

Mountain Recreation Facilities Master Plan

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Wednesday, March 2, 2016

PC MARC	11am – 1pm	(18 people signed in)
Basin Fieldhouse	5pm – 7pm	(21 people signed in)

- A total of 20 comment forms were filled out and left with the planning team at the meetings.
- 10 people submitted comments on the “Comment Forum” on the project website.
- 7 people submitted comments via email.

VERBATIM COMMENTS

Question #1: *A list of potential uses and facilities has been identified for each site identified for development or expansion. Do you agree with the potential activities listed in the Facilities and Locations Matrix?*

- There are a lot of cyclists in town. How about a velodrome either free-standing or as part of a multi-purpose space?
- Public school facilities should be utilized with expanded hours to maximize use and minimize down time (buildings closed).
- Yes
- Parking at the MARC is already a problem. I'm concerned that any increase in use at that site will compound the issue.
- Utah Youth Soccer has adopted smaller field sizes for most younger teams. You might consider more multi-purpose layouts that would adapt to the upcoming variety of game field sizes.
- Parking at Willow Creek is also now a problem - further expansion should be avoided
- Yes – agree.
- Seems like a good vetting so far. Thanks for the open house.
- Please explore Matt Knoop Park on the 224 by the community gardens. I love that its central from Kimball to PC, could be a great location.
- Climbing facilities
- I agree.
- I definitely agree and the community center/senior center should be a shared space for teens.
- All weather 400 meter track open to the public, indoor or outdoor.
- Climbing wall / gym. Climbing wall / gym. Climbing wall / gym.

Question #2: *Do you agree with the Guiding Principles that have been established for this project? Are there other Guiding Principles that should be considered? Please specify.*

- As long as we get some type of 2nd ice sheet I'm happy with your principles.
- Yes
- Yes, aesthetics should be a consideration. I prefer the parking and buildings to be close to highways and roads and athletic fields and gathering areas away from traffic noise.
- I was surprised to see that acceptance of the prior work done on community needs and unmet demand isn't explicitly incorporated

- Yes, overall. Would like to keep some facilities focused in would neighborhoods, but larger facilities outside of neighborhoods.
- Yes
- Accessibility both financially and location wise.
- Ensure easy access to life style recreation.
- Yes
- It's hard to figure out what you want without knowing the dollars budgeted.
- I agree.
- A climbing facility (cheaper than pools and ice rinks).
- Yes

Question #3: *Do you agree with the Evaluation Criteria? Are there other criteria that should be considered when evaluating the various options? Please specify.*

- PCSD should not be building their own indoor athletic facility, it should be a partnership.
- Traffic and transportation should be a main consideration in locations.
- Possibly and concentration of sports (pools vs ice vs hard surface vs turf) to allow for regional and national competition as in skiing and MTBing. Also some smaller mixed sport areas for neighborhoods.
- We aspire to use public transit more in our community, but the reality is that it is not a practical solution for many of us - especially with respect to the youth sports that are the primary users of many of the basin rec facilities. I would ignore public transportation access as a criteria.
- Likewise, I do not place high importance on energy conservation with respect to public recreation facilities. Aquatics, indoor activities in the winter, ice arenas, skiing, others all are energy consumers, and the health benefits to our community should outweigh environmental concerns.
- Please consider partnership with Park City School District.
- Cost and transportation and no duplication. Thanks!
- Excellent.
- Revenue neutral.
- Yes
- It's the off leash area in Round Valley holds dog parks maybe a lower priority.
- Yes, keep kids away from dogs or delete dog park.

Question #4: *What do you think of the building programs for the major facilities? Let us know if the buildings address all needs and requirements.*

- Add a velodrome.
- Indoor lap pool is needed in PC city limits - Quinns or somewhere close – not sure where.
- Builds and parks should encourage bike commuting with bike parking and trails to the facilities.
- I think a two-sheet ice complex with the conversion of the old facility to a field house sounds like a very elegant solution to two of our highest-ranked unmet needs.
- I would not use any facilities at City Park - it is too far from my house, and parking is too much of a pain there
- I like the idea of restricting lighted fields to parcels away from homes, especially the 24 acre parcel out by Quinn's junction

- I would like to see an evaluation of covering the Quinn's sportex field with a bubble during the winter months only - it may be a less expensive and faster alternative than building another field house.
- Good
- I would like to see option with a competitive size Olympic pool.
- Climbing is needed.
- Add teen center.
- Lack of indoor space for ice, aquatic and sports absolutely needs to be addressed.
- Having a 50 meter indoor pool is optimal. If not feasible an indoor 25 meter needed, preferably at PC MARC.
- None of existing aquatic options meet funding / economic benefit / multi use/ partnering. You need both 50 m and warmup pool.
- Climbing wall / gym.
- No buildings at Canyons- avoid terrible traffic on 224.

Question #5: *What do you think of the site designs and layouts? Let us know how well the site design for each option addresses needs and requirements.*

- Additional ice sheet at Quinns makes sense to me. Indoor turf field at Quinns makes sense to me.
- What a great job of planning. Congratulations in order for your efforts. PC is such a great place for athletes.
- Silver Creek looks like an access nightmare - this site should be de-prioritized
- Good
- I think the 24 acre parcel is the best location for adjacent use and public transportation. PCMC's advisory board COSTC recommendations say to keep Clark Ranch open with only possible recreation. Please take it off the list of considerations, seems like there are plenty of other sites. Thanks.
- I like infill locations that the public can reach by foot or bike. The necessity of all users needing to drive to Quinns or the 40 highway . . . (Triangle?) Seems outdated and wasteful.
- Please don't place fields by the freeways. Wind is an issue for fields and all activities.
- The Triangle parcel with the community center seems to be the best option.
- Need to add a climbing wall.
- Keep fields off noisy highways. Use all sites except Triangle site.

