the water source which previously served the residential community, as well as renovation of the wellhouse at the park’s entry. Electrical service to the site is assumed to be a fairly reasonable endeavor, however the lack of sanitary sewer represents a challenge.

The final recommendations and layout for Fairmont Park represent a creative solution to two important criteria: the desire to preserve the natural habitat adjacent to the Kansas River, and
the stipulations of FEMA regarding restrictions on permanent structures within the flood zone. The resulting park theme is termed "passive recreation", and incorporates several unique features. Due to its remote location, a bicycle and pedestrian bridge connection to Manhattan was recommended to provide more convenient access to park users. The area between the levee and the Kansas River are to be preserved in their natural state with the exception of a series of nature trails offering opportunities for interpretation of the riparian habitat. A canoe launch, youth practice fields, playgrounds, a restroom building, picnic shelters, community gathering open-air plaza, looped trail system, community gardens, and a gateway piece complete the park design.

NORTHEAST COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN
The Northeast Community Park Master Plan was completed by Richard Allen of the Parks and Recreation Department in January of 1998.

The park site is located in the Northview area, adjacent to the abandoned Blue River channel which parallels the south property line. The Dixon Addition residential development borders the west property line, and a mix of agricultural land and open space border the remaining north and east property lines. The neighborhood is mainly residential in character, and incorporates the Northview Elementary School, Eisenhower Middle School, Armory, Northview Swimming Pool and Park, Harbour Park, and the Linear Trail Park. The location of the site is such that all major utilities are immediately available including: water, electricity, sewer, and gas.

After an extensive public process which included 12 public meetings, the resultant park master plan theme is termed "compromise". Community participants included supporters of neighborhood parks, natural parks, active recreation, and community park themes. The concept of a compromise that would include a little of each theme was ultimately chosen.

The north half of the Northeast Community Park includes a variety of sports fields such as baseball, soccer, basketball, tennis, and sand volleyball courts, organized around a trail system that links all major features of the park. The park is served by a single entrance drive from the south side of Knox Lane which penetrates the central zone of the site with a loop circulation pattern feeding two parking lots. The main features of the south half of the park include a 15 acre restored prairie, a 13 acre arboretum, and a Community Center / Nature Center of 10,000 square feet. Playgrounds, shelters and Restroom Buildings are illustrated in several locations throughout the park.

AQUATIC MASTER PLAN
The Aquatic Master Plan was completed by Larkin Associates in October, 1997. The purpose of the study was to provide an aquatic planning document that addressed existing conditions of the four municipal aquatic facilities, as well as expansion of the aquatic program. The plan offers recommendations for enhancements, repairs, replacements, and new aquatic facility developments for the City of Manhattan.

The four municipal aquatic facilities operated by the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department include: City Park Pool, CiCo Park Pool, Douglass Park Pool, and Northview Park Pool. Summaries of the conditions and recommended alterations are described below:

City Park Pool is the largest pool facility operated by the Parks and Recreation Department. The park and pool are centrally located within the City, and has an annual user attendance second only to CiCo Park Pool, despite the fact that it is twice the physical size of the CiCo Park Pool facility. The City Park Pool hosts a number of competitive swim meets, and serves as a general recreation pool use as well. The facility is considered to be in good condition.

The recommendations for City Park Pool include renovations to the bathhouse, filter building, and main pool in order to extend the life of the facility. It was further recommended that the
existing wading pool be replaced with facilities that accommodate fun and family recreation such as waterslides, a plunge pool, a zero-depth entry pool, water play features and shade structures. Parking deficiencies were also cited, and recommendations include the expansion of these facilities when enhancements are implemented.

Douglass Park Pool is the smallest pool facility in the parks system, and the oldest. Douglass Park is centrally located in the City, approximately five blocks southeast of City Park. It is the least used pool with an approximate average attendance of only 13 persons per day. The bathhouse, an old wood structure, was cited to be in poor condition, and while the pool has been recently repaired it continues to leak water. No wading area exists.

The recommendations for the Douglass Park Pool involved the removal and replacement of the pool and bathhouse with a new facility. Four options were presented, however no consensus has been reached regarding the desired development.

The first option would replace the bathhouse and pool which would include a small wading pool. This option would utilize the surrounding greenspace for the expansion. The second option would replace the pool and bathhouse with a water playground facility, offering year-round use, and require no supervision. The third option is to provide a small bathhouse and a zero-depth pool with no deep water. The fourth option is to remove the pool facility entirely and return the site to a neighborhood park use. It was cited that the nearby residents were most opposed to the fourth option.

Northview Park Pool is located within the northeast community, on a site shared with the Northview Elementary School and playgrounds. The pool serves as purely a recreation aquatic facility offering a medium sized pool, a small training pool, a wading pool, and bathhouse. It was cited that the projected development in the northeast district will overload the existing Northview Pool facility which is already often crowded. The existing site offers no room for expansion. The bathhouse and small pool are in fair condition, and the large pool is in need of repair.

The recommendations for the Northview Park Pool include the removal and reconstruction of an expanded facility in an alternative site east of the Northview School. It was further recommended that the new facility offer a larger main pool, with family play amenities similar to those recommended for City Park Pool. The facility should also include wading pools and zero-depth entry.

CiCo Park Pool is the newest aquatic facility in Manhattan. CiCo Park is located in west Manhattan, an area of continuing growth in the city. The pool facility experiences the greatest attendance of any pool in Manhattan, and is often overcrowded. The pool and bathhouse were cited to be in good condition and provide features that emphasize recreation and swimming instruction. The pool separation wall and fence are in need of repair.

The recommendations for CiCo Park Pool include the replacement of the wading pools with a larger shallow water pool that emphasizes family recreation and fun. The addition of water slides, zero-depth entry, water play features, and additional shade structures would also enhance this popular aquatic facility.

New Outdoor Pool Considerations were also analyzed in the Aquatic Master Plan. The recommendations include the addition of an aquatic facility in the west district of Manhattan to respond to the extensive growth the area is experiencing. The recommended facility should be of comparable size and features to that of the CiCo and City Park Pools. It was cited that the new facility could be combined with a Community Center.
New Indoor Pool Considerations were offered in light of the deficit of available indoor swimming facilities in Manhattan. The plan recommends that a new indoor pool facility be implemented to serve the community with facilities for year-round exercise, warm water for elderly citizens, swim team training, competitive events and family recreation. It was further recommended that the indoor pool facility be incorporated into a new Community Center in realize the efficiencies of shared use components such as locker and changing rooms.

