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City Hall
1101 Poyntz Avenue
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Project: Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study

Members of the Commission:

The document being presented herein represents the culmination of further analysis of the four priorities identified in the Parks & Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan issued in August, 2015 by RDG Planning & Design. The team of Bruce McMillan AIA Architects, P.A.; Orazem & Scalora Engineering; and Schwab Eaton Engineering; Manhattan, KS; Schaefer, Johnson, Cox, Frey (SJ CF) Architecture; and Dudley Williams & Associates; Wichita, KS, and Ballard King & Associates; Denver, CO. have all provided significant input for this study.

In addition to detailed analysis of the four priorities, community input was obtained by incorporating a 23-member Steering Committee chaired by former City Commissioner and four-time Mayor, Bruce Snead. City Administration Staff from the City Manager’s Office, Ron Fehr and Jason Hilgers, Parks & Recreation Administration Staff, Eddie Eastes, Randi Clifford, Casey Smithson, Angie Sutton, Melissa Kirkwood, and Wyatt Thompson, and Public Works/Engineering Administration Staff Rob Ott and Brian Johnson provided significant guidance and information for the design team and the Steering Committee.

Each of the four priorities is represented in its own section with budget analysis and cost/benefit information. An executive summary follows.

Your interest and support of this project and process has been most appreciated. This document is therefore provided to allow the Commission to consider a possible initiative to present to the community for a public vote on the facility improvements described for community benefit and use. Thank you.

For the Design Team
Sincerely,

Bruce McMillan AIA
BEM/lb
In August 2015, the City of Manhattan received the Parks & Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan prepared by a consulting team led by RDG Planning & Design of Des Moines, Iowa.

The document recognized the significant participation of a 15-member citizen Steering Committee chaired by former City Commissioner and four-time Mayor Bruce Snead. Members of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board also participated in the committee.

The report culminated in approximately one year of meetings and evaluation that included a demographic survey, market review, level of service analysis, and existing parks and facilities assessment. Public engagement through focus group and community meetings further identified priorities that the community would benefit from if implemented. A statistically valid community survey was conducted, anticipating 600 households responding, which was exceeded with 847 households responding.

The recommendations from this study focused on the four priorities that are ultimately discussed in Chapter 8 of the SFIP document.

Priority 1: Creation of indoor space geographically located to meet unmet needs in the community

Priority 2: Improvement to safety & playability of existing field playing surfaces

Priority 3: Improve availability & condition of community parks, trails, and neighborhood parks

Priority 4: Development of new indoor aquatics facilities

Upon completion of the RDG Report, the City of Manhattan Staff, the City Commission, and the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board evaluated the recommendations and determined further study of each of the priorities was important in order to identify specific improvements and how community benefit would be accomplished.

A Request For Qualifications (RFQ) was prepared to solicit services to address all four priorities in conjunction with the original and expanded Steering Committee. The following team was retained to complete this study:

**Bruce McMillan AIA Architects, P.A. (BMA)**
Lead Architect
Manhattan, KS

**Schaefer, Johnson, Cox, Frey Architecture (SJ CF)**
Architectural Consultant
Wichita, KS

**Orazem & Scalora Engineering (OSE)**
Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Engineer
Manhattan, KS

**Dudley Williams & Associates (DWA)**
Structural Engineer
Wichita, KS

**Schwab Eaton Engineering (SE)**
Landscape Architects & Civil Engineers
Manhattan, KS

**Ballard*King & Associates, Ltd. (BK)**
Operational Cost Consultants
Denver, CO

During the course of the RDG study, community input was paramount in identifying needs to be investigated. Consequently, community input was deemed of high importance in this subsequent study. The previous Steering Committee was reengaged and, upon recommendation of the design team, expanded to include additional stakeholders and active users of the many amenities provided by Manhattan Parks & Recreation. The overall role of the Steering Committee was to provide guidance, direction, and input for potential projects.
concepts. In regard to the Priority 1 large multi-court spaces, the need for multipurpose flooring to accommodate different sports activities was determined to be very important. Also, possibly elevating a walking track to a second level was recommended as the committee felt that this would allow more flexibility in the use of the space.