Additional Comments or Questions (Comment Forms, Emails, Meetings):

- Try to connect all new facilities to the paved path system in town.
- We need to engage the PCSD Board to partner with Basin Rec at PC Rec. No reason PCSD should have athletic/recreation staff when PC Rec and Basin Rec already has the staff and expertise.
- Include rough estimates of option/site location costs +/- 1 or 2 or 5 mm \$. Also means of funding, i.e. bonds. Possible sequence of phasing in these projects by location and sport.
- I believe it's been two years since we passed a bond funding development of a second sheet of ice. When will we see progress on this? Since it's the highest-ranked recreation project, and already (at least partially) funded, shouldn't this be carved out from the master planning process and executed now? Thank you again for being open to community input!!!-

- I like having Olympic capable ice sheet on IHC 15 acre parcel and turning current ice sheet into a field house. 24 acre parcel – would like to see additional outdoor tennis courts. Triangle parcel – would like to see indoor field house (potentially football field) and aquatics center (indoor and outdoor). PC Mark – like the indoor gym turned into indoor lap pool, like glass-enclosed tennis courts which could be open in the summer. Canyons – like this location for aquatics center, would be good for tourist use and keep the center in good use. City Park – I like inward facing plan with small sprayground.
- Very important to me as a swimmer and physician. We must have state of the art European technology for water purifications in aquatic center. Use of ozone, peroxide, eh. No chrome / bromine as these are toxic and detrimental to health. Thanks.
- Could admission be kept affordable? I love the indoor outdoor idea and sunshade option. I was very surprised by the Canyons aquatic center idea. I really like the central location and the idea of the locals using some of the Canyons space.
- I'd like to see several of these scenarios implemented.
- I love the city park community center. The split building makes sense keeping kids away from the parking lot.
- Not from triangle parcel: too far out. Not for golf practice option. It uses up too much space.
- Like MARC improvements, city park improvements, canyons aquatics
- Concerned how far out some of the facilities are from current population densities, including Sr. Center options.
- Multi use of Sr. Center to include teen center.
- Concerned about proposed facilities on the Wasatch County border – competition or complimentary.
- PC MARC Concept B: I like the idea of putting an indoor pool where the MARC gym is currently. I'm concerned about lack of parking though. Holding competitive events would be hard because of that.
- Triangle Parcel: I don't like having the fields right up against highway 40. If this area is decided on I think having the buildings along the highway vs the fields along the highway is better for everyone, a better experience.
- Canyons Master Plan: I worry about having a big facility at the base of Canyons as well I think we may find it overrun with tourists which I don't feel is the point of this.
- Overall I believe this was a great informative presentation. I like the idea of utilizing the Quinn area as much as we can. That is already a recreational hub that makes a lot of sense. It also keeps more traffic out of town.
- I like the Triangle option the best but do not like the fields right next to the highways because of noise and pollution.
- The baseball/soccer field overlap seems counter intuitive. It seems they should not overlap so that you can have soccer and baseball games at the same time.
- As a parent, the 24 acre parcel needs to have the playground. I have 2 kids and if one is playing on the field the other one gets bored. Having an option for a playground is important.
- The cluster of Silver Creek / Triangle I think works best. For example, if you have a game and then want to go swimming afterwards the buildings are right there.
- Transportation, buses, accessibility, again I think the Silver Creek, Triangle options allow easy access without bringing traffic into town.
- Maybe a climbing wall.

- Facilities need to be built to minimize operational and maintenance cost. A single facility is cheaper to operate than many facilities. Rather than building multiple aquatic facilities, one should look at enlarging current facilities, like Ecker Hill Aquatic Facility.
- I find it confusing and as a taxpayer unacceptable for City/County and School District to separately plan recreation and taxpayer funding. Currently Ecker Hill operates the only Pool whereas school tennis teams have priority for city tennis courts. I fear voters will withdraw approval unless our government entities are collaboratively planning.
- I'm concerned that we should be spending money on the infrastructure of the area before we overspend on these projects. If we don't get a hold on traffic, we won't be able to enjoy any of these.
- Coordinated planning between the City, Basin and School District is the whole point of this process and why all 3 entities and stakeholders are invested in this Master Plan project.
- I think location and accessibility to any new facilities may not have been adequately addressed. A current and future population distribution map should be used to locate facilities. Silver Creek has poor access for anyone living outside the new development, and the large area of land around Jeremy Ranch is unused.
- Tennis Court Utilization The Marc tennis courts are very hard to access during all but very early morning and evening times. Mornings are swamped by women and lessons; yet many other city and county courts are underutilized in city /county parks or adjacent to Trailside elementary that would be reliably useful if we could schedule. Please invest in software easily available to residents and visitors that shows court availability and allows for reservations. Without such coordination, the MARC has the only tennis courts one can reserve online and reliably plan to play. Without online reservations, you cannot see utilization. If you wish to reduce driving, let us go nearby and not drive around hunting for a court that may or may not be available. More courts at the MARC are desirable. But that land is limited.
- My Votes on Concepts offered: City Park Concept B MARC A IHC 15-Acre Concept C Triangle Parcel B
- The ice rink is lovely. My favorite place. Tennis courts would be wonderful and adding a pond to the dog park would be fun. Thank you!!
- During the public meeting several residents raised questions about who was planning and would be programming the swimming facility. The speakers agreed a professional with this expertise would be welcome.

Another set of anxieties were voiced because the School District was not participating and tax payers want efficient use of funds.

I have an expert who happens to offer consulting services. Tim Sheeper, currently head of aquatics for Menlo Park, CA and retained by St Helena and Santa Clara counties to help with their facility planning/programming for families, seniors, school age children and athletes.

I swam in Menlo Park this week and got an enthusiastic "yes" when I asked Tim if he would be interested in talking to Park City Recreation. Great guy. Knows government facility mgmt, school age requirements and aquatic programming for all ages. If you bring him to Park City, he is welcome to stay in our home. Chris Roon

- World Class Park City can have world class public rec facility just as it hosted Olympics. Include: racquetball, aquatic center, Olympic pool in and out, net with climbing wall, leisure pool (as Kamas), 2 slides, hot tub/lazy river, fitness studios, indoor track, weights / cardio machines, party

room, ice sheet at Quinn's, tennis courts inside or out, gym (basketball) to serve as Sundance venue, playgrounds. NO dog park! NO spa services as manicures, messages, etc. NO golf (already at Canyons or mini golf).