Other Considerations
The Aquatic Master Plan provides an analysis of the operational concerns of the aquatic program as well, stating that revenues from pool admission fees and concession sales typically equate to between 53 - 63% of the annual operating costs, resulting in an annual operating deficit. The improvements recommended in the final report include several water play amenities and other elements that could substantially increase the ratio of revenue to operating cost. While doing so, it is important to note that some of these features will require additional staff (thereby potentially increasing operating costs). The report also recommends that an active marketing campaign be implemented once improvements are underway, in order to promote increased pool and pool program attendance.

LINEAR TRAIL PARK - PHASE II
Theis Doolittle Associates and Brent Bowman & Associates completed the Master Plan for the Phase II Linear Trail Park in Spring of 1998. The Phase II Master Plan completes the northern half of the perimeter loop around the City of Manhattan, and provides linkages to school sites, commercial areas, and places of special interest within and around the city. In addition, each trail segment was specifically routed to expose users to some of the most enjoyable landscapes and viewsheds of the area.

The Phase II trail begins at the existing terminus of the Phase I trail; the levee immediately south of the proposed Northeast Community Park. The trail proceeds north from the park site and crosses Knox Road to the south edge of the Blue River channel. The trail turns in a northwesterly direction along the river intersecting with a drainage channel entering from the west. Features along this section include the Riparian habitat and towering cottonwood trees along the river banks.

The trail follows the river connecting with a gas line easement turning northwest to Casement Road. Utilizing a drainage channel box culvert the trail goes under Casement Road then follows the southern edge of the channel to Eisenhower Middle School and on to Tuttle Creek Blvd. This trail section connects to future residential areas.

The trail crosses under Tuttle Creek Blvd. through an existing box culvert and proceeds west along the north edge of Marlatt Ave. Visual interests of this trail section include agricultural fields, and open vistas of the native Kansas landscape and the Blue River Valley, amidst a background of the Flint Hills to the north and east.

The route turns north for a short distance along College Avenue then turns northwest following a large draw through the Flint Hills framing the north edge of Manhattan until the intersection at Seth Child Road. To cross Seth Child, the trail will utilize a new box culvert where the trail leads to Marlatt Park and the Top of the World area. Dramatic views of the Flint Hills and City of Manhattan, stands of cedars and hardwoods in the draws, and hilltops of prairie grasses can be realized in this trail section.

The trail turns southwest and proceeds south until connecting with the existing Hudson Trail. The alignment turns west near the central portion of the Hudson Trail and follows along the edge of the proposed Colbert Hills development intersecting with the Little Kitten Creek. The trail turns south along the creek to Kimball Avenue which it follows until intersecting with
the future North Scenic Drive. This segment provides many connections to residential neighborhoods.

The trail then turns south along the west edge of Scenic Drive crossing under Anderson Avenue through a new culvert, then continues south across Wildcat Creek Road to Wildcat Creek. The trail proceeds under the Scenic Drive bridge then heads east to Anneberg Park along the north edge of Wildcat Creek. This last segment allows views of a Riparian Habitat on a different order than was seen along the Blue River. Hardwood trees are prominent.

Community participants throughout the planning phase requested that a series of "neighborhood loops" be implemented to allow for short-trip uses of the park system. The resultant plan provides for one primary route and several secondary loops:

- Along Blue River through Northview area.
- An extension from the Blue River area to Tuttle Creek.
- Segments through the Seth Child Road and Anthony Middle School area
- Segments from the Top of the World north to Tuttle Creek Reservoir
- Segments through Colbert Hills and within the residential area east of Scenic Dr.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PLAN
The Parks and Open Space Plan was completed in 1995 in order to assess the park and open space needs of the residents of Manhattan, as well as financing and acquisition methods. A public survey was conducted as the primary component of the study, and recommendations were made based on information obtained. It is important to note that the response rate was insufficient to make inferences about the total population. The survey indicated that to a considerable degree residents have a desire to maintain open space both within and beyond the city limits of Manhattan, particularly the openness of the natural Kansas landscape. The following summarizes the recommendations:

Future park and open space measures should be coordinated, funded, and executed to prevent future increases in sales and property tax, as taxpayers feel they are already contributing more than their fair share.

The report advocates the Partnering Concept, recommended in the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, particularly with Riley County, and the Manhattan School District.

The city should consider large community parks as an alternative to small pocket parks. The results indicated that large community parks in Manhattan provide a high degree of user satisfaction, while smaller neighborhood level parks are moderately satisfactory. It was noted that the lack of facilities and activities at neighborhood parks most likely determined the satisfaction level. In the future, quality of parks should be the issue, not quantity.

Developers should contribute to the future parks and open space. The study recommended land development fees be implemented on subdivisions, as well as possible incentives to encourage developers to incorporate more parks and open space in their subdivisions.

The study recommends consideration of privatization of parks in residential subdivisions in order to maximize public need and minimize public cost.

A recommendation that the public sector commit to achieving National Recreation and Parks Association Standards in future parks and open space development.
GATEWAY TO MANHATTAN PLAN
The Gateway to Manhattan Plan was prepared as an update to the 1991 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, focusing on two planning areas located south of the Kansas River in the unincorporated area of Riley County. The plan was completed in January of 1998 and was a joint effort between the City of Manhattan and Riley County, with the assistance of Shafer, Kline & Warren, Inc., and participation of a 93-member Focus Group.

The project was initiated by the City and County in response to two events subsequent to the completion of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan; the expansion of K-177 to a four-lane divided highway, and a petition by citizens to create a sewer benefit district. These events caused both the City and County to reassess the assumptions and recommendations of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan regarding these project areas.

Early in the planning process the Focus Group participants were asked to develop a 20-year vision for the project area. The resultant vision statement served as the basis for the recommendations included in the Gateway to Manhattan Plan. The vision statement is as follows:

The Southern Gateway to Manhattan is a picturesque entrance
that says welcome to a center of history, culture, education, progressive development, and
environmental beauty.

The project area encompasses two major entrance ways into Manhattan; K-177 which includes the hilltops of both the Konza Prairie and Flint Hills where the views and vistas are scenic and generally undisrupted, and Highway 18 with the Flint Hills on one side and the Kansas River Floodplain on the other. Consequently, the recommendations of the Gateway to Manhattan Plan focus both the typical planning issues of providing appropriate level of services for development within the project area, to the more aesthetic goals of protecting and conserving the natural and rural character of the native landscape, and preserving important viewsheds.

Though the Gateway to Manhattan Plan was not initiated by the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department, its relevance to the future development of the parks system exists. The Future Land Use Map was amended by this study to include a large expanse of park land adjacent to the 40 acres of parkland already owned in the Fairmont district bordering the Kansas River. The intent is to provide the means to conserve the space beyond the proposed Fairmont Park development for a future sewage treatment facility.