Additional parking at all Priority 1 site locations was a concern for the Committee. The need for additional tennis courts and an indoor aquatics facility were also priority needs. Following discussion and other suggestions to strengthen the concepts, the Committee unanimously approved the following initial recommendations. These are refined in subsequent sections of the Phase 1 & Phase 2 reports.

• Provide community facilities located at Anthony & Eisenhower Middle Schools, each with four (4) multi-use regulation-size courts, preferred elevated walking tracks, & support spaces.
• Provide a neighborhood facility at Douglass Park with two (2) multi-use regulation-size courts, possibly elevated walking track, & support spaces.
• Provide new and expanded connecting trail links from facilities noted in this study to existing walking/biking/jogging trails in the community, with the understanding that the Linear Trail, as an important community amenity, may be completed as part of the current and future CIPs.
• Provide safe and upgraded outdoor playing fields and courts, particularly tennis, and recommend a suitable location(s) for court placement/improvement with an initial emphasis on eight (8) courts.
• Provide a new indoor aquatics center with a 25-yard competition pool & separate leisure pool at CiCo Park.
• Complete an improvement plan for CiCo Park.
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Of the four priorities, adjacent diagrams shown, conclusions indicated that five of the six activities most important to the community involved indoor courts, outdoor playing fields, parks and trails (walking/biking, etc). The City of Manhattan staff, the City Commission, and the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board evaluated the recommendations and determined further study of Priorities 1, 2, & 3 was important in order to identify specific improvements and how community benefit could be accomplished. Therefore, further analysis of Priorities 1, 2, & 3, was pursued in conjunction with the Steering Committee, representatives from USD 383 including the Board of Education, senior staff, and coaching staff, Manhattan Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, the Riley County Parks Board, and the general public. Input was sought and included in the recommendations reported in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports on April 26, 2016 and January 10, 2017 respectively.

The scope of the Phase 1 study developed a multi-faceted process that identified Priority 1, to address indoor multipurpose space, as the initial focus of the document. Priorities 2, 3, & 4 were addressed in the Phase 1 document but were held for more in-depth study based upon City Commission preference and direction after the joint work session with the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board on April 26, 2016. The Phase 2 study focused on Priorities 2 & 3 while Priority 4 was deferred to a later date.

Overall, the expanded Steering Committee significantly added to the benefit of this study, particularly in regard to its knowledge and understanding of needs, improvements, and possibilities for the community. The Committee’s input was valuable and validates the accuracy of these recommendations as representative of the community.
It was agreed that the indoor community/neighborhood multipurpose facilities, as recommended by the Steering Committee, should be essentially equally located within the community in order to facilitate walking, biking, and ease of access from various neighborhoods. It was determined that, rather than one large center, several smaller centers better satisfies public need.

Discussion occurred between City staff, the design team, and USD 383 Manhattan-Ogden School District representatives regarding placement of a facility at each of the middle school sites. Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools are strategically placed in the northwest and northeast portions of the community respectively.

A third neighborhood center to be considered at Douglass Park in the south portion of the City would equalize availability and access to like amenities. As all three sites are public property, no land acquisition costs would be involved.
The Douglass Park site became the focus for a Community Development Block Grant that could support approximately $3,000,000 in construction once the project was approved. Therefore, this project was addressed separately although in tandem with other Priority 1 community facilities.

During Phase 2 the overall role of the Steering Committee was to provide guidance, direction, and input for Priorities 2 & 3. A Steering Committee meeting occurred on November 16, 2016. The four priorities were briefly reviewed, and goals, objectives, and specifics for potential projects at CiCo Park were discussed relating to two concepts, A & B. Concept B was selected and is shown in the Priority 2 section.

In addition, a CiCo Park Neighborhood Meeting was held on December 1, 2016 to inform those living in the vicinity of CiCo Park about proposed improvements and to receive feedback.

