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This updated master plan document is a long-range vision for City Park. Established in 1857, City Park is one of the oldest parks in Manhattan, Kansas. The park has seen many transformations through its 160-year existence. The master plan responds to the site’s history, existing conditions, and community-identified priorities. This document begins with site inventory and analysis. Subsequent chapters describe community engagement efforts and concept development. The closing chapters describe the plan’s recommendations, phased implementations, and budget estimate.

The master plan for City Park was paused toward the end of 2015 due to some questions raised in the master plan process. The community was interested in seeing a covered swimming pool and the expansion of tennis courts at City Park. The Parks and Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan (SFIP) supported these as well; however, the City was interested in determining if City Park was the most feasible to accommodate these amenities or if they were better suited elsewhere.

In 2016-2017, the Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study further explored the four priorities identified in the SFIP. Priority 2 addressed needed improvements to existing outdoor court playing surfaces, focusing on tennis as a strong community and school district need for both recreation and competitive use. The study recommended that CiCo Park could accommodate tournament level playing facilities for tennis. Priority 4 addressed the community desire for indoor aquatics. The final recommendation, if implemented, was to provide a new indoor 25-yard lap pool and leisure pool west of the existing CiCo Park Pool facility.
2006 City Park Master Plan

A master plan was prepared by RDG Planning & Design in 2006. The plan was developed concurrently with a proposed recreation center at CiCo Park. The 2006 master plan recommended the following improvements to City Park:

- Consolidation of Parking and Roads
- An enhanced Rose Garden with the Fountain remaining as the focal point
- New Play Area that provides more exposure to the Johnny Kaw statue
- Large expanses of un-programmed Open Space
- Bio-retention Swales for storm-water management with aesthetic appeal
- Meadow Plantings using native prairie plants.
- Informal Gathering Spaces
- Uniform Signage

Why Update the City Park Master Plan?

Since the City Park Master Plan was adopted in 2006, numerous projects have been completed in City Park including construction of the Wefald Pavilion, renovation of the Rose Garden, installation of a new playground and splashpad, replacement of the City Park Pool, paving of the perimeter trail, construction of Flag Plaza and installation of pedestrian lighting.

Additional projects planned at the time the planning process began included modifications to parking lots, pedestrian-bicycle circulation and drainage infrastructure at City Park Pool and along North Park Road. As design for those projects progressed, it became apparent that the existing 2006 master plan no longer provided adequate guidance. Figure 4 highlights projects completed between 2006 and 2018, noting differences with the 2006 master plan. City Administration recommended a process to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to update the City Park Master Plan.
Figure 4: 2006 City Park master plan and completed projects since then.

Figure 5: 2017 aerial view of City Park looking south.
CHAPTER 2: Understanding the Park

This chapter of the master plan provides a brief site inventory and analysis. Site inventory and analysis are the first steps in the design process. The goal of this work was to document existing conditions of the site and understand the relationship between those characteristics.
Existing Conditions

City Park lies within the heart of Manhattan, Kansas. Approximately 2,750 residences are ½ a mile from the park, and 7,600 residences within a 1-mile radius (Figure 6). The zoning around the park consists of mostly traditional neighborhoods. The northern side is adjacent to Aggieville and Multi-Family Development. The southern portion of the park is located across from a Restricted Business district (Figure 9). City Park contains the following features:

- 6 Tennis Courts
- 3 Baseball Fields
- Basketball Court
- 2 Sand Volleyball Courts
- Horseshoe Pits
- Pool
- Playground and Splash Park
- Pavilion and Stage
- 2 Shelters
- Rose Garden
- Log Cabin
- Roundhouse and Old Parks & Rec Office
- 1.05 Miles of Trail
- 545 Parking Spaces
- Johnny Kaw Statue

The park also hosts a variety of events throughout the year. Arts in the Park is a community favorite on Friday evenings during the summer. Juneteenth is an annual event held in the park, celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. Purple Power Play in the Park is a K-State pep rally event that takes place Thursday and Friday before the first home K-State Football game of the season. Cars in the Park is also an annual event that the Yard Art Classics Car Club hosts in City Park.
Figure 9: City Park Community Context Map.

Figure 10: Arts in the Park.

Figure 11: Splash Park constructed in 2009.
Figure Ground Analysis

Figure ground diagrams can be used to analyze park feature footprints and determine land use. Parking and Roadways account for 14% of the park and about 64% of the park is non-programmed open space.
Figure 18: City Park existing conditions in 2015.
Environmental

The majority of land cover at the park is unirrigated mowed turf grass. The athletic surfaces are maintained at a higher level than the general open spaces of the park. Trees are scattered throughout the park and are more densely located along the perimeter. A tree inventory was done in 2015 to assess tree conditions.

Figure 19: 2015 City Park Tree Condition Assessment.
Athletic Facilities

The three baseball fields focus on youth programming. Jerry Wilson Field serves as the freshman high school and Manhattan Christian College field. The outfield of Wilson Field is also used for soccer and flag football games. Jesse Baker and Henry Miller field are used for youth baseball and softball. Annually, 138 baseball/softball games are programmed in City Park. Participation in baseball and softball is remaining consistent. The softball fields are not irrigated and the lighting was installed in 1996. The two sand volleyball courts experience high use and significant programming. The courts are not lit; however, a 2018 CIP is adding lighting based on high participation and demand for evening games. There are two pods of three tennis courts, with six total courts. Manhattan High School Tennis team practices and plays in City Park. The tennis courts are lighted and were resurfaced in 2017 and 2018. The basketball court was built in 1995 for drop-in use and has poor pavement conditions.
Amenities

The Jon and Ruth Ann Wefald Pavilion and GTM Family Center is a 10,000 sf facility that includes restrooms, dressing rooms, storage and a 6,000 sf multi-purpose space. The facility includes large overhead doors along the east and west sides. It functions as an indoor space that can be reserved by the public. During the winter months, it is used as an indoor ice rink. It is not a full rink, more of a leisure ice circle, but accommodates a full spectrum of programs. The Larry Norvell Band Shell and Arts in the Park Stage is an outdoor facility completed in 2004. The Arts in the Park is a summer program that attracts approximately 6,500-7,000 people on Friday nights throughout the summer.