- It would be great to have more indoor tennis courts, especially during prime am and after school hours. There are a lot of options to add them at Quinn's. There are so many options for indoor multi-use fields – couldn't some be tennis instead.
- What about the proposal to make a lake area / picnic – dam up Round Valley?
- Sundance Film venue and fields at new film studio.
- Quinn's Junction – what happened to the construction guy who was donating land for tennis courts?
- We need more indoor tennis courts with the growth of the community and the higher number of visitors during the winter months, additional courts will be needed and more in demand.
- Need better parking.
- School District needs to participate.
- Big difference between auditorium and aquatics center / competition vs training (Greg Cannon with Sparano + Mooney might have more information.
- No clear contact for aquatics in the area.
- No 25 meter pool, too small, doesn't meet needs. Lots of arbitration, need clearer picture of competition vs training (Greg Cannon).
- Summit Park (north of the park) why aren't we looking at it?
- I spent some time looking through all the different possibilities laid out in the Rec Facilities Master Plan. My feedback is primarily on the Silver Creek proposals, because I live very near that parcel. I feel that Option A is far superior to the other two options and I am strongly in favor of all the facilities proposed. There is a serious dearth of any recreation facilities in the northeast corner of the Basin, so getting as much bang for our buck at that location is very important. Softball/baseball fields, tennis courts, pickle ball courts, dog park, picnic pavilion, multi-purpose fields, bike park, trail connections, and of course a new rec center with aquatics of all descriptions are all desperately needed. I see Option A as creating a world class recreation multi-purpose area that will get great use and be a gathering place for residents in the northeast corner of the Basin. I hope my feedback is valuable to you.
- As the Field House expands please consider the ever growing popularity and growth of yoga class attendance. Soon a larger space/expandable space or additional space will need to be dedicated to this. Thanks for listening. We buy an annual couple pass with fitness for the sole purpose of yoga classes. FYI.
- City Park – the location of the playground might be better off further away from active play, also needs fencing around it.
- (Staff) The current softball field has a fence which is too short for our play. Please consider moving the field to the south (eliminating the platform tennis). if the area behind the condos is developed it will be in jeopardy of Homeruns with the fence where it is.
- (Staff) Two things that were big daydreams about the Triangle parcel for the Rec District. 1. a large shared maintenance building with the county about where the 4, 5 and part of 2 are. Also it is a very important trail connection that we would love to have through this parcel from our undercrossing out to the rail trail.....
- (Staff) 24-acre Parcel - The layout on Concept A works well as one field would be open if both ball fields were being used where in the lower picture, only one sport could be played and it's usually better if the ball fields are clustered together. In either case, the playground must be

protected from errant play- center field softballs and beyond the goal soccer balls or lacrosse balls

- Thank you for an informative session this evening. I appreciate your efforts to involve the community in this important set of decisions.
- Dear Advisory Committee Members:

Park City Pony Club has brought together the local equestrian community including equestrian neighborhoods, associations, businesses, professional trainers, competitive athletes, and supporters to provide public comment on the Mountain Recreation Facilities Master Plan.

Park City Pony Club was founded in 2015 with 20 members and 40 sponsors and are affiliated with the United States Pony Club (USPC). USPC is a national program that develops character, leadership, confidence and a sense of community in youth through a program that teaches the care of horses and ponies, riding and mounted sports for boys and girls ages 5-18. Park City Pony Club is a nonprofit organization relies on member dues, donations and fundraising to support its activities.

We were excited to have an opportunity to review the Recreation Master Plan.

However, we are disappointed to find that equestrian amenities were not provided for. This is an important issue for Pony Club as we lack enough year-round facilities and amenities to host educational opportunities for our members and facilities to care for our horses. There really are not a lot of affordable opportunities for parents to get their kids involved in Equestrian Sports in the area. We live in an outdoor recreational community with Olympic tradition, it would so great for our community to provide public amenities that support youth and adult Equestrian Sports and Recreation.

Based on our review of the documentation available, we found some possible inconsistencies in the data and analysis used to set priorities for equestrian services that we wanted to bring to your attention. But most importantly, we found that the Master Recreation Plan conflicted with the Basin General Plan Policy. The Synderville Basin General Plan Policy 4.24:

"Promoting and encouraging horseback riding and other equestrian uses for equestrian trail connectivity". The Basin General plan also has defined six (6) equestrian neighborhoods with six (6) provisions for equestrians including: development, recreation, trails, standards, enhancements, and safety. How can the Basin Recreation Master Plan not address any of the General Plan policies or provisions?

Park City Pony Club also found confusing definitions used for equestrianism and equestrian facilities. The Master Recreation Plan does not adequately define or describe Equestrians or Equestrian activities. Common definitions of Equestrianism include such categories as working, transportation, recreational, cultural exercises, and competitive sport https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animals_in_sport . Grouping all equestrian activities into one group is like grouping all hardcourt ball sports such as tennis, basketball, racquetball, paddleball, and pickleball into one group.in the end you may not make anyone happy with what you produce.

The majority of parents who want to give their young kids the opportunity to learn to ride must drive outside of Snyderville Basin and Park City. We are concerned that with the lack of equestrian amenities in the 10-year Master Plan, as development and growth continues, we won't have opportunities for equestrian sport or recreation in our area in the future. Equestrians need land to care for horses; facilities to house horses; and trails, tracks and arenas to recreate, train and compete. Without these provisions, we can't exist.

Please find the attached letter with our findings and public input. We are respectfully requesting that you consider equestrian activities, amenities, and facilities be included in the Master Plan for Public Input and that an equestrian professional be nominated to the Advisory Committee with further analysis.

Our goal is protect and preserve equestrian sport and recreation and to create the next generation of knowledgeable and competent horsemen and women. We hope you will give us an opportunity to be heard as a group so we can share with you what it means to be an equestrian and live the equestrian way of life in Snyderville Basin and Park City.

Respectfully,

Dawn Vibert Bowes

Owner, EquiSportUSA - 3-Day Eventing Barn

Secretary, Park City Pony Club

- Hi Ken,

Thanks for your e-mail and questions. I have reached out to Travis English requesting that the 15 or so active equestrian sport associations in the area have input on the Fair Grounds plans. He said once they get the land finalized they'll be open to a meeting. I have also sent a vision statement and a community development document to Kim Carson who said she submitted to Counsel. I have met with Pete Gillwald representing the Bitner Family, who are open to equestrian amenities as part of their entitlement request. I've heard that they presented an Equestrian Horse Park plan to some members of the County Council, I'll forward you those documents in a separate e-mail.