Though the Gateway to Manhattan Plan was completed in January of 1998, it has not been adopted by the City of Manhattan and is currently being revised.

CITY/UNIVERSITY BICYCLE MASTER PLAN
The mission of the City/University Bicycle Master Plan is to create a safe, convenient, and fun environment to bicycle for personal transportation and recreation within Manhattan. The Master Plan was initiated by a joint effort between Manhattan Parks and Recreation and Kansas State University, and was completed in 1997 by LandPlan Engineering and Bicycle & Planning Consultants. Its purpose is to create a structure for future development of bicycle facilities to respond to both short and long term needs.

The goals of the Bicycle Master Plan outlined in the study include a public awareness component to send the message that bicyclists belong in the community. It is also anticipated that implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan will result in increased frequency of bicycle use for every day transportation. Other goals cited in the study include improved safety and access of bicyclists, and the enhancement of recreational opportunities for the community.

The plan envisions a coordinated inter-connected system of bicycle lanes, routes, pathways, and ancillary facilities such as signage and bicycle parking, which facilitate safe and convenient
access for cyclists to various destinations throughout Manhattan. It is intended that the routing of the Bicycle Master Plan tie into the routing of the Linear Trail Park, providing access for all residents of Manhattan at several linkage points.

Some of the project is currently being funded through the Manhattan Public Works Department budgets for routine maintenance and overlays. These improvements however are limited to re-striping of pavement, and pavement of shoulder areas. The Plan also cites the funding opportunities for ISTEA Grants for the transportation-based improvement project.
COMMUNITY MEETING NOTES

Manhattan Parks and Recreation
Strategic Park Plan
Community Meeting
September 17, 1998

This was the first of four Community Meetings held for the Manhattan Park and Recreation Strategic Park Planning Study. It was held at the Manhattan Arts Center at 7:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the community to the planning project, the Strategic Planning Committee and Consultant Team, and to hear input on their concerns and desires for the future development of the Manhattan Park and Recreation system.

After a brief introduction by Terry DeWeese, Lorie and Brent Bowman engaged the audience in a slide presentation illustrating the evolution of the Manhattan Park System, beginning with a photograph taken in the mid 1850's. The presentation also included several slides of some current park facilities, and ended on a map illustrating the locations of existing parks and trails, as well as masterplanned parks and trails within the city.

At the conclusion of the slide presentation, Lorie Bowman reviewed the goals and recommendations that resulted from the Comprehensive Park Master Plan completed in 1992. She presented final renderings and offered summaries of each park master plan completed in the last 8 years which include: Fairmont Park, Northeast Community Park, Linear Trail Park Phase II, City/University Bicycle Trail, and the Aquatic Study.

An "open slate" forum was then initiated in which the audience was asked to comment on two specific issues:

- What park and recreation facilities do you believe should be a priority for implementation?
- What type of funding do you believe is appropriate for future park development?

The following comments were made regarding priorities for future development:

1. "Don't spend money on Fairmont Park, it's in the flood plain and nobody lives nearby."

2. "We like the Fairmont area as a nature area, but it doesn't need to be developed."

3. "Warner Park is not a nature park anymore."

4. "Our interest is in nature."

5. "In-Line skating/skate boards -- a park for this is needed -- Salina did one, Lawrence is going to use their existing tennis courts."

6. Community Youth Council Representatives
7. Need skate park.
8. Need indoor recreation facility.


10. "A Skate Park would be best located centrally, we use it after school." (kids)

11. "Cops won't let us skate anywhere, so this (a skate park) would keep us off the streets and the cops doing more important things". (young skater)

12. "Indoor swimming facility is my highest priority."
13. "Indoor swimming is my priority."
14. Fairbanks, Alaska and Rockville, Maryland have great facilities.
15. "Interior improvements to Douglass Center are needed."

16. "We need a large indoor (like Battle Creek, Mich.) recreation center, centrally or north centrally located." "A lot more important than Fairmont, Park."

17. "We need more activities for our Job Corps students in winter....more things for all kids to do in winter."

18. "We have six parks within a few city blocks, Longs etc....Where is the money going to come from? The comment was made that we perhaps need to eliminate some and establish other priorities."

19. "My interest is finishing the north coop of Linear Park, (Kimball & Browning are east/west traffic problems).

20. "Need to get over and under Tuttle Creek Blvd with the Linear Park."

21. "The skating area in City Park is too small, especially for hockey."

22. "We need to update play equipment at Long's Park."
23. Truth Park is toddler friendly - a great secret.
24. Lower sandbox for little kids in City Park.

25. "Nature parks are my priority. The only real nature park is the Konza Prairie. Warner should be restored as a nature park."

The following comments were made regarding funding for park development:

- Karen McCulloh: Foundations are a good idea, Ithaca, New York has Ithaca “dollars” and some % goes to the Parks Department.
- Battle Creek, Michigan has gift certificates, and the school gets a share....from Merchant. KM “legal tender throughout city”
- Another Quality of Life Bond Issue.
- "Pursue grants -- lots of money out there"
- Job Corps Representative #1 -- Pursue funding for Youth Programs
- Job Corps Representative #2 -- Focus on the benefits of indoor recreation on youth behavior.
- Female college student -- Focus on benefits for youth recreation its our future. -- raise sales tax.
- Raise Users’ Fees. (Like groups use)
- Anneberg & Linear Park are great increases of family use of Park facilities.
- Wichita’s indoor skate park is great, also has good outdoor skate park. (Two separate facilities).
- Neighborhood (parks) should have local financial support.
- What about an earnings tax?
- Quality of Life Bond Issue should be considered again.
- Boys that are interested in skate parks should be involved in their planning.
- Volunteer efforts could be considered for support. Maybe we need a Friends of the Park organization.
- Foundation is critical!
- Warner Park endangered by Wal-Mart on Johns’ property -- lighting and grading.
- Karen McCulloh - do some chart w/ property tax implications of various scale of projects.
# Community Meeting 9/17/98 Sign-Up Sheet