Many of the existing CiCo Park facilities were constructed in the 1960s when the park was originally developed. Although there have been various additions and improvements made since that time, some of the original facilities are in need of significant repair or replacement. The Phase 2 report focused on those facilities related to Priorities 2 & 3.
Creation of indoor space geographically located to meet unmet needs in the community
Neighborhood Multipurpose Facility at Douglass Park

Synopsis
The City of Manhattan, Kansas Community Development Department identified that a neighborhood recreation center, proposed to be located in Douglass Park at 10th and Yuma St., will enhance the opportunities for youth and adult court use and provide an additional venue for neighborhood activities and support. The Neighborhood Multipurpose Facility proposed for Douglass Park has been developed in conjunction with Community Multipurpose Facilities being considered for sites in the northeast and northwest portions of Manhattan adjacent to Eisenhower and Anthony Middle Schools. The Douglass Park site is centrally located in the south portion of the city and allows access to a community center within walking or biking distance of the center of town.

As part of the Feasibility Study conducted for the Parks & Recreation Department and City Commission, the project was developed as part of the three building Priority 1 component of the Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study completed in April, 2016. The program for the building was developed with participation of the Steering Committee representing various user groups, members of the City Commission, City staff, and the design team.

Over the course of approximately 60 days beginning in February, 2016 meetings were conducted by the design team with the steering committee, City staff, City Commission and local USD383 School District representatives. All provided significant input regarding the necessity of this facility and its companion projects to meet unmet needs in the community.

The Douglass Park location, being positioned in south central Manhattan, was chosen as it balances the potential location of the two additional neighborhood multipurpose facilities. As a Priority 1 facility, it would accommodate scheduled and drop-in use by citizens interested in court activities (basketball, volleyball, etc.).

Existing facilities adjacent to the site include a former U.S.O. building that has been retained and refurbished for limited drop in recreation activities and a former grade school currently used for meetings, tutoring activities, and exercise classes. A new community center functioning as proposed is seen to further

Facility Functions
Walking & Running Track
Flexible Sporting Surface for Multi-Use
Space Available for Regulation-Size Court & Two Cross Courts
Community Meeting Space
meet existing needs for recreational and community activities. The information on this project was provided to the Manhattan City Commission and Parks & Recreation Advisory Board in April, 2016. Consensus was reached regarding the need for the facility at that time and support for moving forward with the project with a Community Development Block application was endorsed.

**Project Overview**

The preliminary program, based on Steering Committee recommendations, consisted of space for 2 multi-sport courts, an elevated walking/running track, a multipurpose community room, an appropriately scaled lobby, hospitality space, staff office area, restrooms with lockers and changing space, storage, and miscellaneous building support spaces. This approximately 25,000 square-foot facility was shown to be located on the south portion of Douglass Park, at the corner of 10th Street and Fort Riley Boulevard.

Existing Douglass Park amenities include: Douglass Community Center & Annex, outdoor lighted court space, and playground. Given that these are located on the north side of the site, adjacent to Yuma Street, the proposed new facility would logically be sited in the open green space on the south side of the site. This would preserve the existing park amenities and provide a buffer for the park from the noise generated by traffic on Fort Riley Boulevard.

The exterior aesthetic for the neighborhood multipurpose facility at Douglass Park should be designed so that it is appropriate for a neighborhood facility, while respecting the nature of the existing Douglass Center and the neighborhood it is intended to serve. Thoughtful use of stone veneer accents is recommended, along with careful consideration of scale, in order to create a welcoming atmosphere upon arrival.

An alternative to the 25,000 sq. ft. option shown contained a 17,340 sq. ft. single 94’-0” regulation size multi-sport court facility with two cross courts surrounded by a walking/running track at floor level. This alternate was included to allow for possible funding limits from a Community Development Block Grant. Available CDBG funding is approximately $3 million.