The challenge and the dialog we would like to open up as an equestrian community, as referenced in the letter submitted to the Advisory Committee, is how Equestrianism and Equestrian Facilities or Amenities is defined. The current design and plans for the Summit County Fair Grounds are "Cultural" equestrian activities (e.g. rodeo, livestock, 4-H, etc.). The equestrian activities such as "Competition Sport" (e.g. Show Jumping, Hunter/Jumper, Eventing, Reining, Endurance, Vaulting, Driving, etc.) require very different facilities and amenities. It's kind of like saying that all hard court ball sports are the same and require the same facilities (e.g. tennis, basketball, pickleball, handball, etc.).

On page 4 of the letter, we've listed possible amenities that could be included if we broaden the definition, I've copied below. With more accurate definitions, a lot more opportunity opens up. I'm sure that once the public has the ability to provide feedback, if it's included in the Master Plan, more ideas will surface. A lot of these Ideas that are easy to implement, affordable, and benefit many and would go a long way to getting the Equestrian Community support.

I guess what I'm wondering, not sure if you have any guidance, if the Advisory Committee is non-denominational and we can't be represented on the Committee, how does the equestrian community have an open dialog with the County? If we are not included on the Master Plan how do we give input in a public form? Do we all show up to the April 13th Public Input meetings? We now have close to 100 supporters and growing and mostly from the 6 equestrian communities represented in the Basin General Plan, including Silver Creek Estates.

Please let me know if I can answer any additional questions.

Best,
Dawn Bowes

P.S. This topic will be on the agenda for SA#3 Board Meeting Monday Night.

POSSIBLE EQUESTRIAN AMENITIES COULD INCLUDE: (Not defined in the Master Plan)

1. Soft Surface Trails - designed for equestrian use. Paved trails, off-leash dogs, and Mountain bikes make it dangerous to navigate from horse back. Equestrian purpose-designed trails with better safety education will make it safer for equestrian trail users. Currently, the Master Plan lacks all reference to Equestrian Trail User's needs or types of trails/tracks, except to say that all trails are "available" to Equestrians. Amenities include:
 - a. *Trailhead Signage* – Better education for non-equestrian trail users such as Bikers and Dog Walkers the importance of and how to give right of way to equestrians.
 - b. *Trail Maintenance* – Deep Ruts, Steep trails of scabble, Blind Corners (especially when Bikes are going fast), low hanging vegetation and narrow trails are dangerous for equestrians.
 - c. *Soft Surface Trails* – Paved Trails are not good for horses. Paving trails near equestrian neighborhoods and paving trails with access to back country trails makes it dangerous and unsafe for equestrians.
 - d. *Trailhead Parking* to accommodate Horse Trailers – For Equestrians to access public trails they either need to ride from their home or trailer to a trailhead that can provide enough room to park a horse trailer and a location to unload their horse. *Horse Ties* or Corral areas are also safe ways to provide for equestrian trail access.
 - e. *Watering Troughs* – *to provide water for horses out on the trail.*
 - f. *Rest Rooms* – *To provide equestrian toilette and washing facilities.*
2. Outdoor Soft Surface Tracks – These types of equestrian trails can easily and cost effectively be built for Equestrian users on existing trails and open spaces. These trails are multi use as they can be used by cross country skiers in the winter. Outdoor specific Equestrian Tracks/Trails include:

- a. Gallop tracks and conditioning tracks
 - b. Competitive trail courses – 3-4 mile looped track with trail obstacles
 - c. Hacking or Bridle Path trail loops off roads and separate from bikes and motorized traffic.
 - d. Cross country tracks – 3-4 mile looped track with natural jumping obstacles (water, logs, ditches, banks, etc.) Used as a competition and training course.
3. Outdoor Riding Arenas
 - a. Competition Arenas to host Dressage, Hunter/Jumper, and Eventing.
 - b. Schooling/Practice Fields for local associations (e.g. Park City Pony Club)
 4. Temporary Stalls
 - a. To house Horses temporarily (short-term) during summer months for Horse Shows, Clinics and Events.
 5. Indoor Event Center –
 - a. For Year-Round Equestrian Training, Lessons, Clinics and Shows Events.
 - b. Can be used for other non-equestrian events, trade shows and festivals.
 6. Indoor Boarding Facilities –
 - a. To House and care for local population of equestrians who need year round facilities to house their horses and take lessons and train.

COMMENTS WRITTEN ON THE MAPS & BOARDS

Guiding Principles

- Project purpose: Add “Ensure easy access to lifestyle activities, (financial too).

Existing Facility/Location Matrix

- Mark box labeled: Outdoor Multi-Purpose Fields (unlighted) / Matt Knoop Memorial Park

IHC 15-acre Parcel – Concept A

- (Staff) Correct options for recommended ice sheet options to the three that Victus Advisors recommended:
 - #1 Outdoor on soccer
 - #2 Indoor on soccer*
 - #3 2 sheet on IHC 15-acre adjacent parcel*
 - *Options included Olympic expansion
- 24-acre Parcel
Concept A – Why a road around the field? Traffic is issue with running sports. People can walk.

Silver Creek – Concept B

- (Staff) Cyclocross could be an option in this park. The Basin has been looking for a location to provide these facilities.

Triangle Parcel – Concept A

- Ice and pool into one building
- Second that idea

Triangle Parcel – Concept B

Rail trail, trailhead?, existing underpass

To: Park City and Snyderville Basin Advisory Committee Members

From: Park City Pony Club and the Equestrian Community

RE: Request to Include Equestrian Facilities, Amenities and Trail Users in the Park City and Snyderville Basin Master Recreation Plan

Date: March 10th, 2016

The Equestrian Community of Park City and Snyderville Basin; including Park City Pony Club, Regional Equestrian Associations, Local Equestrian Facilities, Equestrian Businesses, and Equestrian Professionals, Athletes, and their Supporters are respectfully submitting a united formal public comment on the Mountain Recreation Facilities Master Plan (Master Plan) and the related content provided on the Website.

We are requesting that the Master Recreation Advisory Committee include Equestrian activities, amenities, and facilities in the Master Plan. We have found inaccuracies in the data and analysis used to set priorities for equestrian services; improper definitions of Equestrians and Equestrian Facilities; and most importantly, conflicts with the Basin General Plan.

The Master Plan is consistent with the Snyderville Basin General Plan policies and provisions, specifically, the General Plan Policy 4.24: "Promote and encourage horseback riding and other equestrian uses for equestrian trail connectivity". Further, the Basin General Plan has identified six (6) equestrian neighborhoods with six (6) provisions for equestrians including: development, recreation, trails, standards, enhancements, and safety. How can the Basin Recreation Master Plan not address any of the General Plan policies or provisions?