Manhattan Parks and Recreation Strategic Park Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Mail Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ann Perl</td>
<td>110 Courthouse Plaza, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bob &amp; Mary Rogers</td>
<td>1121 Pierre, Manhattan, KS 66502-5450</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eugene J. Laughlin</td>
<td>1528 Williamsberg, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Verlyn Richards</td>
<td>1528 Williamsberg, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>J. Taylor</td>
<td>3312 Newbury, Manhattan, KS 66503</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gustin Mace</td>
<td>310 15th Street, Ogden, KS 66517</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Jake Conner</td>
<td>11072 Waler Rd</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Nate Docsett</td>
<td>1715 Leavenworth, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Joe Malone</td>
<td>4415 Boller Rd., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Chris Koehler</td>
<td>3005 Geneva Dr., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Alec Sun</td>
<td>2509 Candlecrest Circle, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Sheen Hua</td>
<td>1758 Kings Road, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Seth Chandler</td>
<td>1421 Givens Rd., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Jane Gibson</td>
<td>1427 Leavenworth, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ed Klimek</td>
<td>2928 Gary Ave, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sylvia Beeman</td>
<td>1744 Leavenworth, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dave MacFarland</td>
<td>2030 Hunting Ave, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Janet Benson</td>
<td>401 Denison Ave., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Jeff Hilges</td>
<td>1965 College Heights, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Cathy Bylinowski</td>
<td>1604 Hillcrest Apt. 25, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dallas Skare</td>
<td>1924 Plymouth Rd, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Jenny Finlen</td>
<td>1430 Hartman Pl. #3, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Mariah Isern</td>
<td>3023 Sandstone Apt. 9, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Don Parish</td>
<td>1400 Poyntz, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Janis Teague</td>
<td>2119 Tamarron Terrace, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in attendance: Terry DeWeese, Richard Allen, Jim Colley, Jerry Dishman, Don Combs, Brent Bowman, Lorie Bowman.
Manhattan Parks and Recreation
Strategic Park Plan
Community Meeting
September 22, 1998

This was the second of four Community Meetings held for the Manhattan Park and Recreation Strategic Park Planning Study. It was held at the Riley County Seniors Service Center at 7:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the community to the planning project, the Strategic Planning Committee and Consultant Team, and to hear input on their concerns and desires for the future development of the Manhattan Parks and Recreation system.

After a brief introduction by Richard Allen, Lorie and Brent Bowman engaged the audience in a slide presentation illustrating the evolution of the Manhattan Park System, beginning with a photograph taken in the mid 1850's. The presentation also included several slides of some current park facilities, and ended on a map illustrating the locations of existing parks and trails, as well as masterplanned parks and trails within the city.

At the conclusion of the slide presentation, Lorie Bowman reviewed the goals and recommendations that resulted from the Comprehensive Park Master Plan completed in 1992. She presented final renderings and offered summaries of each park master plan completed in the last 8 years which include: Fairmont Park, Northeast Community Park, Linear Trail Park Phase II, City/University Bicycle Trail, and the Aquatic Study.

An "open slate" forum was then initiated in which the audience was asked to comment on two specific issues:

- What park and recreation facilities do you believe should be a priority for implementation?
- What type of funding do you believe is appropriate for future park development?

The following comments were made:

1. John Carlin: "Wasn't there a collaboration strategy with the National Guard for an indoor pool?" These exist in Derby and Olathe. This should be considered.

2. "Was a SW location ever considered for a new pool?"

3. R. Allen: "This was identified as a future location."

4. "Indoor recreation needs discussed"

5. Ice hockey is needed.

6. City Sticker tax similar to Kansas City, Missouri.

7. Discussed user fees at the Sunset Zoo.

8. "I support NE Park & Canoe Launch at Fairmont, indoor pool, extension of Linear Park."

9. Student: Discussed the notion of a Skate Park -- "students hang out there as well as skate". (From her experience in Virginia.)

10. Needs are for both Skate Park and a larger rink for hockey, etc.

11. Admit basketball has been displaced by "Traveling Basketball".
12. Student: "indoor rock climbing is a big desire at KSU."

13. Gerry Reek: Some of the far flung ideas may need to be public/private partnerships.

14. Jim Colley: Maybe there could be privately funded commercial components to a public recreation center...like an indoor soccer facility.

15. "I would love to see a better location for Farmer's Market."

16. Sales Tax pays for one half of the children's program, User's Fees make up the other one half.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Meeting September 22, 1998 Sign-Up Sheet</th>
<th>Manhattan Parks and Recreation Strategic Park Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jim Colley, 1101 Fremont, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>Mail Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Richard Allen, 1101 Fremont, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Christy Speigel, 1605 Hillcrest Dr. X-23, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Andi Caldwell, 717 Humboldt #1, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arlene Carlson, 2712 Aspen, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Elaine Mohr, 800 S. Juliette Ave, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Susan Gordon, 531 Bertrand, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kyle Harsha, 1083 Wildcat Creek Rd., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. John Carlin, 1401 Meadow Ln., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in attendance: Richard Allen, Jim Colley, Jerry Dishman, Don Combs, Jerry Reeck, Brent Bowman, Lorie Bowman.
Manhattan Parks and Recreation
Strategic Park Plan
Community Meeting
September 23, 1998

This was the third of four Community Meetings held for the Manhattan Park and Recreation Strategic Park Planning Study. It was held at the Northview Elementary School Gymnasium at 7:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the community to the planning project, the Strategic Planning Committee and Consultant Team, and to hear input on their concerns and desires for the future development of the Manhattan Park and Recreation system.

After a brief introduction by Richard Allen, Brent Bowman engaged the audience in a slide presentation illustrating the evolution of the Manhattan Park System, beginning with a photograph taken in the mid 1850’s. The presentation also included several slides of some current park facilities, and ended on a map illustrating the locations of existing parks and trails, as well as masterplanned parks and trails within the city.

At the conclusion of the slide presentation, Brent reviewed the goals and recommendations that resulted from the Comprehensive Park Master Plan completed in 1992. He presented final renderings and offered summaries of each park master plan completed in the last 8 years which include: Fairmont Park, Northeast Community Park, Linear Trail Park Phase II, City/University Bicycle Trail, and the Aquatic Study.

An “open slate” forum was then initiated in which the audience was asked to comment on two specific issues:

- What park and recreation facilities do you believe should be a priority for implementation?
- What type of funding do you believe is appropriate for future park development?

The following comments were made:

1. Park component of new golf course important.
2. Northview Park - concerned with financing for it, possibly being lumped into bond issue for development of new parks.
3. Need to find dollars elsewhere.
4. Concerned that many of city's youth live in Northview area and don't have adequate park space.
5. Warner Park trail with no access; “crummy” parking and access.
6. Is there a plan for money distribution for parks throughout the city in the future?
7. Currently unbalanced throughout city; wants a balance to not just acreage, but dollars spent.
8. Studies on youth distribution would facilitate distribution of dollars and space of parks.
10. Concerns with school “public” areas (fields, gyms, etc.) not readily accessible to community due to greater need by schools.

11. Need for some of older facilities to be replaced: such as community center.

12. Need to work with schools and communities supporting schools in park planning.

13. Funding Opportunities - parks used for learning opportunities and accessible for schools could open up grants and other revenues; could draw volunteers.