**Pros & Cons**

- Facility entry is inward focused, addressing the neighborhood it serves
- Overhead electrical that currently bisects the site would be buried
- Opportunity for Douglass Park/Douglass Center signage on the new facility
- Existing Douglass Park amenities would remain intact
- Provides maximum possible equity with facilities at middle school sites

As the final concept plan illustrated, the base building of approximately 17,340 sq. ft. comprises a single full-size court running east/west and two non-regulation-size north/south cross courts. Restroom/locker rooms are provided as is a staff office with visual control of the court area and lobby. A multi-use/classroom is included to allow neighborhood residents to schedule meetings, classes or other activities. Mechanical, electrical, storage, and a family restroom are shown adjacent to a large lobby.

This building design, as addressed by the community-based Steering Committee and City, identifies the necessary functions, components, and needs for this facility and meets an anticipated budget availability of approximately $3.3 Million.

Site amenities include being adjacent to playground equipment in Douglass Park and the existing Douglass Center for other activities. Parking is available for 20 vehicles on street and space is available on-site as well.

The concept design for the building shown is anticipated to be a pre-engineered steel structure with panel siding and masonry accents. Interior finishes would be scheduled as liner panels on exterior court space walls, athletic flooring surface in the court area, interior masonry partitions, and standard vinyl floor coverings, painted walls, heating/air conditioning, and electrical and plumbing.

It is noted that Davis Bacon Wage Rates have been used to estimate cost. A budget sheet for the scope of work identified is included. It should also be noted that the estimate is shown in 2016 dollars and that it is likely amounts may vary from this report due to material costs, time scheduled for implementation and other factors that may influence the final project.
2 Multi-Use Courts | Pros:
- Facility entry is inward focused, addressing the neighborhood it serves
- Overhead electrical that currently bisects the site would be buried
- Opportunity for Douglass Park/Douglass Jogging Track

Center signage on the new facility
- Existing Douglass Park amenities would remain intact
- Provides maximum possible equity with facilities at middle school sites

25,000 square feet
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2 Multi-Use Courts | Cons:
- Proximity of building to Fort Riley Boulevard & 10th Street
- Limited available land for parking
- Space constraints in the north-south direction
- Height will be out of scale with adjacent structures
- Several mature trees would need to be removed
- Loss of a large amount of green space
- Southern border of the park would be closed off to views
- No flexibility of building positioning in the east-west direction
- Construction would likely disrupt park activities with lack of space for staging
- The 2 court facility would likely require additional funding beyond the budgeted CDBG Grant.

1 Multi-Use Court | Pros:
- Facility entry is inward focused, addressing the neighborhood it serves
- More open green space would remain along Fort Riley Boulevard
- Southern border of the park would remain partially open to views
- Several mature trees could remain, if desirable
- Separation between the Park facilities & the Breadbasket would be maintained
- Flexibility of building positioning on the site in the east-west direction
- Overhead electrical that currently bisects the site would be buried
- Opportunity for Douglass Park/Douglass Center signage on the new facility
- Existing Douglass Park amenities would remain intact
- Construction could occur without disrupting all park activities by staging to the east.
• The size of facility may be able to be built for CDBG funding amount

1 Multi-Use Court | Cons:
• Proximity of building to Fort Riley Blvd. and 10th Street
• Limited available land for parking
• Space constraints in the north-south direction
• Height will be out of scale with adjacent structures

Structural Requirements
The ground level floor for this facility will utilize a concrete slab-on-grade floor system. The foundation system for the building will be as recommended in a geotechnical engineering report which is yet to be developed. Since this was previously the site of the Douglass Park Pool that was removed and the pool excavation was infilled, the geotechnical report will need to address conditions created when the past site modifications occurred. However, it is anticipated that the foundation system will consist of shallow footings bearing on native soils or engineered fill soils at a depth of 36 inches to 48 inches below the perimeter final grade elevations. The jogging track around the perimeter of the gym court area will be at the floor slab level.