In the Strategic Action Plan Page 20 - Figure 4 – Opinion Survey scatter Diagram, on the X axis "Importance Rating", the Mean of the 33 facilities listed in Assessment Matrix score is 77.7, Indoor Equestrian Center and Outdoor Equestrian Park is scored 81, above the Mean. Yet in the scatter diagram, Equestrian facilities are listed below the Mean. There are additional errors found in the Demand study, Opinion Survey, Strategic Action Plan as detailed further in this document. In our opinion these errors seem to be the primary reason that Equestrian amenities, facilities and trails are not included in the Master Plan.

The Master Plan does not adequately define or describe Equestrians or Equestrian activities. Basin on common definition of Equestrianism "practical working purposes, transportation, recreational activities, artistic or cultural exercises, and competitive sport." the Demand Survey does not differentiate between very different Equestrian Activities. Grouping these equestrian activities into one category of demand or supply is like grouping all court ball sports (Tennis, Basketball, Racquetball, Paddleball, Pickleball) into one facility or program to determine demand and supply. In the end you won't make anyone happy.

The Demand survey also states that there are at least eight (8) locations in Snyderville Basin and Park City that offer equestrian services. On Summit County Licensing Website a search for Equestrian Facilities provides two (2) licensed, privately owned, equestrian facilities that offer boarding, training, and lessons and three (4) that are licensed as Horseback Tour Guides of which most provide the trail rides outside of Snyderville Basin and Park City. The Demand Study states that the "Current demand is being met by private sources". "Horseback tours, boarding facilities, and training grounds are provided

at several locations within Park City and SBSRD.” Doing a simple search on the internet, there are seven (7) unlicensed equestrian facilities. This would indicate that there are also issues with the licensing process that might need to be addressed.

Interesting to note, is that only one (1) of the two (2) licensed facilities accommodate lesson horses for kids and adults to learn to ride without the expense of purchasing and housing a horse. Most parents who want to give their young kids the opportunity to learn to ride and take care of a horse must drive to Heber City and or Eastern Summit County.

Because of these and other significant issues identified in our findings, we believe another look should be given to the issue of whether or not Equestrian amenities, facilities and trail user accommodations should be included in the Master Plan so that input may be provided by the Public?

We respectfully request that these issues be addressed and request that the Advisory Committee consider including equestrian activities, amenities, and facilities in the Master Plan and in the Public Input process. We request that an equestrian professional be nominated to the Advisory committee with further analysis to be completed.

If we are inaccurate in our statements or further explanation is required, we hope to have this information addressed by representatives of the Advisory Committee with a formal response to this letter.

Respectfully,

Park City Pony Club and the Equestrian Community

Supporters of this Letter:

Last Name	First Name	Neighborhood	Affiliation
Aas	Anna-Kari	Silver Creek	Equestrian, Horse Owner, Pony Club Supporter
Allen	Carol	Midway	Equestrian & Pony Club Supporter
Anderson	Lisa	Deer Valley	Equestrian Parent
Bargowski	Julie	Silver Creek	Pony Club Parent
Berger	Silvia	Park City	
Bloom	Marsha	Silver Creek	Equestrian Professional
Bowes	Dawn	Silver Creek	Pony Club Officer, Equestrian Facility Owner
Bowes	Len	Silver Creek	Equestrian Facility Owner
Bronfman	Anika	Oakley	Pony Club Supporter, Horse Owner, Amateur Equestrian
Bronfman	Josh	Oakley	Equestrian Supporter
Campbell	Monice	Park City	Pony Club Parent
Caro	Debie-Kim	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Cernjul	Pamela	Snyderville Basin	Equestrian Parent
Clissold	Ed	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Clissold	Dinah	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Compagna	Gary	Midway	Pony Club Supporter
Crowther	Bud	Goshawk	Equestrian
Dennison	Dana		
Dunn	Katy	Kamas	Pony Club Officer and Parent
Dunn	Phil	Kamas	Pony Club Parent
Eaton-Hilly	Rebecca	Silver Creek	Equestrian, Horse Owner
Favero	Randy	Goshawk	Equestrian
Feltman	Judy	Silver Creek	Horse Owner
Galvin	Page	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Gebhart	Ron	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Gilbert	Larry	Deer Valley	Horse Owner
Green	Tisha	Snyderville Basin	Professional
Guthrie	Ellen	Jeremy Ranch	Equestrian, Athlete, Horse Owner
Hansen	Emily	Jeremy Ranch	
Harrower	Kristin	Pine Brook	Equestrian
Henson	Lori	Snyderville Basin	Pony Club Parent
Hodson	Nicholas	Mtn. Ranch Estates	
Horton	Kristi	Snyderville Basin	
Ibach	Dan	Jeremy Ranch	Equestrian Supporter
Irvin	Summer	Silver Creek	
Keblish	Colleen	Silver Creek	Pony Club Officer, Parent, Equestrian, Horse Owner
Keblish	Peter	Silver Creek	Pony Club Supporter
Keller-Gall	Julie	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Keye	Nicole	Snyderville Basin	Pony Club Parent
Kraut	Eric	Silver Creek	Equestrian Professional
Lieppe	Suzanne	Deer Valley	Horse Owner
Lybbert	Blair	Silver Creek	Park City Equine Center
Malin	Randall	Silver Creek	Pony Club Parent
Martin	Deb	Silver Creek	Horse Owner
Minihan	Julie		Pony Club Parent
Montgomery	Regina	Silver Creek	Horse Owner
Montgomery	Michael	Silver Creek	SA#3 Board
Peterson	Mark	Silver Creek	
Pierson	Whitney	Park City	
Plummer	Janice	Silver Creek	Horse Owner
Postula	Lara	Deer Valley	Pony Club Parent, Equestrian Professional
Sachen	Stacy	Goshawk	Equestrian
Saunders	Leslie	Marion	Equestrian, Horse Owner, Amateur Athlete
Schechinger	Tammy	Jeremy Ranch	

