

VERBATIM COMMENTS

I am in NorCal again and talked to [Meno Park's aquatics director](#) Tim Sheeper about the 50m Pool temp comment. Candidly, he searched for a benefit. Either its a long water training pool or its two lesson/play pools that happen to share a common pump and filter. This will become obvious when programming and budget are considered if an experienced ops professional is consulted.

He recommends looking at the new facility in Carlsbad, CA. Its a destination for that community. 50M training pool, lesson pool, splash pad, food service and cabanas to rent. Here is link: [Alga Norte Pool Facility, Carlsbad CA](#)

Some comments and one request
Meeting organization

- I thought it great that Ken Fisher introduced the mission, history and players at the beginning of last nights meeting. It brought clarity that does not appear on the website and citizens only learn from digging, if at all. It was welcome context we needed. Ken or others should lead this way in future meetings with the public so everyone knows were are, and where we have been.

Park City School District – Commitment?

- I am personally uncomfortable with the PCSD's role to date. Maybe I should not be concerned but you are welcome to forward this comment.
 - PCSD was not participating until their bond got defeated and several citizens including myself wanted them at this this table. Its great they have joined, but my concern is whether they are participating or committed.
 - PCSD chose to go alone without inviting City or County into their curricular and extra-curricular athletic programming or bond budget approval
 - Leaves me wondering what was so wrong about City or County dependence and whether this problem has been addressed
 - Someone last night brought up the distinction between curricular PE and extra-curricular team sports. Interesting. I do not know how to factor that
 - I do not see anyone from PCSD attending or publicly visible in this discussion. Leads me to believe they are watching but not committed
 - As a citizen without school age children, I want great schools to attract great families and for high returns in real estate values and quality of community. I do not support us (public facilities) and them (school age facilities) beyond where safety and sensible travel necessitate (e.g. Locker rooms and Physical Education)

- Children are part of the community and should become comfortable interacting, competing and sharing public funded facilities. It takes a village and lets encourage our next generation to interact and influence the existing generations in the safe and sensible PC community.
- City limits do not provide sufficient space for all facilities to be co-located on each campus.
- Many sports, including skating, hockey, tennis and swimming, can allow teenagers to train, practice and occasionally compete side by side. For me its a capacity issue.
 - I played drop-in hockey on Tuesday – it was a 14 year and older session. Damn, those youths are fast.... But we made better use of available ice time and got a bigger group for more interesting hockey.
 - Twin 15 year old high school tennis girls (Livy and Maddie) are #1 and #2 on the high school team. I have hit with them at the MARC and now read the sports page to watch their progress.
 - High school coaching and tennis competition stresses access to our MARC courts for all non-highschoolers. Similarly, the Adult Hockey league is the far and away largest revenue source for the rink, yet we can only get ice time after 9pm during the school year so youth and high schoolers can play during the preferred times. As a MARC tennis pass holder and a year round hockey player, I accept these priorities as they should be... even when my hockey games begin at 11:30 pm. Again, its a capacity issue. We need more ice availability. We need more tennis court capacity for High Schoolers.

Tennis Capacity

- Related to tennis court capacity, I believe we under-utilize the existing tennis infrastructure and the city/county/district can do better. I offer a recommendation.
 - Has anyone counted or provided a reference on where all the tennis courts that are open to the public exist, how to reserve and rules for time on court or permission to teach?
 - I know of dozens located in quiet locations with ample parking. Many are adjacent to schools, others are in city or county parks. Yet to my knowledge on the MARC courts can be reserved in advance or require a fee.
 - I understand the RAP tax promise was to allow visitors open access to many courts, including city park.
 - These courts are under-utilized. Full only infrequently and during peak weather/season hours.
 - If we cannot reliable schedule access for citizens or visitors, these ample assets will remain under-utilized while we fund additional capital and operating expense for expansion.
 - City and County and District does need another concentrated set of 6 or more courts for high school and potentially other competition. Covered in winter seems essential... Marc is at capacity without available land and an appropriate place to seed and verify growing interests in Pickle Ball and Paddle Tennis.... Despite their competing again for my desired Tennis court capacity.