The structural framing system for this facility will utilize a pre-engineered metal building roof and exterior wall framing system. The use of a pre-engineered metal building structural system for this facility should provide the best opportunity to meet with the CDBG funding which is available for this project. A high-volume building area with around 25 feet clear from the floor level to the bottom of the roof structure will need to be provided in the building area with the basketball court. The court area of the building will likely require an approximately 32 feet to 34 feet tall exterior wall, including parapets. A lower volume building area will be utilized at the entry lobby, multipurpose room, and support areas for the building. The lower volume support portion of the building will probably require 16 feet to 18 feet tall exterior walls which would provide 12 feet to 14 feet clear from the floor level to the bottom of the roof structure.

The structural framing system will likely entail clear span rigid steel frames at the court area and lean-to steel frames at the support area with the frames spaced around 25 feet on-center for the length of the building. Secondary steel purlin and girt framing members would occur between the frames to support the roof and wall metal panels.

One of the primary factors which allows the pre-engineered metal building structural framing system to be an economical solution is that the metal panel roofing system and metal panel exterior wall enclosure system, as well as the insulation system at the roof level and the exterior perimeter walls, is all provided by one supplier. However, the exterior facade of the building may include masonry veneer, an exterior insulation and finish system or stucco, or other types of architectural finishes to meet the architectural exterior facade requirements. The interior face of the exterior walls could incorporate a metal liner panel by the metal building supplier, a metal stud and gypsum board furring system, masonry block veneer, or other materials as deemed appropriate for the appearance and durability of the spaces.
**Mechanical, Electrical, & Plumbing Components**

The following components are recommended for this facility and included in all cost estimates.

**HVAC:**
- Packaged, single zone, natural gas-fired rooftop heating & air conditioning units equipped with full mechanical ventilation capability to condition all spaces
- Exhaust system for toilet rooms
- Exhaust system for hospitality room dishwasher
- No commercial Type 1 or Type 2 hood systems
- Honeywell DDC energy management system

**Electrical:**
- Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter
- LED lighting
- Addressable fire alarm system
- General power for all areas
- Empty data/phone boxes & conduits to accessible ceilings
- Power & control circuitry for powered goals & nets
- Sound system with zoned public address throughout
- Electrical provisions for scoreboard system & other audio/visual systems
- LED parking lot lighting (cost is included in parking lot cost)
- New LED, wall-mounted exterior lighting will be provided at the building entrances

**Plumbing:**
- Dedicated sewer, water, & natural gas services to building, single meter
- On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s)
- Sewer & water piping to building fixtures
- Natural gas piping to rooftop units & water heaters
- Automatic flush valves & faucets
- Roof drainage & overflow roof drainage systems

**Fire Protection:**
- Dedicated fire protection service to building
- Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas

**Parking Opportunities**

The site presents parking challenges that could be addressed by providing 90 degree or angled parking along 10th Street. This scenario provides 20 parking stalls, including the two accessible spaces. Further options could include expanding into the utility easement or adjacent Breadbasket parking lot.

**Operations**

The following information addresses the general operational considerations not only at the Douglass Park site, but also at both middle school sites, and the indoor pools. The operations analysis represents a conservative approach to estimating expenses and revenues and was completed based on the best information available and a basic understanding of the projects. This pro-forma does not imply any particular operator but rather an estimate of operating costs and revenues for stand-alone facilities. Fees and charges utilized for this study reflect a philosophy designed to meet a reasonable cost recovery rate and future operations cost and are subject to review, change, and approval by the City of Manhattan. There is no guarantee that the expense and revenue projections outlined in the operations analysis will be met as there are many variables that affect such estimates that either cannot be accurately measured or are subject to change during the actual budgetary process or partnership.
Projected Operating Costs and Revenue of Douglass Park Concept Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$72,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conference</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotion</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Program Supplies</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscription/Licenses</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Replacement</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Expenses      | $179,013 annually |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Potential Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Admissions</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passes</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Programs</td>
<td>$25,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions/Vending</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Revenue       | $33,300 annually |
| Difference          | ($145,713) annually |

Expenditures

Expenditures have been formulated on the costs that were designated by Ballard*King and Associates to be included in the operating budget for each facility option. The figures are based on the size of the center, the specific components of the facility, and the hours of operation. All expenses were calculated to the high side and the actual cost may be less based on the final design, operational philosophy, and programming considerations adopted by the City.