Schmid	Patricia	Salt Lake City	President, Wasatch Range Eventing Association
Scott-Gray	Courtney	Jeremy Ranch	Horse Owner, Equestrian Professional
Sharp	Tracy	Silver Creek	Pony Club Sponsor, Equestrian, Horse Owner
Sharp	Scott	Silver Creek	Equestrian Supporter
Skylling	Brandy	Silver Creek	Pony Club Officer, Pony Club Parent, Equestrian,
Skylling	Carl	Silver Creek	Equestrian Supporter
Smith	Tina	Park City	Equestrian, Horse Owner
Smulders	Mary-Lou	Mtn. Ranch Estates	Equestrian
Strange	Robin	Jeremy Ranch	Pony Club Parent
Tall	Sammi	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Thomas	Susan	Silver Creek	Equestrian
Thomas Wright	Nikki	E. Summit County	Equestrian, Pony Club Parent
Trapp	Ryan		Professional Farrier
VenVenzo	Marlo	Summit Park	Equestrian Professional
Walterson	Karen	Silver Creek	Equestrian, Horse Owner
Weiner	Mike	Snyderville Basin	Equestrian Supporter
Weiner	Mary Angele	Snyderville Basin	Equestrian Supporter
Welton	Meghan	Eden Utah	Wasatch Pony Club
Werner	Pat	Silver Creek	Pony Club Parent
Wicks	Allie	Salt Lake City	President, Utah Hunter Jumper Assoc.
Wright	Charmian	Silver Creek	Equine Vet

POSSIBLE EQUESTRIAN AMENITIES COULD INCLUDE: (Not defined in the Master Plan)

1. Soft Surface Trails - designed for equestrian use. Paved trails, off-leash dogs, and Mountain bikes make it dangerous to navigate from horse back. Equestrian purpose-designed trails with better safety education will make it safer for equestrian trail users. Currently, the Master Plan lacks all reference to Equestrian Trail User's needs or types of trails/tracks, except to say that all trails are "available" to Equestrians. Amenities include:
 - a. *Trailhead Signage* – Better education for non-equestrian trail users such as Bikers and Dog Walkers the importance of and how to give right of way to equestrians.
 - b. *Trail Maintenance* – Deep Ruts, Steep trails of scabble, Blind Corners (especially when Bikes are going fast), low hanging vegetation and narrow trails are dangerous for equestrians.
 - c. *Soft Surface Trails* – Paved Trails are not good for horses. Paving trails near equestrian neighborhoods and paving trails with access to back country trails makes it dangerous and unsafe for equestrians.
 - d. *Trailhead Parking* to accommodate Horse Trailers – For Equestrians to access public trails they either need to ride from their home or trailer to a trailhead that can provide enough room to park a horse trailer and a location to unload their horse. *Horse Ties* or Corral areas are also safe ways to provide for equestrian trail access.
 - e. *Watering Troughs* – to provide water for horses out on the trail.
 - f. *Rest Rooms* – To provide equestrian toilette and washing facilities.
2. Outdoor Soft Surface Tracks – These types of equestrian trails can easily and cost effectively be built for Equestrian users on existing trails and open spaces. These trails are multi use as they

can be used by cross country skiers in the winter. Outdoor specific Equestrian Tracks/Trails include:

- a. Gallop tracks and conditioning tracks
 - b. Competitive trail courses – 3-4 mile looped track with trail obstacles
 - c. Hacking or Bridle Path trail loops off roads and separate from bikes and motorized traffic.
 - d. Cross country tracks – 3-4 mile looped track with natural jumping obstacles (water, logs, ditches, banks, etc.) Used as a competition and training course.
3. Outdoor Riding Arenas
- a. Competition Arenas to host Dressage, Hunter/Jumper, and Eventing.
 - b. Schooling/Practice Fields for local associations (e.g. Park City Pony Club)
4. Temporary Stalls
- a. To house Horses temporarily (short-term) during summer months for Horse Shows, Clinics and Events.
5. Indoor Event Center –
- a. For Year-Round Equestrian Training, Lessons, Clinics and Shows Events.
 - b. Can be used for other non-equestrian events, trade shows and festivals.
6. Indoor Boarding Facilities –
- a. To House and care for local population of equestrians who need year round facilities to horse their horses and take lessons and train.

Findings of Errors in the Analysis:

- 1) In the Strategic Action Plan – Figure 4 – Opinion Survey Scatter Diagram. Equestrian Indoor and Outdoor facilities are placed in the Exceeds Expectation Category, meaning that Unmet Need is low and the Importance is low. The X axis “Importance Rating”, the Mean of all 33 facilities proposed is 77.7, Indoor Equestrian Center and Outdoor Equestrian Park are scored with an 81, above the Mean, but yet in the scatter diagram they are listed below the Mean. On the Y axis “Unmet Need”, Equestrian Indoor Equestrian Center and Outdoor Equestrian Park are listed as low Unmet Need. Based on the 2012 Opinion Survey, Indoor Equestrian Center and Outdoor Equestrian Parks, were the top three highest of Needs Not Met at 56% and 42%, respectively. In addition, the Demand Survey data and assumptions are incorrect.
- 2) In the Snyderville Basin General Plan, six (6) communities in the Basin are identified and described with specific policy and accommodations for equestrians yet the Master Plan has not included any language relating to the any of the General Plan policies or accommodations for equestrians, including:
 - a. Policy 4.2: “Promote and encourage horseback riding and other equestrian uses. Equestrian trails should be designed to avoid “land locking” horse owners and provide them with trail access to appropriate areas.”

- b. “future development should occur in a manner that takes into consideration the need for equestrian uses, such as trails and other facilities”;
- c. “Maintain reasonable standards for equestrian activities”;
- d. “Enhance equestrian trail connectivity between residential areas, schools, parks and open space”;
- e. “Mitigate traffic impacts through the neighborhoods to maintain safety for school, parks, pedestrian, equestrian and cycling users”;
- f. “Enhance pedestrian, equestrian and non-motorized trail connectivity between residential areas, schools, parks and open space areas”; and
- g. “The continuation of recreational opportunities, including trails (equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle) and large area of open space suitable for the continuation of wildlife in the area are encouraged”.

The only reference to equestrians as users of trails in the Demand Study on page 44 under Parks and Trails states; “It is important to note that all SBSRD trails are *available* for equestrian activities”. This statement does not lead to any consideration of trails that are actually usable or safe for equestrians and is inconsistent with the Snyderville Basin General Plan. For example, paved trails near equestrian neighborhoods or as access to back country trails are not equestrian friendly and are dangerous. There is a difference between making a trail “available” to a user vs. “accommodating” a user’s needs. It’s like saying that all trails are “available” to cross country skiers in the summer.