14. Counter - bring schools to parks instead of making parks close to schools.

15. Have schools “reach out into community”; promote interaction.

16. Second park needed in northeast portion of the city (over next 15 years).

17. Use specific funding possibilities on survey.

18. Ways to include youth priorities - interview students.

19. Correspondence if we could make students understand importance in their lives and optimum age group should be sought out.

20. Making decisions on mainly what students want could be very nonproductive, as would the opposite.

21. Developing Park further from city center beneficial for flora and fauna conservation and enjoyment.

22. “Currently most of our parks are sports oriented.”

23. “Most of our larger parks currently are “drive-to” facilities.”

24. “What about dotting city with community parks that are smaller?”

25. “What about developing bike trails for safe access to exterior parks?”

26. “Once park is developed, educate schools with photos and such to show kids what is available and continue to “sell” the park.

27. Overall theme seemed to be working with schools before, during, and after parks developed.

28. The public survey will be made available at the Library and advertisements in the Mercury/Collegian.


30. Look for dollars within community - invested interest.

31. Multi-use indoor recreation center “where everyone is considered” - i.e. childcare.
### Community Meeting 9/23/98 Sign-Up Sheet
Manhattan Parks and Recreation Strategic Park Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Mail Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Janet Benson</td>
<td>401 Denison Avenue, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delores B. Thomas</td>
<td>1523 Williamsburg, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A. J. (Jim) Thomas</td>
<td>1523 Williamsburg, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mark Morgan</td>
<td>709 Canyon Dr., Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>William Warner</td>
<td>1907 Bluestem Terrace, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Steve Pfister</td>
<td>1908 Tulip Terrace, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mark Kinnaman</td>
<td>3701 Crossgate Circle, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>El Klimke</td>
<td>2928 Gary Avenue, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Katie Philp</td>
<td>1723 Little Kitten, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Brodersen</td>
<td>2120 Halls Landing, Manhattan, KS 66502</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Geri Rademacher</td>
<td>419 Oakview Drive, St. George, KS</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doug Benson</td>
<td>233 Harvey Drive</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in attendance: Richard Allen, Jim Colley, Jerry Dishman, Brent Bowman, Jodi Loy.
Manhattan Parks and Recreation
Strategic Park Plan
Community Meeting
October 1, 1998

This was the last of four Community Meetings held for the Manhattan Park and Recreation Strategic Park Planning Study. It was held at the Amanda Arnold Elementary School Gymnasium at 7:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the community to the planning project, the Strategic Planning Committee and Consultant Team, and to hear input on their concerns and desires for the future development of the Manhattan Park and Recreation system.

After a brief introduction by Terry DeWeese, Lorie and Brent Bowman engaged the audience in a slide presentation illustrating the evolution of the Manhattan Park System, beginning with a photograph taken in the mid 1850's. The presentation also included several slides of some current park facilities, and ended on a map illustrating the locations of existing parks and trails, as well as masterplanned parks and trails within the city.

At the conclusion of the slide presentation, Lorie Bowman reviewed the goals and recommendations that resulted from the Comprehensive Park Master Plan completed in 1992. She presented final renderings and offered summaries of each park master plan completed in the last 8 years which include: Fairmont Park, Northeast Community Park, Linear Trail Park Phase II, City/University Bicycle Trail, and the Aquatic Study.

An "open slate" forum was then initiated in which the audience was asked to comment on two specific issues:

- What park and recreation facilities do you believe should be a priority for implementation?
- What type of funding do you believe is appropriate for future park development?

The following comments were made:
3.1 De Ann Waldron: Saw a park in Columbia, MO; Cosmopolitan Park or "Cosmo Park". 500 acres with a 2 acre playground that was outstanding. Play area incorporated tunnels, bridges, tube slides, etc. She would like to see something similar implemented in Manhattan.

2. Butterfly Garden at Truth Park provides a first-class introduction to butterflies! There is a need for more nature-oriented activities to be family inclusive, interactive.

3. Jim Sherow, Flint Hills Sierra Club Chairman: Need to hire a naturalist to oversee maintenance and management of park and recreation facilities. Cited Warner Park where the need is great. He is committed to riparian habitat area in Fairmont, and would support the City/University Bike Trail project as well. He is in support of another Quality of Life Bond Issue.

4. We need a center for children (older) to gather after school. Mixed use.....Gym, etc.

5. A skate park is desired (kids). Right now they have to go to Salina and Lawrence to skate. These are being built all over the state.

6. KSU student: a park for skating should be built...they are doing one in Hutchison, Kansas.

7. Water play areas for children are fun. (Not incorporated in swimming pool.) More of a water playground with water guns, etc. Hutchison has one that recently won ASLA award.
8. Taxation is not the best method for funding. First part of Linear Trail Park was not cost effective as a youth activity.


10. Warner Park - volunteers should help clean it up.

11. Explore alternative recreation ideas, like Frisbee golf.

---

Community Meeting 10/1/98 Sign-Up Sheet
Manhattan Parks and Recreation Strategic Park Plan:

1. Keri Moser, 1850 Claflin, Apt. 7, Manhattan, KS 66502
2. Brandi Butler, 2959 Prairie Star Drive, Manhattan, KS 66503
3. Matt McClure, 312 N. 15th St., Manhattan, KS 66502
4. Ty Cecil, 617 Bertrand St., Manhattan, KS 66502
5. Shawn Frost, 1110 Claflin Road, #201, Manhattan, KS 66502
6. Les McDonald, 1622 Osage, Manhattan, KS 66502
7. Rebecca Haag, 3000 Tuttle Creek #86, Manhattan, KS 66502
8. Angie Kowalski, 5926 Ashby #1, Ft. Riley, KS 66442
9. Ryan Weir, 2318 Indian Mound Lane, Manhattan, KS 66502
10. Patrick Trier, 1965 College Heights, Manhattan, KS 66502
11. Sara Bidwell, 1524 Nichols, Manhattan, KS 66503
12. Greg Jolley, 809 Glenstone Circle, Manhattan, KS 66502
13. Troy Henningson, 904 Gardenway, Manhattan, KS 66502
14. Jay Grader, 2558 Candlecrest Circle, Manhattan, KS 66503
15. Taylor Gould, 527 Laramie, Manhattan, KS 66502
16. Madonna Stallmann, 7705 Lakeside Avenue, Manhattan, KS 66502
17. Jason Lankas, 3407 Musil Drive, Manhattan, KS 66503
18. Don Combs, 217 Carlisle Terrace, Manhattan, KS 66503
19. Jim Sherow, 2821 Arbor Drove, Manhattan, KS 66503
20. Paul Tayler (?), 701 N. 9th Street, #9, Manhattan, KS 66502
21. Reginald B. Murray, 515 Allen Road, Manhattan, KS 66502
22. Adrienne Kirkwood, 1812 Elaine Drive, Manhattan, KS 66502
23. Matthew Ohm, 1131 Thurston St., Manhattan, KS 66502
24. Cameran Hawk, 3115 Harrahey Ridge, Manhattan, KS 66503
25. Ryan McCants, 3904 Westbank Court, Manhattan, KS 66503
26. Li Jing, 1409 Normandy Place, Apt. 215, Manhattan, KS 66502
27. Marion Kundiger, 723 Pottawatomie Avenue, Manhattan, KS 66502