Revenue

Revenue projections were formulated from information on the specific components for each facility option and the demographics of the service area as well as comparing them to national statistics, other similar facilities and the competition for recreation services in the area. Actual figures will vary based on the size and make-up of the components selected during final design, market stratification, philosophy of operation, fees and charges policy, and priority of use. All revenues were calculated conservatively as a result.
Community Multipurpose Facility at Anthony Middle School

Project Overview
The preliminary program consisted of court space for 4 multi-sport courts, an elevated walking track, a multi-purpose/community room, an appropriately scaled lobby, hospitality space, staff office area, restrooms with lockers and changing space, storage, and miscellaneous building support spaces. A 44,000 square-foot facility to be located adjacent to the existing middle school would accommodate 4-courts, while a 33,000 square-foot facility would accommodate 3-courts. The primary difference between this facility and the proposed Douglass Park facility is the size of the court space. Connectivity with, and consequently, adjacency to the existing middle school gymnasium is important for the shared-use nature of this facility. The proposed building would be sited in the open green space north of the existing school and parking. A link would be constructed to allow secure access to the new facility from the middle school. The courts, although being securely divided so some courts could be available during the day for use by community members while still allowing school students secure use of court space, will be determined administratively for hours of operation by USD 383 and public use by the City.

The exterior aesthetic for this facility should be designed using similar materials to that of the school, so they complement each other visually. Brick veneer is recommended, particularly at the entry and lower portions of the court space with masonry back up. The entry elevation should be composed in a way that provides a unique identity to the community facility, visually setting it apart from the middle school, yet blending.

Pros & Cons
Pros:
- Separation between the Middle School and Multipurpose Facility is preferable for ease of construction
- Flexibility of building positioning on the site in the east-west direction
- Construction could occur without disrupting school activities with staging to the west
- Size of facility would address both Community and School District needs for court space
- A link should allow direct access to the existing track and field

Cons:
- Positioning of the existing Middle School track

Facility Functions
Walking & Running Track
Flexible Sporting Surface for Multi-Use
Space Available for 3 or 4 Courts
Regulation Size (94’-0”)
Community Meeting Space
### Structural Requirements

The ground level floor will utilize a concrete slab-on-grade floor system. The foundation system for the building will need to be as recommended in the geotechnical engineering report which has not yet been developed. However, it is anticipated that the foundation system will consist of shallow footings bearing on native soils or engineered fill soils at a depth of 36 inches to 48 inches below the perimeter final grade elevations.

- Narrow space between track and drive to the north could result in inefficient parking lot layout
- Connecting link if on grade could block access from existing parking to track area unless additional control mechanisms are designed
- Existing storm water detention areas will be built on and must be created elsewhere on site and expanded to add new increased impervious surface areas associated with the new plan

### Conceptual Floor Plan

- **3 court with 4th court alternate**
- **33,000 square feet**
- **11,000 added square feet**

---

**Conceptual Site Overview**

and field requires a long connecting link

- Narrow space between track and drive to the north could result in inefficient parking lot layout
- Connecting link if on grade could block access from existing parking to track area unless additional control mechanisms are designed
- Existing storm water detention areas will be built on and must be created elsewhere on site and expanded to add new increased impervious surface areas associated with the new plan
The roof structure for all areas of the building will utilize steel beam and joist framing which will support a metal roof deck. At the court portion of the building area, there will not be any ceilings and an acoustical metal roof deck will be used. At the entry lobby, multi-purpose room, and support areas, ceiling systems will typically be used along with standard, non-acoustical metal roof deck. The gymnasium portion of the building area will have 25 feet clear from the floor to the bottom of the roof structure, which will create an approximately 31.5 feet to 32 feet tall volume within the space below the metal roof deck.