The City Park Pool is an outdoor aquatic center with a 50 meter pool, leisure pool with zero depth entry, slides, and flow rider. In 2017, the pool had 103,580 participants throughout the public swimming pool season. Special events, classes, lessons, and rentals totaled about 26,000 participants. Participation numbers have steadily increased over the past 5 years.
Vehicular access, circulation, and parking

There are five vehicular entry points to the park. One on each side of the park, with the exception of two on the north side. Parking includes some paved and gravel lots. There are approximately 550-590 parking spaces available. Dead end parking is provided at five locations in the park, resulting in undesirable traffic flow.

Pedestrian access and trail circulation

Clarenburg Trail is a paved perimeter trail, mostly 8 foot wide although some sections are 5 feet wide. The trail is approximately 1 mile long. Paved access is not provided from the softball parking lots to the seating areas or dugouts. ADA parking stalls are also not provided at the softball diamonds. The pressbox to Wilson Field does not have paved access leading up to the stairs. Recent improvements at the Pool Parking Lot enhanced pedestrian circulation around the pool, volleyball courts, Poyntz Shelter, and the playground. Adequate ADA parking for those facilities was also provided.

City Park brand recognition

Limestone veneer sets the tone for the character of City Park. Limestone is also provided at the Rose Garden, City Park Pool and entry features around the park. Entry monuments are located at the south, east, and southwest corners of the park. Johnny Kaw is a 30’ tall statue of the fictional wheat farmer, constructed in 1966. Future construction should respond to the character of City Park.

Historic Resources

The historic features found in City Park include Floral Hall (a.k.a. Roundhouse), Pioneer Log Cabin, Rose Garden Fountain, Tattarax Monument, Wareham Memorial Fountain, and Wharton Memorial. Floral Hall and the Pioneer Log Cabin are the only features from City Park listed on the historic register. As one of the oldest parks in Manhattan, it is no surprise that City Park contains so many historic features. The updated master plan should strive to maintain these historic resources for the benefit of the Manhattan community.
Challenges and Opportunities

The old parks and recreation administration office, originally built in 1955, is no longer used for the parks and administration offices as they are now located in City Hall. The status of this building is undetermined at this time; however, a preliminary study has explored the possibility of renovating the building for therapeutic recreation activities, dance classes, rentals for private gatherings, and other City functions.

Existing features, such as the stone monuments seen in Figures 31 and 32, can be enhanced through decorative plantings and art installations. These monuments can be used as key features in creating a “gateway” into the park. Another connection that can tie City Park in to the surrounding community is the transition between the park and Aggieville at N. Manhattan Ave.

The potential relocation of the exiting tennis courts would create a green space buffer between the neighbors on the west side of the park and the heavily programmed center of City Park. Aesthetically, the park could further improve through the removal of portable restrooms and intrusive traffic signs. The installation of a permanent restroom on the north side and purposeful street design can address these issues. Functionally, there are some drainage issues throughout the park that will need to be addressed as the elements of the master plan are implemented.

Figure 31: Wharton Memorial.  
Figure 32: Wareham Memorial Fountain.

Figure 33: N. Manhattan Ave. and Fremont St. crossing in to Aggieville.
Figure 34: Existing tennis courts on the west side of City Park.

Figure 35: Portable restrooms at Wilson Field.

Figure 36: Traffic signs at the end of E. Park Rd.

Figure 37: Standing water near Wilson Field.
City Park Usage Study

In September and October of 2017, the City partnered with the Flint Hills Metropolitan Planning Organization (FHMPO) to conduct trail counts in key locations throughout City Park. The City wanted in-depth information about City Park Trail & Bike Boulevard usage. The counters were able to track how many people traveled through the park and recorded day-to-day usage patterns. The following graphics convey the data recorded by the counters. Only entries were summarized within the report; however, exits were tallied to ensure data accuracy and reliability.

Figure 38: Average bike and pedestrian count through City Park.
**City Park Trail:** 2,630 Total Trail Users (🚴 + 🚶)

Figure 39: Total bike and pedestrian trail users from September 7-24, 2017.

**Central Park Rd - East:** Traffic Counts = 1,190 (🚴 + 🚗)

Figure 40: Total bike and vehicle counts on Central Park Rd-East.

**Central Park Rd - West:** Traffic Counts = 873 (🚴 + 🚗)

Figure 41: Total bike and vehicle counts on Central Park Rd-West.
The planning process incorporated numerous opportunities for the public to participate in the planning effort. Meetings were held at the park for public input and to view concepts in development. The following chapter depicts City Staff effort to engage the community.
Community Engagement Process

The City Park Master Plan process involved a robust and targeted outreach to the community. The community engagement methodology was to go to where the people are, utilizing scheduled City advisory board meetings and community events to engage the public, promote the planning process, and receive input. Community input opportunities were themed around Johnny Kaw with the tagline: “What Would Johnny Do?” The primary planning workshops were scheduled to coincide with large community events happening in or near City Park.

Community engagement activities were divided into two phases. Phase One was the information gathering phase. Eighteen public meetings were held from early February through May 1, 2015. The purpose of these meetings was to inform the community about the master planning process, find out how they used the park today and engage in conversations about the kinds of improvements and amenities they would like in City Park in the future. An estimated 600-700 people received information and provided input at these events.

First Online Survey in 2015

In addition to the public meetings and events, an online survey provided another avenue for direct feedback. The online survey was administered through Survey Monkey. The survey consisted of 21 questions, including questions about park use and demographics. The survey was promoted through online venues, posters throughout the community, and public meetings during the master plan process. The first survey received 541 responses. Most respondents were permanent residents of Manhattan (87%), 21-40 years old (55%), and identified as Women (62%).

“What Would Johnny Do?” Workshops

Manhattan Parks and Recreation hosted three community workshops to inform the public about the planning process and gather input on issues related to the future of City Park.

Workshop #1

Workshop #1 was held on March 14, 2015 from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm in the Wefald Pavilion in City Park. St. Patty’s Day activities, including an annual Fun Run, 10k Road Race and St. Patty’s Day Parade, drew large crowds to Aggieville and City Park throughout the day.