Mail Survey: yes
STRATEGIC PARK PLAN
CITIZEN SURVEY

The Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department is in the process of preparing a Strategic Park Plan for the City of Manhattan, to guide development for the next 15-20 years. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, who is overseeing the completion of the Plan, has been gathering information from the community through public meetings, meeting surveys, and letter correspondence. The Board is very interested in public opinion and your household has been chosen at random to provide opinions about the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Strategic Park Plan. All information you provide will be strictly CONFIDENTIAL.

Because this is a random survey, your prompt response to complete the survey and return it in the prepaid envelope will be very much appreciated. By taking the time to complete the survey, YOUR WATER BILL ACCOUNT WILL BE CREDITED 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 write or fill-in the appropriate circle that denotes your response to each question, and RETURN THE SURVEY BY NOVEMBER 5, 1998.

We thank you in advance for your participation as we plan for the future of our park and recreation system.

1. What area of Manhattan do you live? ____________________________

2. Which of the following age groups applies to you?
   ○ under 18  ○ 18-24  ○ 25-35  ○ 36-45  ○ 46-55  ○ 56-65  ○ Over 65

3. How many occupants in your household?  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5  ○ More than 5

4. Do you...  ○ Own your home?  ○ Rent your home?

5. Do you expect to live in Manhattan five years from now:  ○ yes  ○ no

6. How many years have you been a resident of Manhattan?
   ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5  ○ More than 5

7. Are you currently enrolled as a college student?  ○ yes  ○ no
The following items A - I, describe proposed enhancements to the Manhattan Park and Recreation system. Please use this list for your response to questions 8 through 10.

A. Outdoor pool improvements: An aquatic study was completed that proposed improvements to CiCo, City Park, and Douglass Park pools, and recommended a replacement facility for the Northview Park pool.

B. Indoor Recreation Center: This would probably include gymnasiums, multipurpose rooms, and offices for community use.

C. Indoor Swimming Facility: This facility could be incorporated into an indoor recreation center complex.

D. Northeast Community Park: The proposed park includes a nature center/community room, grasslands, arboretum, soccer and baseball practice fields, playground, and volleyball courts.

E. Fairmont Park: The proposed park includes nature trails, sports fields, shelters, nature trail along the river, canoe launch, and open space. The park land is owned by both the City of Manhattan and Riley County.

F. Linear Trail Park Phase II: The Phase II trail extension would provide the northern half of the proposed perimeter loop around Manhattan. The trail will make connections to Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools, as well as other features along its course.

G. Land acquisition for future parks and open space: Land acquired would be conserved for future park developments and natural areas.

H. City/University Bike Trail: The proposed bike trail provides routing for cyclists through the heart of Manhattan.

I. Other: _____________________________________________________________

8. Of the items A - I listed above, what item would you rank most important? ______

9. What item do you believe the entire community would rank most important? ______

10. Which of the following funding strategies would you deem most appropriate for any or all of the park system enhancements described above?

   O Increased property tax through a bond issue
   O Sales Tax Increase
   O Increased property tax through City Capital Improvement Program

11. Please note any comments you may have regarding the services and facilities operated by the Manhattan Park and Recreation Department.
COMPARABLE FOUNDATIONS RESEARCH

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS PARKS FOUNDATION
The San Antonio Parks Foundation was established in 1981. It is a non-profit organization, tied in Mission to the San Antonio Parks and Recreation Department. They have their own charter and by-laws. It is designed to provide advocacy and financial support for park initiatives. The Park and Recreation Department typically develops a “wish list” of efforts needing attention. The foundation board chooses which to implement. Because of the historic nature of San Antonio, this foundation tends to be more geared toward restoration or rebuilding of existing park projects, however they have done their share of work toward development of new parks. Their work seldom includes involvement in recreation programming.

Fundraising is a major focus of this foundation. Charitable donations are their primary source of funding, supplemented also through Federal and City funds, grants, and private citizens groups. The City of San Antonio provides extensive in-kind services to the foundation.

The foundation has occasionally acquired land through charitable contributions, however this is not their main purpose. They merely act as intermediary to inventory the land eventually giving it to the city when ready for park development. These lands have typically not required maintenance prior to development.

The foundation also serves as a repository of funds for less formal groups (such as neighborhood interest groups), who do not otherwise have the means to take-on park system projects. In this way, they provide the tax exempt status, banking, and accounting services for the duration of the project, and have even assisted these smaller groups in the seeking of grants.

The foundation has nine board members who are all very well-connected in the community. They meet typically four times per year, however they are available to meet on a more frequent basis if the need arises. Only recently did this foundation develop the paid position of the Executive Director, a woman who previously served four terms as Mayor of San Antonio. Up until that time the board members and an extensive group of dedicated volunteers handled the entire foundation effort which includes the implementation of three annual fundraising events: Jazz Alive, Celebrate San Antonio, and the Hispanic State Fair. The board is supported by a large group of dedicated volunteers.

IDAHO FOUNDATION FOR PARKS & LANDS
The Idaho Foundation for Parks & Lands is a non-profit, multi-agency foundation serving the state of Idaho. They exist to preserve and protect Idaho lands, in keeping with the highest goals of land use and management. Their primary role is land holding. They serve as fiduciary for funds, sometimes funneling to organizations or public entities. They often team up with other groups as an added enhancement to a project. Facilitating “tax benefits” is not their predominate reason for existence. They have several creative land acquisition techniques, as well as creative ways to handle maintenance prior to handing over to a public entity for development. The organization is funded through charitable donations, and they currently have land holdings worth over 6 million dollars. They receive no funding subsidy from other public entities.

The 17-Member Board of Directors is considered larger than necessary, in fact the director confided that a board of eleven is preferred, as is a board of an odd number. The board meets regularly, three times per year.