- RECOMMENDATION – City and County should map all publicly available and publicly maintained courts. Hotels and other hospitality concierge should send visitors to a Park City Recreation website where visitors can surrender their identity in order to get a temp, nearly free, or annual recreation pass. Said pass allows citizens and visitors alike to reserve courts in advance for free.
 - Citizens drive multiple cars (doubles tennis is most popular) to multiple locations (Trailside, Willow Creek, City Courts) only to find someone playing and now way to verify when they began or when the courts become available.
 - Violates the city/county mission to reduce traffic and effluent
 - Allows uncertified professionals to teach and sometime monopolize a court for many hours
 - Forces all certified teaching to occur almost exclusively at the MARC whereby some wealthier residents simply book a lesson/clinic to gain preferred playing times
 - Puts unnecessary strain on the MARC facility
 - I have yet to find any of the recreational doubles players or USTA tennis teams that would not welcome alternative courts such as City Park or Willow Creek or Trailside if they knew their court time was reserved.
 - Let the visitors and public walk on. But if a registered rec pass holder makes an online reservation confirmed via smart phone, the walk ons must vacate.
 - And a new, compelling data asset. This temp visitor pass holder system will build a valuable City/County database of visitors available for future re-marketing and targeting when we offer future recreational and hospitality events.

Swimming Facility Plan

- Great strides on considering design in parallel with use.
- Please forward any notes or presentation you can on the meetings that took place with aquatic-interested citizens and the Greg Cannon of the Acquatics Design Group. I find nothing available on the website.
 - Your boss and founder of Landmark stated some results that I had not heard before.
 - 50 meter pool will be optimized for general use and not for competition
 - Pool temp will be higher and depth will be shallower than training would prefer
 - Bulkhead separation configuration design allow two 25 meter pools (short water) and sub optimize long-water training or competition.
- Designers are not operators. Who owns the profit and loss responsibility for this future facility?
 - Tennis courts, most fields, and ice rinks suitably substitute as training and competition facilities, but for the spectator and locker room demands.
 - We have dedicated training facilities for athletic conditioning, ski jumping, ski racing, and suitable facilities for tennis, skating and field sports.
 - We do not have any swim training or competition facilities. Consider it analogous to our our gymnasium situation where teams do not wish to come where the locker rooms and courts are unsuitable.
 - As a former board member of a private club where competitive swimming/training and general use including swim lessons took place, I know pool temp and dampened waves affect training and competition. You cannot train for an hour in a pool that is too warm.

- If the City/County/District are going to get into the swimming business, we need someone to take public responsibility for operating cost and programming. If designs are set for general use and long water is not intended for training/competition, I fear the plans remain naïve. Again, great progress but please make these decisions public and early in the process so the public understands the implications.

Ice Rink plans on hold due to private funded potential

- Sounds great. I hear grading has begun on a site but nothing has been submitted to City or County planning.
- Private parties are welcome and should be encouraged.
 - I remind that Canyons did not wish to follow through on their golf course commitment until City and County forced it.
 - Private parties can walk away with no exit cost. Lets get some earnest milestones in place before we suspend further ice rink planning more than 1 year
- If private and public shared use is a planning priority, how does the facility plan incorporate Silver Summit's swimming and conditioning capacity in our plans.
 - I simply wish to know if or how private use capacity will be considered in the public prioritization, funding and access.

Begin planning recreation segments in parallel with Facility Planning. Great opportunity for anger and citizen revolt when such large communication and expectations gaps exist.