Workshop #1 was the public kick-off to the planning process. The purpose was to gather feedback from the community on their vision for the future of the park and gather as much information as possible on how people use the park.

Nine activity stations were set up to allow the public to learn about the park and the planning process, and several stations gave participants an opportunity to offer their suggestions for improving the park. Activities included:

- Park Walk
- Sticky Note Challenge
- City Park Art Table
- Priorities (Dots)
- Plan Your Perfect Park
- Can You Tell Me How You Get to City Park?
• Johnny Kaw Trivia
• What is Green Space?
• What is your Favorite Memory of City Park?
• Online Survey

Eight people attended the Walking Tour and over 40 participated in the workshop activities.

Figure 44: Workshop #1 kids memory wall.

Figure 45: Workshop #1 priority dots.

Figure 46: Workshop #1 City Park walk.
Workshop #2

Workshop #2 was conducted on May 9, 2015 from 1:00 to 4:00 pm. The event was held alongside Yard Art in the Park, an annual classic car show and music festival.

The purpose of this workshop was to share two concept master plans with the community. A priority dots poster and an interactive board were present for community interaction. About 25 people participated in the second “What Would Johnny Do?” workshop.

Figure 47: Workshop #2 public engagement.

Figure 48: Workshop #2 priority dots.

Figure 49: Workshop #2 interactive board.
Workshop #3

Workshop #3 was held on May 19, 2015. The event was held with students from Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School.

Students were in small groups with tabletop activities to learn park history and design a playground. The main activity was to “design” City Park using cut-out pictures and write short statements on what they would like to see in the park.

Figure 50: Workshop #3 interactive quiz.

Figure 51: Workshop #3 interactive park collage.

Figure 52: Workshop #3 student posters.
Second Online Survey in 2015

A follow up survey was issued in the summer of 2015 after the first two concepts were presented to the public. The survey consisted of 11 questions and over 1,400 people responded. A majority of people who took the survey (726, 54%) preferred Concept A. When asked specifically about Concept A, 729 survey respondents (54%) agreed with the statement, “Eliminating vehicular access through the middle of the park is okay with me.” Overall public feedback and the second online survey influenced the following themes heard in 2015.

2015 Feedback Themes

Five key themes became evident from this process:

1. Preserving open green space in the park is important. Many people acknowledged that trade-offs would be necessary if increasing the amount of non-programmed green space was a priority.

2. Parking was a common topic of discussion. Some respondents wanted parking lots to be paved and better organized. Some wanted to reduce or even eliminate parking on the interior of the park.

3. Improved pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and accessibility was mentioned at nearly every meeting and strongly acknowledged in the survey.

4. There was a strong desire for park beautification. Added garden spaces, flowers and trees were frequently mentioned.

5. A longer swimming season and year-round access to an enclosed/covered swimming pool was also a common request.

The themes heard in 2015 were similar 3 years later in 2018. The community still wanted to see a park with minimal vehicular traffic and more green open space. Parking within City Park became the biggest topic of discussion for advisory boards and City Commission.

2018 Public Engagement

City Staff re-engaged the community starting in April of 2018. In the time since the first couple of phases of the engagement process, it was determined that CiCo Park would be better suited for tournament level tennis courts and an indoor pool. The Parks and Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan recommended this location for those amenities. These were questions raised in 2015 and needed answered before the City Park Master Plan could be completed.

In 2018, Staff presented to six advisory boards and the City Commission in a work session. The latest concepts of the Master Plan were also presented at six public meetings in which Staff sought community input. The number of meetings with the public, advisory boards, and the City Commission totaled to 40 different occasions in which City Staff tried to engage the community in the Master Plan process for City Park.
2015 City Park Master Plan Process: Phase One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggieville Business Association</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Advisory Board</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Fair Booth (Manhattan Town Center)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden Show Booth (Pottorf Hall)</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Resources Board</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPRD Promo Event @ Dicks Sporting Goods</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Advisory Board</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What Would Johnny Do? Community Workshop #1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Association Meeting</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology Class @ K-State</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Advisory Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHA! Manhattan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>City Park Master Plan Survey</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 56: Phase two public engagements in 2015.

2 Surveys with over 1,900 responses
2 City Commission Work Sessions
19 Advisory Board Meetings
19 Public Engagement Opportunities

2015 City Park Master Plan Process: Phase Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>What Would Johnny Do? Community Workshop #2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown Farmers Market</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Resources Board</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>T.R. Elementary School Student Workshop</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen’s Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flint Hills Daylily Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Advisory Board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts in the Park + What Would Johnny Do?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>City Park Master Plan Follow-Up Survey</td>
<td>1,404 Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>City Commission Work Session</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>City Commission Work Session</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018 City Park Master Plan Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Meeting in Welfald Pavilion</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Commission Work Session</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Advisory Board</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnny Kaw Birthday Celebration in City Park</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Resources Board</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts in the Park</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Purple Power Play at the Park</td>
<td>30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Third Thursday on Poyntz</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 57: Public engagements in 2018.

Figure 58: Master plan concept at Purple Power Play at the Park.
CHAPTER 4: Concept Development

Using the information collected through the public engagement process and the site inventory and analysis, multiple conceptual layouts for the park were developed. The following chapter explores the multiple concepts developed during the design phase.
Design Phase

Based on the feedback received during Phase One, Staff developed two alternative concepts for the park. The concepts offered two possible futures for City Park. Both concepts sought to prioritize pedestrian-bicycle access to and through the park, enhance activity areas, and improve the quality of open green spaces. Concept A eliminated vehicular traffic through the park and consolidated and reduced the amount of parking. Concept B allowed vehicular traffic through the park and sought to better organize, rather than significantly reduce, parking. Neither scenario was intended to be a “final plan;” rather the concepts were intended to convey a variety of ideas for the community to respond to.

During May and June 2015, the two master plan concepts were on display for the public to review at City Hall, the Parks and Recreation Office, the Manhattan Public Library, and the Manhattan Area Chamber of Commerce. Information about the concepts was distributed through merchants in Aggieville and Downtown and through media coverage in the Manhattan Mercury and on KMAN Radio. Staff shared the concepts at eleven public events during this period, including presentations to City advisory boards and community organizations, displays at the Downtown Farmers Market and Arts in the Park and at a student workshop at Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School. Over 300 people participated in these events. A second online survey was created to gauge public response to the concepts, and over 1,400 people provided feedback.