TRUST FOR PUBLIC LANDS and the LAND TRUST ALLIANCE
The vast amount of published information made available by both the Trust For Public Lands, and the Land Trust Alliance has served as a valuable resource for the research involved in this study.
GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PARKS AND RECREATION FOUNDATION

The following guidelines are recommended for the start-up of the Parks and Recreation Foundation. These guidelines include responsibilities of both the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Foundation.

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT SUPPORT:

As a start-up measure, the Parks and Recreation Department shall conduct interviews of several key Manhattan citizens in order to establish the first 5-6 Board Members of the Foundation. The consultants of the Strategic Park Plan have offered to assist with this effort.

Parks and Recreation Department staff shall meet with the original Board Members in order to initiate formation of the full Board of Directors, recommended to ultimately include 11-15 people. A start-up information packet should be prepared and distributed to all members. The Parks and Recreation Department shall assist the Foundation in start-up and progress.

The Parks and Recreation Department shall coordinate with the Foundation to implement the land acquisition strategies recommended in the Strategic Park Plan. (Reference Land Acquisition Strategies Exhibit, Chapter Four.)

The Parks and Recreation Department shall be available for assessments of potential sites, meetings with land owners and lessors, and offer any necessary assistance in negotiations.

The Parks and Recreation Department shall facilitate City approvals of land acquisitions as Foundation-sponsored projects solidify.

The Parks and Recreation Department shall make facilities and resources available to the Foundation such as: meeting space, paper reproductions, fax machines, etc.

The Parks and Recreation Department shall provide administrative and support services as needed.

The Parks and Recreation Department shall keep the Foundation informed of the progress made toward implementation of the Strategic Park Plan, as well as any modifications or changes in needs.

FOUNDATION BOARD MEMBER START-UP AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
The Board of Directors should be a diverse group of individuals who are well respected in the community. It is preferred that some members have expertise in public relations, while others have expertise in finance and financial management, real-estate, and law. All members should stay abreast of progress and nurture awareness of potential opportunities for contributions/donations.

The following outlines the start-up measures for the Parks and Recreation Foundation Board Members:

The 5 or 6 original Directors should strive to build the remaining board of 9 - 10 additional members within the first six months. This process will involve the selection of an Administrative Assistant.
The Foundation should work to formalize their Mission Statement, Goals, and Objectives. These should be a clear, realistic, statement of purpose, including the public interests to be served, and the beneficiaries of the Foundation's programs.

The Foundation should develop and adopt By-laws which address the following:

Board Member Responsibilities

Board Meetings

Basic Procedures and Policies including quorum and Meeting Notices, decision-making authority, conflict of interest, compensation, board size and diversity, etc.

The Foundation should file for Nonprofit Incorporation with the State.

The Foundation should file for tax exempt status with the Federal Government.

The Foundation should develop a plan for attending to the reporting requirements in order to maintain nonprofit and tax exempt status.

The Foundation should identify their needs for an acquisition agent, paid staff (if any), consultants, or volunteers. The Foundation must ensure that every transaction is legally and technically sound, and take steps to avoid future legal problems. Obtaining reliable and appropriate real estate, tax, financial and land management expertise for each transaction will be required.

The Foundation should develop a public relations campaign and informational brochure for circulation to charitable organizations, area businesses and consultants, and other members of the community.

The Foundation should develop a Financial and Asset Management Program to ensure that the Foundation manages its finances and assets in a thoroughly responsible and accountable way.

The Foundation shall meet regularly with the Parks and Recreation Department for input on projects. The Foundation shall collaborate with the Parks and Recreation Department to coordinate the evaluation of potential sites in order to ensure that every property acquired results in some public benefit.

The Foundation shall collaborate with the Parks and Recreation Department to ensure that land acquired and conserved for future development, is done so according to the standards established by the Parks and Recreation Department.

The Foundation shall stay abreast of changing laws and regulations that could effect all transactions.

THE PARKS AND RECREATION FOUNDATION AS A SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

If the Parks and Recreation Foundation is established as a Supporting Organization of a Greater Manhattan Community Foundation some tax benefits and administrative efficiencies may be realized that are not otherwise possible. The following identifies these and other considerations:
1. One of the advantages of a Community Foundation is to offer the administrative services, financial reporting, and consulting services for many smaller foundations within their service area. A transition of the Parks and Recreation Foundation into a Supporting Organization of a Community Foundation could thereby eliminate/decrease staffing and operating costs not otherwise possible. For these services, the Parks and Recreation Foundation would pay an annual maintenance fee to the Community Foundation based on the level of services rendered.

The Greater Kansas City Community Foundation estimates that operating costs for a Private Foundation average 1.9% of holdings. Those under $1,000,000 in assets had average costs of 4.8%, while those of $1-$10 million had costs of 3%.

2. The Parks and Recreation Foundation as a Supporting Organization of the Community Foundation may make grants and take other actions without requiring approval of the Community Foundation.

3. The Parks and Recreation Foundation as a Supporting Organization of the Community Foundation is far easier to establish once the Community Foundation is established, than it would be to establish a Private Foundation.

4. If the Parks and Recreation Foundation is a Supporting Organization of the Community Foundation, it may receive charitable contributions through "un-designated gifts" made to the Community Foundation, thereby increasing the benefits to the overall community.

5. If the Parks and Recreation Foundation is a Supporting Organization of the Community Foundation, it can offer the most advantageous tax benefits to donors (20% higher than that offered by a Private Foundation for cash contributions, as well as higher deductions for capital gain of real-estate donations).

6. A Supporting Organization of a Community Foundation pays no excise tax on investment income and net realized capital gain (usually 1-2% for Private Foundations).

7. A Supporting Organization of a Community Foundation eliminates the required minimum pay-out annually, offering the ability to accumulate funds toward a sizable project or grant. (This pay-out typically equates to 5% of average asset value for Private Foundations.) Additionally, Supporting Organizations have the ability to hold low yield property.