- 3) To date, no formal census has been conducted to determine the number of horses or equestrians that live in Snyderville Basin or Park City. Based on the number equestrian neighborhoods and residences per neighborhood, we estimated there are a total of 700 horses and possibly over 1,000 Equestrians live in Snyderville Basin. There are more equestrians than horses that live in this area as many board and train in locations outside of Snyderville Basin and Park City that offer private boarding. How can you accurately determine the Demand for a population without at least some estimates and data to support it?

For each of the equestrian neighborhoods listed in the General Plan, we have estimated the number of horses that live in this area, as follows.

- i. Silver Creek Estates – 500 horses.
- ii. Old Ranch Rd. – 50 Horses.
- iii. Highland Estates – 50 Horses.
- iv. Trail Side – 50 Horses.
- v. West Mountain – 25 horses.
- vi. North Mountain – 25 Horses.

- 4) Equestrians lack representation on the Advisory Committee. Not one active Equestrian athlete or professional is a Committee Member. With an estimated 1000 equestrians and equestrian athletes and 700 horses living in six (6) equestrian communities in Snyderville Basin and with Basin General Plan Policies and Provisions in place, equestrians should be represented on the Advisory Community.
- 5) The definition of Equestrian Centers in the Demand Study and the information summarizing equestrian services in our community are poorly represented, inaccurate and misleading.

Statements made do not represent the actual definition of Equestrianism or Equestrian Facilities, the actual demand or supply of the multi-disciplined equestrian activities and private facilities in Park City and Snyderville Basin. Therefore, any study or survey using this definition of equestrians and equestrian facilities is at best biased and at worst inaccurate.

On Page 28 of the 2011 Recreation Facility Demand Study: There are three paragraphs given to describe and define Equestrian activities and activities as highlighted below in quotes.

“Equestrian Centers are generally multi-amenity facilities, and are often found in rural or semi-rural locations where demand for horse-related activities is highest. Equestrian Centers can include a variety of amenities such as stables, arenas, warm-up tracks, rodeo facilities, livestock barns and event seating. The range of amenities offered can vary greatly – depending on whether or not the facility is public or private --- with a minimal facility being as simple as a staging area at a trailhead where horses can be prepared for trail rides.

*“Park City and the SBSRD currently lack a public equestrian facility. When considering whether or not to provide a public equestrian facility, it is important to consider how current demand is being met by private sources. Horseback tours, boarding facilities and training grounds are provided at several locations within Park City and the SBSRD. At least **eight** locations currently exist within Park City and the SBSRD where private stables are offering equestrian services.”*

“Rather than competing with private facilities, public facilities may serve a more advantageous role by providing large arenas where events and shows can be hosted. Truckee, California – one of the mountain resort communities surveyed – has taken this approach. The City maintains a 280 ft. by 150 ft. arena which seats up to 5,000 people. This arena hosts the Truckee Rodeo for two weeks in July as well as multiple public and private events throughout the year”

Why the Demand Study for Equestrian Centers is inadequate

First lets define the definition (Wikipedia) of **Equestrianism** as “more often known as riding, horseback riding (American English) or horse riding (British English)^[2] referring to the skill of riding, driving, steeple chasing or vaulting with horses. This broad description includes the use of horses for practical working purposes, transportation, recreational activities, artistic or cultural exercises, and competitive sport.”

The definition of **Equestrian Facility (Wikipedia)** is a “facility created and maintained for the purpose of accommodating, training or competing equids, especially horses. Based on their use may be known as a barn or stables, riding hall, and may include commercial operations described by terms such as a boarding stable, livery yard, or livery stable.”

- a. There’s a huge difference between Fair Ground - Rodeo, Livestock (Cultural) facilities; Equestrian (Competitive Sport) facilities; Outfitters who offer trail rides (Recreational) facilities; It’s almost like saying that all of the Skiing sports are the same require the same facilities and amenities.
- b. There has not been a formal Demand Study completed to determine the demand for all equestrian services. Based on our experience, we argue that demand is highest for

Equestrian Competitive Sport facilities in Park City and Snyderville Basin, not the “Rural” areas of Eastern Summit County that the Master Plan indicates. Why is demand highest in Park City and Snyderville Basin? Because Cultural (Rodeo, Livestock Fair Grounds) facilities already exist in the “Rural” areas. People who live in Park City and Snyderville Basin would like to have opportunities to teach their kids how to ride and take care of a horse. Today, these parents must drive to Heber or Eastern Summit County to find a Private Equestrian Center that offer boarding, training, lessons and competition for kids. For example, Park City Pony Club started in 2015 with 20 members its first year. The biggest obstacle the Pony Club faces today is the lack of sufficient facilities and amenities that offer Members a location to board their horse and host mounted meetings. Today, there is only one (1) licensed facility in Snyderville Basin and Park City that offers lessons and a place to host Mounted Meetings for Pony Club members. This facility is only open during the non-winter months as there is no indoor facility. The other licensed facility does not offer lesson horses or provide the facility for Pony Club members to hold mounted meetings.

- c. A quick search on the County website to identify the number of Equestrian Facilities that offer equestrian services in Park City and Snyderville Basin shows only two (2) licensed Equestrian Training, Lesson and Boarding facilities:
 1. Tally Ho Farm – English Equestrian 25 stall boarding and training facility with Indoor Arena <http://www.tallyhofarm.org/>
 2. EquiSportUSA – English Equestrian 6 stall boarding, training and lesson facility no Indoor Arena hosts non-profit Park City Pony Club, teaching kids how to ride and take care of a horse. <http://equisportusa.blogspot.com>

After conducting a simple search on the internet, we find that there are a total of seven (7) private facilities that offer equestrian services without Summit County business license to offer such services. If we are not appropriately licensing equestrian business or making it too difficult or expensive to license this is a problem that should be addressed.