The input received through personal interactions and the online survey was fairly consistent. People generally liked aspects of both plans. When asked which overall concept they preferred, a majority chose Concept A. The Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee voted unanimously in support of Concept A. “Bike and pedestrian access to and through the park” was the highest rated feature amongst survey respondents. Other elements that were mentioned often at public meetings and ranked highly in the survey were “a pond with overlook points,” “gardens, sculpture and strolling paths,” “a covered pool” and “a nature play space.” The lowest ranked features were “fewer parking spaces,” “roads just the way they are now” and “more roads to drive through the park.”

During the community engagement process, expansion of the tennis courts for tournament use and a covered city pool were topics that needed to be addressed prior to the completion of the master plan. The topic in question was whether City Park was the best location for those activities. The Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study later determined that CiCo Park would be better suited to house the expanded tennis courts and covered pool. In spring 2018, city staff began working on the City Park master plan once again and reviewed feedback on Concepts A and B received from multiple advisory boards, community input, and the City Commission. Concept C was created as a result of that effort.

Concept C integrated the base elements of Concept A, which proposed eliminating vehicular access through the park. Parking would be centralized to four areas in order to reduce the concrete footprint. The baseball fields would all remain in their current locations. There was discussion of moving Baker Field to the northern half of the park but community input dictated leaving the field in its current position for historic and cultural purposes.

Concept C also incorporated the bicycle and pedestrian routes from Concept A. These routes run north-south and east-west through the park. Bike-ped counts recorded the routes most heavily used through the park. The north-south corridor runs along N. Manhattan, assuming Aggieville and K-State as the final destinations when people travel north through the park. The east-west route follows Humboldt St. and veers north a bit before reconnecting with Humboldt on the opposite side of City Park.

When Concept C was presented to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, comments were made on how the plan would alter the parade routes and limit parking around Wefald Pavilion. Parking and routing of vehicles were the biggest topics when Concepts C and D were presented to the public, advisory boards, and City Commission. The following graphics show the six concepts developed before the final concept. Each concept varies and responds to feedback received during the process.
Concept A Objectives

The most notable change in this concept is the closure of Central Park Road and consolidating the baseball fields to the northern side of the park. Concept A prioritizes pedestrian-bicycle access through the park. The parking is reduced drastically to 280 parking stalls within the park and 146 on-street. The active recreation amenities include: 3 clustered ball fields, 6 tennis courts, 1 basketball court, volleyball, and horseshoes. A pond was proposed on the southeast corner to provide passive recreation. Additional enhancements were proposed to the rose garden, park office, and irrigated open space. Many of the proposed features in this concept were favored by the community.
**Concept B Objectives**

The most notable change in this concept is the re-configuration of the roads and eliminating Miller Field. Concept B reduces vehicular access through the park but does not eliminate it like Concept A. Parking is consolidated and slightly reduced to 400 parking stalls within the park and 100 stalls on-street. Active recreation features include: 2 ball fields, 3 tennis courts, 1 basketball court, 2 volleyball courts, bocce ball, and an indoor aquatic center. In this Concept, the old parks office is removed. For those residents that wanted to see fewer vehicles through the park, this concept was their least favorite.

*Figure 60: Concept B (2015)*
**Concept C Objectives**

The most notable change in this concept is the closure of Central Park Road. Concept C was developed in the spring of 2018 after City Staff processed feedback received in 2015 for Concepts A and B. Concept C prioritizes pedestrian-bicycle access through the park by eliminating Central Park Road. Parking was reduced and consolidated to 346 parking spots within the park and 176 stalls on-street. Concept C was presented to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and they advised re-visiting the vehicular circulation.
Concept C.1 Objectives

With Concept C, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (PRAB) made comments concerning the parades that start or finish in City Park. In an effort to reduce vehicular traffic through the park, Concept C proposes closing Central Park Rd. Concept C.1 addresses this concern by widening the highlighted trail below. Another comment made by PRAB was the parking situation at Wefald Pavilion. Concept C.1 proposed a drop off area near the pavilion without providing additional parking. This concept also proposes removing the parking near Baker Field. Concept C.1 proposes 281 parking spots within the park, with 457 total spots including those on the periphery.
Concept C.2 Objectives

Concept C.2 is identical to C.1 except for the parking layout near Wefald Pavilion. This concept proposes maintaining the entrance at Leavenworth and connecting to the 12th St. entrance on Fremont, in an effort to address the routing and parking of vehicles near Wefald Pavilion and the Arts in the Park stage. This concept also addresses the concerns raised by the PRAB for the parades through the park. Concept C.2 proposes 361 parking spots within the park, with 537 total.
**Concept D Objectives**

Concept D was developed after City Staff presented Concept C to PRAB and the City Commission. The Park Board was mostly concerned about parade access and parking near Wefald Pavilion. The City Commission was also concerned about the parking situation at the park. The City Commission also inquired about the Old Parks & Rec building and was in favor of renovating it for programming and rentable space. Concept D proposes 396 parking spaces within the park, with 572 total, which includes parking on the edge of the park.
Design Concept Comparison