8. A Supporting Organization of a Community Foundation would be automatically covered by the Community Foundation's liability and office insurance policies.
PARK SITE SELECTION WORK SHEET

TOTAL SCORE ____________________________

PARK SITE NAME ____________________________

1. Does the land have over 42 acres? List number of acres. _____
   a. yes
   b. no

2. What are the views to the site?
   1. Attractive
   2. Good
   3. Poor

3. What are the views from the site?
   1. Attractive
   2. Good
   3. Poor

4. What is the distance of city water main to the site?
   a. Adjacent to Site
   b. More than a 1,000 feet from site

5. What is the distance of City Sanitary Sewer to the site?
   a. Adjacent to Site
   b. More than a 1,000 feet from site

6. What is the distance of 480 Three Phase Electrical Service to site?
   a. Adjacent to Site
   b. More than a 1,000 feet from site

7. What is the distance of Telephone Service to the site?
   a. Adjacent to Site
   b. More than a 1,000 feet from site

6. What percentage of the vegetation on site needs to be removed for development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Type</th>
<th>Percentage Removes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wooded Area</td>
<td>10  25  40  55  60  75  90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Woody shrubs</td>
<td>8    9    10   11   12   13   14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Land</td>
<td>2    3    4    5    6    7    8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Land</td>
<td>1    2    3    4    5    6    7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What is the predominate landform of the site?  
   1. Flat (0-2% slope)  
   2. Gradual (2-4% slope)  
   3. Moderate (4-6%)  
   4. Steep (6%-10%)  

11. How does the water shed affect the drainage in the area?  
   1. Drain away from the site  
   2. Drain onto the site  

11. What flood boundaries does the site contain?  
   1. No flood boundaries  
   2. 500 year flood boundary  
   3. 100 year flood boundary  
   4. Floodway Fringe  
   5. Floodway  

12. Does the site contain any structures or barriers that would need to be removed?  
   1. Large Expense  
   2. Moderate Expense  
   3. Minimal Expense  

13. Does the site contain any hazards?  
   1. Large Expense  
   2. Moderate Expense  
   3. Minimal Expense  

14. What are the adjacent land use next to the site?  
   1. Agriculture  
   2. Residential  
   3. Commercial  
   4. Industrial  
   5. Public  

15. Does the land have room for future expansion?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No  

16. What is the predominate soil type on site?  
   1. Silt  
   2. Loam  
   3. Sand  
   4. Clay  
   5. Rock  

17. Main vehicular access to the site is?  
   1. Minor Arterial  
   2. Paved Lanes  
   3. Arterial  
   4. Major Arterial  
   5. Residential Road
20. What is the proximity to residential areas?
   1. One mile
   2. Half mile
   3. Quarter mile
   4. Eighth mile
   5. Adjacent to site

21. What is the site proposed service area from Park Maintenance Building?
   1. One Mile
   2. Two Miles
   3. Five Miles
   4. Ten Miles
   5. More than fifteen miles

22. Is the site easily developed?
   1. Yes
   2. No

23. What is the site configuration?
   1. Square
   2. Rectangular
   3. Irregular

24. Is the access road paved?
   1. Yes
   2. No

25. What is the proximity to Police/Fire/Medical Facilities?
   1. Two Miles
   2. Five Miles
   3. Ten Miles
   4. More than fifteen miles

26. What are the residential attitudes about proposed park location?
   1. Negative
   2. Passive
   3. Positive

27. What is acquisition cost?
   1. High
   2. Moderate
   3. Low

28. What is development cost?
   1. High
   2. Moderate
   3. Low
<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>RECREATIONAL PARKS</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>66.6 Acres</td>
<td>114 Acres</td>
<td>52.2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Playgrounds</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1/4 Mile</td>
<td>1-2 Acres</td>
<td>Tenth, Stagg Hill</td>
<td>51.7 Acres</td>
<td>Harbour Park</td>
<td>0.5 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Level Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>343.8 Acres</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>233.6 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>285 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Anneberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213.8 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTH EAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Griffith, German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Recreational Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL AREA PARKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>384.8 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Acres/1000</td>
<td>Warner, Wildcat</td>
<td>380 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear Park, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>384.8 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Standards: National Recreation and Park Association
Analysis by Ochsner Hare & Hare

UPDATED 6.14.99
City Staff

- Require the City’s Park Planner to be present at the following meetings to ensure staff implementation of park plans and policies of the City:
  - Initial development review meetings with developers.
  - City staff planning and plat review meetings.
- Require the City’s Park Planner to review all preliminary development plans and plats for compliance with the *Comprehensive Parks Master Plan* and proposed *Linear Trail Master Plan*.
- Require the City’s Park Planner to submit written comments to the developer/architectural engineer outlining how their proposed development should be amended to comply with the adopted City plans.
- Direct City Staff to include in their review of preliminary development plans and plats their discussions with the developer on the use of benefit districts as a funding option for park enhancement.
- Require City Staff reports presented to the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board to include an evaluation of the proposed rezoning, site plan, or preliminary plat with conformance with the *Comprehensive Parks Master Plan*.

County (Intergovernmental)

- Consider tax relief for common areas (open/green space).
- Request the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board to meet at least annually with the appropriate County officials to discuss how the City and County could cooperate in future park and open space planning and implementation.

Advisory Boards

- Active involvement in implementation of the City’s *Comprehensive Parks Master Plan*.

Private Land Developers

- Upon its adoption by the City Commission, be asked to endorse the Strategic Park Plan.
- Provide annual input to the City regarding the implementation of the Strategic Park Plan and its components.
Process For Working with Developers

As outlined in the Park and Open Space Plan that was approved jointly by the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and the City Commission, there was a process outlined for staff to be involved with developers to ensure staff implementation of park plans and policies of the City.

Current Process that is being followed:
1. Along with other City Administration, meets with developer at a predevelopment meeting to discuss and review preliminary development plans and plats, discuss the project and talk about issues that pertain to the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan and Linear Park Master Plan.
2. At the predevelopment meeting City Administration makes recommendations as it pertains to the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan and Linear Park Master Plan.
3. At the predevelopment meeting City Administration discusses opportunities for funding which includes benefit districts, donations, maintenance, tax deductible trusts, and other funding mechanisms that might meet the needs of the developer and the community.
4. Following recommendations at the predevelopment meeting City Administration reviews revised plans and plats to see if the developer has met the needs of the community. This may take several meetings or may be accomplished in one meeting.
5. Prior to the developer taking plans and plats to the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board, City Administration makes a recommendation to the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Advisory Board on what is being proposed by the developer. The developer usually attends the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Meeting for a presentation and to answer questions. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board reviews City Administrations recommendation to determine conformance with the Comprehensive Parks Master Plan and Linear Park Master Plan and develops a recommendation for the Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board.
6. Manhattan Urban Area Planning Board reviews the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Advisory Boards recommendation.
Summary: This process has worked very well since implementation of the Park and Open Space Plan. The City has been able to continue building the Linear Park through benefit districts and grants to enhance pedestrian and bicycle transportation. Some of the trails being jointly developed between developers and the City are maintained by the developer. Potential park or open space has been identified in the developments. The major issue being faced by Administration is financing from the community to purchase needed park property prior to development.

Zoning and Subdivision Regulations: In order for private developers to provide property for park and open space development as a donation or at a reasonable cost, the City needs to offer incentives for the developer that will save development dollars. Incentives may include an easier development process, smaller streets, fewer regulations, etc. This could provide consistency in working with all developers and provide opportunities for park and open spaces.