- I was pleased to hear Ken's remarks on the survey quality of results that informs the facility planning.
- I am proposing a parallel process that is likely outside LandMark's scope. But you are the designated collector of public comments so I send your way.
- I remain deeply concerned about the lack of public participation.
 - I believe there are many, genuinely motivated special interests by form of recreation.
 - I solicit and get strong voices throughout our community, over coffee, on the court/ice/poolside.
 - These voices are not being heard, kept current since the survey now years out of currency
- Some of these future facilities, like a 50 m pool, may cost \$1500-2000 per day operating losses. Lets bring the public along and make sure the appetite and use cases match citizen and council interests.
 - Last night Ken and others made reference to "Todd" who apparently runs Eckert swim facility.
 - I know I how to reach Michael O'keefe on Tennis, Amanda for Ice, or Ken for City facilities.
 - I do not know how Michael, or Amanda or "Todd" or a fields person can lead the discussion for their user community. They are absent, silent, or ill-equipped to lead these discussions because the capital planning process for facilities is orthogonal to sport/activity planning and programming
 - These leaders much be provided with time and resource and clear success priorities before they gather, recommend, prioritize and program optimal use of available facility budget. By example, without knowing how to prioritize a. Citizens served, b. return on capital, c. youth vs adult, d. visitor hospitality night creation – our tennis, ice, field

house, and swim facility spend is only informed by a soon to be outdated survey and not informed by peer findings from peer facilities in other communities.

- City/County/District personnel never seem to present a unified view of value for tax money across their boundaries. Amanda may be best because she has the only rink. Michael is wonderfully informed about county and district tennis facilities and the only one currently managing the pickle ball or paddle tennis demands. Yet his city job does not empower or resource him to gather the racquet demand, existing capacity and unmet demands in a unified manner. Does Todd have this charter or capacity?
- I believe we can seat 100-200 citizens for a "racquet sport facility planning" event where City and County and Citizen leaders could review the capital facility plans, including pros and cons for each. I encourage something similar for swimming, ice and fields/fieldhouse demand.
 - Put all the tennis, pickle ball and paddle tennis advocates into a room once or twice. Survey and take comment.
 - Today Ken Fisher and Michael Okeefe take most of this comment because the MARC is the primary facility. I find that an undue burden on them and does not force District or County to listen, sense or respond
 - Last night two pickle ballers attended and asked a reasonable question about concentrating facilities.
- I do not find any of the ice hockey captains or players know status of these facilities. Amanda is doing a fine job collaborating with the private party planning to build ice facilities but how does Amanda or that private investor hear interest or competing desires from youth parents/figure skaters/hockey or others? Again, an unfair burden on Amanda and the private party.

Thank you Lisa for enduring and forwarding another hour of my observations and recommendations. Thank you too for encouraging it.

Thank You for the opportunity to comment on the Master Plan. As a USAPA Ambassador for Park City, want to make a case for consolidating the Pickleball courts or creating or creating a larger Pickleball complex that will help drive revenue to pay for its own maintenance. POINTS: 1) most successful courts are when they are combined into 8-12-20 courts developments 2) CBS sports said there are 2M current players that will grow to 8M within a few years 3) utah state department of tourism says "pickleball players are some of the highest spenders" compared to other tourist groups 4) 5 years ago northern utah had 8 courts today there are over 60 5) it is an unusual sport where 4 generations can have a competitive game with each other 6) fastest growing sport in north american 7) it is the fun of tennis without the PAIN..... 8) st. george with their 24 court complex brings in million each year with their tournaments.....park city is more beautiful..... We have an opportunity to build a great facility for our sport in the Park City/Basin area. Please let me know how we can best proceed and thank you for your consideration.

Kearns Campus –

I am supportive of the athletics support building adjacent to Dozier.

I would like to see more facilities for P.E. classes added into the gymnasium renovation, and have a smaller field house option (potentially with the ability to expand as needed).