The figure below breaks down the concepts and compares them on multiple levels. Those levels include objectives, transportation, active recreation, passive recreation, and landscape. The comparison below includes the master plan concepts from 2015 and 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
<th>Concept C</th>
<th>Concept D</th>
<th>Final Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize pedestrian-bicycle access to and through the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance activity areas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality of open greenspace</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate vehicular traffic through the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow, but reduce, vehicular traffic through the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate and reduce the amount of parking in the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better incorporate parking in the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Feature/Amenity (location/details may be different in each concept)</th>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
<th>Concept C</th>
<th>Concept D</th>
<th>Final Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pedestrian and bicycle paths with enhanced lighting and gathering spaces – seating, public art, signage, drinking fountains</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced pedestrian crossings surrounding the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All existing park entrances remain open</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated, better organized, paved parking in the park</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Avenue “road diet” with on-street parking</td>
<td>5 lots, 280 spaces</td>
<td>7 lots, 400 spaces</td>
<td>6 lots, 346 spaces</td>
<td>7 lots, 406 spaces</td>
<td>7 lots, 402 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb extensions and on-street parking on 14th St.</td>
<td>±58 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±58 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±58 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±58 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±58 parallel spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb extensions and on-street parking on Fremont St.</td>
<td>0 parallel spaces</td>
<td>0 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±30 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±30 parallel spaces</td>
<td>±30 parallel spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of baseball/softball fields</td>
<td>±3</td>
<td>±2</td>
<td>±2</td>
<td>±3</td>
<td>±3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of tennis courts</td>
<td>±6</td>
<td>±6</td>
<td>±6</td>
<td>±4</td>
<td>±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New restroom/shelter and small event lawn near ballfields/Tennis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New shelter and open activity lawn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New outdoor fitness area(s)</td>
<td>Larger, centralized area</td>
<td>Multiple smaller areas along trail</td>
<td>Larger, centralized area</td>
<td>Larger, centralized area</td>
<td>Larger, centralized area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New basketball court with lights</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded sand volleyball courts with lights</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New horseshoe pits to replace existing (option: lights)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove horseshoe pits and replace with new bocce ball courts (option: lights)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bocce ball courts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation, Sports fields, Sports courts, &amp; Fitness</th>
<th>Space for public art</th>
<th>New Johnny Kaw plaza with interpretive signage (options: sitting walls, lighting, decorative paving)</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance playground to add new play features</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New nature playspace near existing playground</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced dog in house demonstration dugout home, dry-stack stone wall, native plantings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced seating at Arts in the Park Stage</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New shade canopy at Arts in the Park Stage</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pavilion plaza (options: sitting walls, shade canopy, decorative paving, ornamental fence, decorative lighting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurpose Park Office for MPRD programs &amp; community meeting space</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive Recreation, Arts, History &amp; Culture</th>
<th>Remove Park Office and convert to new gardens and green space</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced pedestrian access to rose garden</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New gardens with strolling paths and sculpture</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated open spaces in select areas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native meadow planting in select areas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced landscaping at park entrances and major pedestrian intersections</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 65: Concept comparisons.
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In response to community feedback on the preliminary concepts, a final park proposal was prepared. This chapter highlights the proposed elements recommended for City Park. The focal point of this master plan is to create a space that caters to bicyclists and pedestrians. The master plan also enhances a variety of existing recreational and leisure activities, while increasing accessibility. The community expressed interest in a park that restricts vehicular access and properly organizes parking in order to create more open space.
Pedestrian and Vehicle Circulation

The City Park master plan responds to the theme heard regularly throughout the master plan process: providing a bicycle and pedestrian oriented space. The plan is proposing to close Central Park Road in order to eliminate traffic through the park. This could be done in phases as other elements of the master plan are implemented or it could be done immediately with strategically placed bollards. Currently, there are 5 vehicular access points into the park. The master plan is proposing an additional vehicular access point; however, pedestrians and bicyclists would only cross four of the proposed six access points. The proposed parking lot near Baker Field would be circumvented by Clarenburg trail. In addition, four of the six vehicular access points are one-way. The plan is proposing raised tables at the four crosswalks, consisting of a different
material. These elements are intended to engage vehicles and make drivers slow down as they enter and exit the park. Reducing the amount of contact points between pedestrians/bicyclists and vehicles would be the beneficial safety aspect of fewer and elevated crosswalks.

In addition to the removal of Central Park Road, the master plan is also proposing the consolidation of 13 existing gravel and concrete lots. The existing lots would be reduced to 7 paved lots. This consolidation would reduce the current footprint of parking and create more green space, which was another theme heard from the community. More green space would be implemented in the form of irrigated turf, strategic planting beds, and rain gardens.

The City Park master plan recommends further exploration of a “road diet” for Poyntz Ave. with parking protected buffered bike lanes. A “road diet” is defined as a road in which vehicular lanes are reduced in order to accommodate alternative means of transportation. In preliminary discussions with the City Engineer, the proposed “road diet” is plausible but further traffic study along Poyntz would be necessary. The “road diet” would span from Juliette, west toward 17th Street. The master plan proposes adding 50 additional parking spots on the southern edge along Poyntz. This endeavor would need involvement from multiple entities to be accomplished.

Parking on the peripheral of City Park is currently allowed on the north and west sides. On the northern and west edges, the plan is proposing curb extensions and rain gardens within those spaces. Curb extensions are a feature used to help with pedestrian safety by shortening the distance needed to cross the street. In addition to these curb extensions, a new ATA bus stop and shelter is proposed at the intersection of N. Manhattan and Fremont. The City of Manhattan, the Flint Hills Metropolitan Planning Organization, and a K-State design studio are collaborating on a project to design the proposed ATA bus stop on the northern edge of City Park.

One of the Aggieville master plan concepts proposes closing 12th street through Aggieville. Traffic counts from the engineer shows a minimal amount of use of the entrance, for both Aggieville and City Park. This master plan responds to that data by suggesting the closure of 12th street for the park. The underutilized entrance can be closed off to further support the complete closure of Central Park Road. In addition, the closure of the 12th street entrance would help deter parking in City Park for extended periods of time.
Planting Beds, Rain Gardens, Trees, and Irrigated Turf

A majority of the planting beds are proposed on the edges of the park. On the plan, the planting beds and rain gardens are depicted as a dark shade of green. Not only are these planting beds on the edge of the park but also in strategically placed locations within the park. In an effort to keep these areas as maintenance free as possible, an irrigation system would be ideal for the planting beds. Vegetation within these beds would be chosen based on species native to the area.