Summit County licenses are not listed for equestrian activities for the following private clubs, schools and centers:

- *NAC Equestrian Center* – Non-Profit offering equestrian services for Equine Assisted Therapies and Activities. Doesn’t offer boarding and training for the public. <http://www.discovernac.org/programs/equestrian-programs/>
 - *Promontory Equestrian Center* - Private Club for Promontory members offering Boarding and Training <http://promontoryclub.com/amenities/adventures-and-activities/equestrian-center/>
 - *Another Way School* – Private School that offers riding lessons and trail rides for students <http://www.anotherwayschool.org/>
- 6) In the Project Priorities Matrix of the Strategic Action Plan - Scatter Diagram, the score for Equestrian Facilities – Multi Use is give a score of 81. This score is questionable as we have found a number of errors in score assignment as follows:

- i. Seasons Served – Assigned a 6 should be a 9. The score for an Indoor Facility available 4 seasons should be a 9.
- ii. Potential Partnering/Funding Opportunity (City, Basin, School) – Score of 6. This depends on whether the city, county or basin are open to funding equestrian facilities.
- iii. Potential Partnering/Private Entities – Score of 6, could be a 9. There are an estimated 1,000 equestrians, 700 horses, from 15 Equestrian Associations living in Snyderville Basin and Park City that can and willing to partner including Park City Pony Club, Park City Equine Partnership, and private funding. Typically, Public Horse Parks are a Private/Public Partnership.
- iv. Demand Study Results – Scored a 6, could be a 9. This is a subjective score based on little to no research, lack of definitions of equestrians and equestrian facilities, and the error in the number of private facilities available to meet demand. The demand study results for equestrian centers is not reflective of the reality of demand for equestrian facilities, or supply of equestrian services in the private market.
- v. Opinion Survey Results – Is given a score of (0) zero, should be an 18. The Opinion Survey score is doubled because of the higher importance of public feedback. Zero is for projects that are ranked low Unmet Need and Low Importance. Since the scatter diagrams are in error, Equestrian Facilities should be high importance and high unmet need.
- vi. Multiple uses (local, recreational) – Currently a 3, should be minimally a 6. All Equestrian Amenities (trails, tracks, trail heads, courses, and arenas) are multi-use and support local and regional equestrian sports and recreational activities. For examples: cross country skiing on tracks in winter; dog walking on cross country courses; Indoor Facilities used for non-equestrian events.
- vii. Uses (National, International, Elite) – Currently a 3, should be a 9. If you use the Equestrian definition as a Rodeo or Horseback Tour guides the score of 3 is accurate. However, Equestrian Sports, not mentioned at all in the Demand Study. Olympic Equestrian Sports includes Show Jumping, Eventing, and Dressage. The International Competition Organization (FEI) includes Show Jumping, Eventing, Dressage, Endurance, Reining, Vaulting, Driving and Para; the United States Equestrian Federation (USEF) is the national governing body that includes: English Pleasure, Carriage Pleasure Driving, Hunter, Hunter Seat Equitation, Parade Horse, Roadster, Saddle Seat, Western, Western Dressage, and Western Reining Seat Equitation.
- viii. Land Availability (city, basin, school) – Currently a 6. There is over 250 acres of undeveloped land that exists Snyderville Basin and that is of historic rural value and available to acquire for an equestrian park (outdoor arenas, cross country tracks, competitive trail courses, conditioning and galloping tracks, polo fields) surrounded by existing equestrian communities.

- ix. Improvements (expansion already planned or committed) – Scored a 0. Should be a 3 if you included equestrians as trail users. Trails and Trailheads could be improved to include trails for equestrians.
- x. Potential Economic Benefit – Currently a 6, should be a 9. While data on the economic benefit of aquatic centers or multipurpose fields has not been provided, we do have data on the economic impact of Equestrian Horse Parks. For example, Rebecca Farm in Kalispell MT has publicly stated that its local economy has received \$4.4M of economic value from one horse show. www.eventingnation.com/the-event-at-rebecca-farm-has-4-4-million-economic-impact
- xi. Enhances Tourism – Currently a 6, should be a 9. The typical horse show brings competitors and spectators from around the region and nationally, increasing tourism and economic impact from \$10M – \$50M annually to other communities such as Colorado Horse Park, Galway Downs, Kentucky Horse Park, Tryon Horse Park, etc.
- xii. Available elsewhere in the Region – Given a score of 9. Accurate as there is not a public facility available within 15 miles of Park City. Interestingly, The City of Oakley has invested in a Public Riding Facility. The City of Heber has invested in an Equestrian Event Center.
- xiii. Funding Availability – Currently given a score of three (3), Should be a 9. With public support, private funding could be made available from local, regional and national equestrian associations and horse park businesses. There are over 15 equestrian associations and clubs represented in Summit County. Equestrian Trails, Gallop Tracks, Bridle Paths, Competitive Trail Courses and outdoor arenas could be planned and developed using existing and future funding resources of the agencies. Only an Indoor Arena would require a joint bonding process. All Outdoor amenities could be funded through grants and other special funding mechanisms.
- xiv. Operations and maintenance requirements – Currently a 0, could minimally be the same as trails if trails were a defined and accommodated equestrian use. Trails is a 6. Indoor Facilities would require more operations and maintenance resources and budget.
- xv. Flexibility – Given a score of a 6. Could be a 9 if Indoor facility. With an Indoor and Outdoor Horse Park there is high potential to accommodate numerous unrelated and non-recreation activities.
- xvi. Cost – Current a 3, should be moved to a 6. The cost to build an outdoor horse park is between \$2-5m. The score given is a 3 for a cost \$5-\$20m which is a range for an Indoor Facility.

Other Evaluation Criteria use in the Master Planning Process:

- a) Utilization of existing infrastructure – Approximately 700+ horses live in 6 equestrian neighborhoods in Snyderville Basin, which require facilities. There is undeveloped land in Snyderville Basin that could be protected and preserved as open space for equestrian activity. In addition, if equestrian were defined as an accommodated trail user, the existing trail infrastructure could be used to accommodate equestrians.

- b) Impact on Neighborhoods – With an estimated 700+ horses and 6 equestrian neighborhoods in Snyderville Basin, we would argue that most of these communities would welcome equestrian amenities. Instead, these communities face paved roads, bikes, dogs and lack access to public trails.
- c) Connections to trails – The largest equestrian communities are surrounded by trails, trails are required for equestrian communities to enjoy riding outside. As trails are paved and land development restricting access to public trails, equestrians no longer enjoy the freedom they once had.
- d) Equitable distribution – There are no public equestrian facilities and therefore it is not equitable to reinvest in facilities that are already provided for.
- e) Growth Impact – Supporting equestrian sports lowers density development as horses require land and open space.
- f) Accessibility – Today, learning how to ride or take care of a horse is inaccessible and unaffordable in our area.