I am supportive of tennis courts on the Kearns campus, and I am lukewarm to the idea of a field house. If a field house is built, please consider moving it closer to the school, near the site of the current baseball field, so that flow to/from the school is better and not crossing McPolin Elementary School. The baseball fields (turf) could then be relocated near the other baseball fields on the current site of TMJH. If the field house is located on the Eastern edge of the Kearns campus, I envision high school students driving from the High School over to the field house afterschool for practices, exacerbating the traffic issues.

Please consider a smaller version of the field house, especially in height. A low profile building will be more amenable for the neighborhood, and a smaller overall building will have lower O&M costs. Additionally, if any extra multipurpose space exists, please consider CTE needs of the district and whether some of the space could be beneficial for these needs.

Willow Creek Park –

Please consider pushing back the timeline for any expansion here. If more fields are built at Quinn’s and on the 24 acre parcel, the larger events should be focused there and not in this neighborhood park. We may not even need to expand this at all.

Pickleball – I like the idea of having a consolidated pickleball area, perhaps in the Silver Creek area. It doesn’t make sense to add them scattered about the city.

PC MARC –

I feel that platform tennis would be a big expense without a high need at this point (I had never even heard of platform tennis). With the facilities and costs needed to heat and operate these courts, it just doesn’t make sense to me for a small population of users.

I like the idea of an indoor/outdoor pool option at this location sometime down the road. It would be good for the school district use occasionally for PE classes (currently McPolin students go all the way out to Ecker, which seems like a lot of wasted time and transportation costs). Also, it would be nice to have a location for winter swim lessons in the city and would relieve some of the load on Ecker. It would be nice to have the option to open up this space in the summer to make it open air (although with a roof, is my understanding).

Silver Creek –

If you have an aquatics facility here, you should have more lap lanes.

Very much like the idea of consolidating the pickleball courts in one place – seems like the largest possible parcel is a good choice to fit 12+ courts.

Tennis courts plus bubble at MARC is great.

Seems like the best concept at Silver Creek is the put as many play fields in as possible. I understand the need to try to add a bunch of other “stuff” – but hosting large tournaments is definitely an economic driver, and concentrating fields in fewer spaces is obviously a benefit in terms of cutting down traffic.

Really don’t understand why there is so much insistence on pushing more development into Willow Creek. That neighborhood has absorbed a great deal. How can we spread the wealth?

Thank you for your ongoing work – much appreciated!

Regarding pickleball:

1. Most successful sport complexes are developed in 8-12 court configurations.
 2. CBS Sports reported 2 million current players with 8 million anticipated by 2018.
 3. Utah State Department of Tourism says “pickleball players are some of the highest spenders” compared to other tourist groups. They tend to be older and retired.
 4. 5 years ago, northern Utah had 8 courts. Today there are over 60.
 5. St. George with a 24 court complex brings in a million each year with their tournaments.
 6. Woods Cross, Ogden, and Brigham City have built beautiful complexes, but it is too hot in the summer to play there. Park City is the perfect location for 8 month play.
-

I attended the June 29th meeting at PC High School. One question I have is why are the lacrosse fields (both outdoor and indoor) being "sold" by this recreation committee and the school board as a "need". Lacrosse (both boys and girls) is NOT a sanctioned UHSAA sport. I spoke to Todd Hauber at the meeting on June 29th and he told me that the school board and the school district have absolutely no obligation to build facilities for non-sanctioned sports (e.g. water polo, ice hockey, lacrosse, mountain biking, etc.). If lacrosse is a sport that is to be included in this recreation facilities master plan, it should be included as a WANT, not a NEED.

Thank you for your consideration.

The community has called for an updated swimming facility. The school district needs to replace Treasure Mountain and the high schools indoor athletic facilities do not meet there needs. I suggest build a new high school with indoor field house and 50 meter swimming pool to meet the needs of both the district and community. Build it along Hwy 40. The high school could be used as a replacement for Treasure Mountain. Whatever is done needs to done with careful consideration to the needs of both the school district and the recreation community.