Additional trees are proposed to replace any that may be affected by construction of this master plan. The irrigated turf locations are proposed mostly on the northwestern area of City Park, surrounding Miller Field. Irrigated turf would be ideal for youth soccer programming and any pick-up soccer games. Currently, there is no irrigated turf areas for this sort of youth programming and other community activities.
SoÔ ball and Baseball Fields

The three softball/baseball fields are proposed to receive enhancements, which include; enhanced playing surface (irrigated grass or synthetic turf options), new lights, new fencing, and upgraded player/spectator amenities. Wilson Field has the potential of receiving additional funding from non-public sources for these types of enhancements. The high school freshman and the Manhattan Cristian College (MCC) regularly play on this field. Potential collaboration between MCC and the City could see enhancements done to Wilson Field before any of the other fields. With high school athletics focusing on CiCo Park, the freshman team may move their practices there in the near future.

Shelters and Restrooms

The community expressed interest in seeing more shelters and restrooms in City Park. The master plan has addressed this need by proposing these features near Wilson Field. The proposed shelter adjacent to Wilson Field also contains restrooms. This location is ideal because it is centrally located among a variety of activities. The other shelter proposed is north of the basketball court and adjacent to an irrigated event lawn that could be reserved with the shelter.

Bocce Ball Courts and Fitness Area

Two new amenities are proposed for City Park. The Bocce Ball Court and fitness area are located near the center of the park, just north of the pool. The neighborhood survey noted interest by the community to add fitness equipment along the trail system. The exercise equipment is made to withstand the elements. A variety of equipment would be installed in the fitness area and would be chosen by City Staff at a later date once a funding source is determined. The other new amenity proposed is a Bocce Ball Court. In discussions with recreation staff, the addition of Bocce Courts would provide programming opportunities for Bocce Ball tournaments. This type of active programming is popular with therapeutic recreation participants, according to recreation staff.

Historic Resources

The Pioneer Log Cabin has recently been accepted to the Kansas State Register. In an effort to enhance the park’s historical resources, the master plan is proposing native prairie plantings in the vicinity of the Log Cabin. A picnic area is proposed east of the Log Cabin as an additional amenity for public use.

Floral Hall (a.k.a. Roundhouse) was last renovated in 1987 as a dance studio and space for Parks and Recreation programs, which is how it’s used still today. With the potential remodel of the Old Parks and Rec Building, the master plan recommends reevaluating the use of Floral Hall.

Aside from these two buildings, there are other historic structures which the master plan recommends be respected during the implementation of this plan. Those features include Tattarax Monument, the historic drinking fountain, and the two monuments at the south and east entrances of City Park.
Arts in the Park

For over 40 years, the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department has sponsored, organized, and produced free weekly outdoor concerts for the Manhattan community. A variety of musical genres are offered, such as Country, Folk, Americana, Rock & Roll, Alt Rock, Soul, and Funk. Each Friday in June and July, one artist or group is featured. Booking is available for national and regional touring acts, as well as local artists. During the master plan process, it was clear that the community and advisory boards wanted to continue supporting the Arts in the Park program.

Accessibility for Arts in the Park and events in Wefald Pavilion has been a major topic of discussion in the latest phase of community outreach of 2018. Concerns were raised about the lack of parking near Wefald Pavilion. During the latest concepts developed, the parking and routing of vehicles changed multiple times due to Park Board and City Commission feedback. These concerns are supported by attendance data. Approximately, 6,500 -7,000 people attended the Arts in the Park events throughout the summer of 2018. That’s roughly 700-800 participants per show. During the winter, the Ice Rink in Wefald Pavilion attracts approximately 15,000 participants within a 3 month span, starting in November and ending in February. Apart from City Pool, the Arts in the Park stage and Wefald Pavilion are some of the busiest amenities in City Park.

The popularity of Arts in the Park and the Ice Rink has influenced the master plan to address accessibility and efficient routing of pedestrians and vehicles. A new one-way entrance is proposed at Osage street. The north parking lot totals 77 spots and accommodates not only Wefald Pavilion, but also Roundhouse and the repurposed Parks and Rec Office. A drop-off area is located on the west side of Wefald Pavilion. An additional parking lot is located south of the Arts in the Park stage, totaling 69 parking spots. The exit for one-way traffic is proposed at Leavenworth Street. As proposed, Central Park Road is closed at the current 12th Street entrance, responding to traffic data from the Aggieville master plan and the potential of closing 12th Street through Aggieville.

In addition to the parking and traffic redesign, new enhancements to seating and the pavilion are proposed in the master plan. To the east of the Wefald Pavilion, a new plaza with sitting walls, shade canopy, and decorative paving is proposed. This outdoor area would be an extension of the Wefald Pavilion and would enhance the pavilion’s ability to be rented as an indoor/outdoor space, without adversely affecting the lawn area. The Arts in the Park stage area is also being considered for enhancements. Interest has been shown to upgrade the seating and provide shade over a portion of the seating adjacent to the tech shack. Open lawn will be kept in the plan for participants to provide their own seating.

Recent community interest has set in motion a collaboration between the Kansas State University Architecture, Planning & Design College and Parks & Rec Staff. During the 2019 Spring semester, a multi-disciplinary effort will be made to provide student concepts for re-envisioning Wefald Pavilion and the surrounding amenities for Arts in the Park events. These upgrades could potentially open up the venue for bigger events. The proposed designs by the City Park master plan is not set in stone and can be altered to fit future needs of the community. In this instance, community interest in upgrading the Arts in the Park could set this as a priority in the near future.
Figure 72: Example of shade structure over seating area. Photo Credit: Superior Recreational Products Shade.

Figure 73: Example of proposed seating option for Arts in the Park. Photo Credit: Preferred Seating.

Figure 74: Enlarged plan of Wefald Pavilion area.

Figure 75: Proposed outdoor space for Wefald Pavilion.
Repurposed Old Parks and Rec Office

The former office building for the City of Manhattan Parks & Recreation Department in City Park was vacated in 2016 and has been minimally used to date. The City has expressed interest in repurposing the building and may be suitable for use for a variety of activities serving special populations including instruction classes, rental for private gatherings, and City functions. Bruce McMillan AIA Architects developed a feasibility study for the building. The Old Parks and Rec Office could be remodeled with a +/- 1,730 sq. ft. activity space that can be subdivided with a folding partition and a +/- 375 sq. ft. kitchen capable of being used for teaching up to 10-12 people and for catering purposes. A +/- 300 sq. ft. game room that serves as a staff office with storage is included plus ADA men’s and women’s restrooms. The building would be fully ADA accessible with oversize door openings to better accommodate motorized wheelchairs.

Figure 76: Old Parks and Rec Office conceptual south elevation & main entrance. Photo credit: Bruce McMillan Architects.

Figure 77: Old Parks and Rec Office conceptual floor plan. Photo credit: Bruce McMillan Architects.
Expanded Playground and Nature Playspace

Northwest of Johnny Kaw, the master plan proposes expanding the existing playground and adding a new nature playspace. During interactions with students from Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School, interest in an expanded playground and nature playspace was conveyed. Expansion of the existing playground would incorporate traditional playground equipment. The new nature playspace would be something new to the Manhattan parks system. Research indicates that, when children play and learn in nature, they do so with more vigor, engagement, imagination, and cooperation than in artificial environments, and that symptoms of attention deficit and depression are reduced. The idea behind a nature playspace is that, instead of the traditional playground, people can incorporate the surrounding landscape and vegetation to bring nature to children’s daily outdoor play and learning environments. Examples of nature playspace “equipment” would be boulders to climb, water features to dam, logs to practice a balancing act, and a multisensory garden to explore.

Figure 78: Proposed nature playspace facing south toward existing playground.

Figure 79: Proposed nature playspace facing east.
Johnny Kaw Plaza

Community groups provide an alternate source of funding to complete parks projects. Once such project is the Johnny Kaw Plaza. In 2015 when the master plan process started, the plaza was an idea that stirred community support and the Friends of Johnny Kaw was created. City Staff worked with Bruce McMillan AIA Architects to create the proposed layout. The master plan responds to the layout by re-routing Clarenburg Trail from the east. Additional connections to the area are to the west and south. Johnny Kaw overlooks an old grass-covered clay pit on the corner of Poyntz and 11th. The design of the Urban Meadow ties Johnny Kaw to the surrounding site through the use of native plantings; limestone and shale, the bedrock of the Flint Hills; and the abstract form of the eroded limestone. The vegetation follows a mosaic pattern using plants native to the Flint Hills region. Additional picnic areas are located within the proposed Urban Meadow.

Figure 80: Early conceptual layout for the Johnny Kaw Plaza.
Figure 81: Section through Johnny Kaw Plaza.

Figure 82: Proposed Urban Meadow facing toward Johnny Kaw.

Figure 83: Example of paving pattern for the plaza.

Figure 84: Example of railing for the plaza.
Implementation

The phasing strategy for the City Park master plan hinges on a few external circumstances. Those items pertain to the Aggieville master plan, potential sale of Community House, a future stormwater project along 14th street, tennis courts constructed at CiCo Park, community driven efforts to enhance Arts in the Park, potential partnership with Manhattan Christian College to remodel Wilson field, and conditions of existing roads throughout the park.

The Aggieville master plan is proposing a parking garage at Laramie St. and N. Manhattan Ave. This would help alleviate the parking that is currently happening in City Park due to Aggieville. The Aggieville master plan is also exploring the closure of 12th St. between Bluemont Ave. and Fremont St. The City Park master plan is proposing the closure of the 12th street entrance to the park, to minimize drive-thru traffic.

The potential re-purposing of the Community House could influence what the Manhattan Parks and Recreation Department (MPRD) programs at the Old Parks and Rec Office building. The Community House is not up to code in regards to ADA standards and this has affected some programming options for the facility.

A future stormwater project along 14th St. could potentially impact the west side of City Park. This project is planned for the early to mid-20’s. During the stormwater project, coordination between Public Works and Parks & Rec could facilitate the implementation of the proposed elements from this master plan.

The highest priority for the City Park master plan is to promote pedestrian-bicycle access to and through the park and eliminate vehicular traffic. Eliminating vehicular traffic through the park could be implemented today by strategically installing removable bollards along Central Park Road. The following list of phases is more of a guide on how implementation could occur if all the proper resources were in place. The dynamic nature of community priorities and future stakeholder involvement could potentially alter this list; however, the master plan shall be flexible to respond to the community’s needs as they arise.

Phasing Strategy

Each proposed phase could consist of multiple projects over the span of several years. The phases do not necessarily have to be built in order and the proposed phasing in this document shall be fairly flexible.

- Phase 1A: Mid-closure of Central Park Rd (between Wefald Pavilion and Baker Field)
- Phase 1B. Urban meadow and partial construction of Clarenburg Trail (southern portion) in response to Johnny Kaw Plaza
- Phase 1C: Construction of parking around Wefald Pavilion (dependent on community driven efforts to enhance Arts in the Park area), demolition of north Central Park Rd entrance, partial demolition of East Park Road, partial construction of bike trail (eastern portion)
- Phase 1D. Remodel of Old Parks and Rec Office (dependent on potential sale of Community House) and partial construction to widen Clarenburg Trail on east side of City Park (northern portion)
- Phase 2A: Playground parking remodel
- Phase 2B: Construction of expanded playground
- Phase 2C: Construction of nature playground
- Phase 3A: West parking lot and enhancements to Baker Field (dependent on stormwater project along 14th st.)
- Phase 4A: Demolition of Central Park Road (between Wefald Pavilion and Baker Field)
- Phase 4B: Construction or remodeling of Basketball, Tennis, Bocce Ball, fitness area, and Pioneer Log Cabin grounds
- Phase 4C: Construction of north parking lot (near Wilson Field), restrooms, and soccer field
- Phase 5A: Enhancement of Wilson (dependent on potential partnership with Manhattan Christian College) and Miller Fields
- Phase 5B: Remodel sand volleyball and horseshoes
Phase 1A-C

Implementing the master plan’s main theme of reducing traffic through the park and increasing pedestrian/bicycle safety could be accomplished by placing multiple removable bollards along Central Park Road. Figure 85 shows the approximate locations of the removable bollards. In this scenario, 2 existing gravel parking lots would be inaccessible. The total number of parking spots lost would be 41. The street would be removed at a later date when the amenities in this area are funded for construction. For the time being, closure of Central Park Road would create the biggest impact of reducing drive through traffic.

Phase 1B proposes responding to the Johnny Kaw Plaza improvements set to be constructed in spring of 2019. Clarenburg Trail would be slightly re-routed to meander closer to the plaza in an effort to improve pedestrian accessibility to the area. The trail would also be widened to 8’ from the current 5’ width of the trail. In addition to the trail, the Urban Meadow in front of Johnny Kaw would be ideal to implement at the same time. Enhancing the southeast corner of City Park would also include a Public Works project that is re-constructing the intersection of 11th and Poyntz, set to begin in spring of 2019. With interest from the community to enhance the seating at the Arts in the Park stage in the next year or two, the master plan is recommending that the vehicular circulation and parking be addressed as well.
**Phase 1D**

The Old Parks and Rec Office could be remodeled at any time as it is not dependent on anything other than a funding source. If the Community House is repurposed, Parks & Rec may be highly motivated to remodel the building in order to make up for the lack of programmable indoor space.

**Phase 2A**

Before expansion of the existing playground and construction of the nature playspace, the parking around the area will need addressed. The plan is recommending the parking be moved to the west in order to safely accommodate the needs of the playgrounds.

**Phase 2B**

Expansion of the playground can occur at any time funding is available but the parking would have to be addressed first before the expansion is to occur.
**Phase 2C**

The nature playspace would best be implemented shortly after the expansion of the existing playground; however, it can be constructed any time as long as the funding is available.

![Figure 91: Phase 2C.](image)

**Phase 3A**

The west parking lot is contingent on several other projects to occur. The tennis courts at CiCo Park would have to be built before the three courts in City Park along 14th are removed. The 14th street stormwater project would also affect the west parking lot and part of Baker Field. Coordination between Parks & Rec and Public Works would be ideal in accomplishing these projects simultaneously.

![Figure 92: Phase 3A.](image)

**Phase 4A-B**

The removal of central park road between Wefald Pavilion and Baker Field could potentially occur any time funding is available. But this part of the road will need to be removed prior to the construction of the proposed amenities in this area. Once Central Park Road between the Pavilion and Baker Field is removed, the area is set up for the construction of the Bocce Ball Courts and new fitness area. Remodeling of the Basketball Court, Tennis Court, and the enhancements of the Pioneer Log Cabin would also occur at this time.

![Figure 93: Phase 4A-B.](image)
Phase 4C

The additional restroom and shelter with event lawn near Miller and Wilson Fields would be implemented before major remodeling of the ball fields. In addition to the restroom and shelter, the open space surrounding Miller Field would be irrigated for other programming purposes such as youth soccer, flag football, and other recreational activities.

Phase 5A

Enhancements to Miller and Wilson Fields could occur at any time as long as the funding is available and permanent restrooms are available in the area. Upgrades to Wilson Field may occur sooner if there is financial cooperation between the City and the Manhattan Christian College.

Phase 5B

The sand volleyball courts and horseshoe renovations are not dependent on any other construction prior to being built. These amenities could potentially be enhanced once the funding is available and community input prioritizes these upgrades.
Budget Estimates and Land Use Comparison

The following information includes budget estimates for improvements shown on the final master plan concept. A high and low estimate of costs for each phase is shown. The cost for these improvements may vary depending on the size, quality, or complexity of the elements ultimately selected for each feature. The estimates were developed based on 2018 dollars, and represent construction costs only. A 20% contingency has been added to account for aspects of each project that are not known at this time. Each phase also includes a 1% set-aside for public art. Some aspects of these projects could be completed by City Staff or possibly in partnership with local organizations or volunteer groups. These strategies could help reduce the estimated costs. As projects are further developed and more refined budgets are prepared, consideration should be given to engineering and architectural design fees, permitting fees, additional contingencies, and other costs necessary to complete each phase. Project budgets should also account for annual inflation and other market conditions based on the anticipated construction dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LOW TOTAL ESTIMATE</th>
<th>HIGH TOTAL ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Middle closure of Central Park Rd</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Urban Meadow and Clarenburg Trail Redirect (Johnny Kaw)</td>
<td>$170,000.00</td>
<td>$256,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Construction around Wefald Pavilion</td>
<td>$530,000.00</td>
<td>$720,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Closure of north Central Park Rd entrance, remodel of old parks building</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$786,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Playground parking remodel</td>
<td>$145,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Expanded Playground</td>
<td>$145,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>Nature Playground</td>
<td>$96,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>West parking lot and enhancements to Baker Field</td>
<td>$536,000.00</td>
<td>$731,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Demolition of Central Park Rd</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Basketball, tennis, bocce ball, fitness area, and Log Cabin grounds</td>
<td>$290,000.00</td>
<td>$620,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>North parking lot, restrooms, and soccer field</td>
<td>$305,000.00</td>
<td>$516,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Enhancement of Wilson and Miller Fields</td>
<td>$875,000.00</td>
<td>$958,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Sand volleyball and horseshoes</td>
<td>$62,000.00</td>
<td>$84,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total | $3,603,400.00 | $5,322,800.00 |
20% contingency | $720,680.00 | $1,064,560.00 |
Total | $4,324,080.00 | $6,387,360.00 |

Figure 97: City Park master plan budget estimate.

Figure 98: City Park land use comparison.
Many citizens consider City Park the crown jewel of Manhattan, Kansas. Throughout the master plan process, residents were engaged and passionate about various aspects of the park. Some people wanted to see historic features brought back, while others entertained the idea of new elements to be incorporated in the park.

The master plan process started in 2015, with 13 advisory board meetings, 15 public interactions, and two surveys with over 1,900 respondents. Public comment and the City Commission raised questions that forced the process to pause for a few years. These questions involved the expansion of tennis courts for high school tournament play and a covered pool for year-round access. The Parks & Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan from 2016-2017, determined that the tennis courts and covered swimming pool would be better suited for CiCo Park. 2018 saw an additional 12 forms of public engagement opportunities for community input for the City Park Master Plan.

Community input has been an integral part of shaping the vision and plan for City Park. The community’s vision for the park expands on existing conditions yet strives to create a bike-ped oriented space, steering away from decades of catering to the automobile. Citizens want to see more green space and fewer vehicles in their park. To realize this master plan, the City of Manhattan will need to continue partnerships with community members who have helped shape the plan and commit resources to the development and management of City Park.
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