The court area will likely require approximately 34 feet to 36 feet tall exterior walls to create the noted interior clear heights. An elevated walking or running track around the perimeter of the court area would utilize a concrete slab on metal form deck supported by steel beam framing if implemented. The outside perimeter framing for the elevated track would be supported by the perimeter walls. The inside perimeter framing for the elevated track would be supported by steel hangers from the roof structure. A lower volume and roof level will be utilized at the entry lobby, multi-purpose room, and support areas for the building. The roof deck for the lower roof level areas will likely be around 15 feet to 16 feet above the floor level which will require approximately 18 feet tall exterior walls. Steel framed screen walls supported by the roof structure will be constructed above the roof levels to provide visual screening for the roof level mechanical units and equipment.

At the high volume court area, plant fabricated precast concrete wall panels or site-cast tilt-up concrete wall panels would likely provide the most economical option for the perimeter walls. However, reinforced masonry block walls would also be an acceptable option. Precast concrete wall panels, tilt-up concrete wall panels, or reinforced masonry block walls would also be good options for the perimeter walls of the lower volume support areas. The exterior perimeter walls for the high volume and lower volume areas would be used to support the roof structure and an elevated track. The exterior perimeter walls would also provide lateral stability for the building and would provide resistance for the lateral wind loads and seismic forces. With either the precast concrete wall panel, tilt-up concrete wall panels, or masonry block wall options, rigid insulation could be installed on the outside face of the wall with masonry veneer, architectural metal wall panels, or other exterior finish systems selected for the exterior architectural finish on the exterior facade of the building.

A connecting link will be constructed between the court area and the adjacent existing middle school building. A steel framed structure would provide a good choice for the structural framing system using steel beam and column frames to support the vertical loads and lateral loads on the connecting link. This framing scheme would accommodate significant glazing along the walls of the connecting link if this is an architectural objective. A concrete slab-on-grade floor system would be used for the floor of the connecting link. An expansion joint should be constructed where the connecting link abuts the existing school building. Depending on the final overall length of the connecting link, an expansion joint may also be placed between the connecting link and the new gymnasium building.

Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

The following components are recommended for this facility and included in all cost estimates.

HVAC:
• Packaged, single zone, natural gas-fired rooftop heating & air conditioning units equipped with full mechanical ventilation capability to condition all spaces
• Exhaust system for toilet rooms
• Exhaust system for hospitality dishwasher
• No commercial Type 1 or Type 2 hood systems
• Honeywell DDC energy management system

Electrical:
• Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter
• LED lighting
Parking Opportunities
The Anthony Middle School site currently has a main parking lot with 169 stalls. The proposed concept includes 80 additional parking stalls to include accessible spaces near the entry. This total of approximately 250 stalls may be insufficient for hosting tournament play however. Additional parking could be supported on this site, if necessary and affordable.

Plumbing:
- Dedicated sewer, water, & natural gas services to building, single meter
- On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s)
- Sewer & water piping to building fixtures
- Natural gas piping to rooftop units & water heaters
- Automatic flush valves & faucets
- Roof drainage & overflow roof drainage systems

Fire Protection:
- Dedicated fire protection service to building
- Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas

Parking Opportunities
The Anthony Middle School site currently has a main parking lot with 169 stalls. The proposed concept includes 80 additional parking stalls to include accessible spaces near the entry. This total of approximately 250 stalls may be insufficient for hosting tournament play however. Additional parking could be supported on this site, if necessary and affordable.
## Projected Operating Costs and Revenue for Community Facility at Anthony Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$126,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$112,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conference</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equipment</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotion</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Program Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscription/Licenses</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Replacement
- $15,000

### Total Expenses
- $323,441 annually

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Potential Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Admissions</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passes</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs</td>
<td>$87,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Programs</td>
<td>$27,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Programs</td>
<td>$51,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions/Vending</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Revenue
- $255,438 annually

### Difference
- $(68,003) annually

---

See Operations, Expenditures, & Revenue narrative for Neighborhood Multipurpose Facility at Douglass Park. (pp 13 & 14)
Community Multipurpose Facility at Eisenhower Middle School

Project Overview

The preliminary program consists of court space for 4 multi-sport courts, an elevated walking track, a multipurpose/community room, an appropriately scaled lobby, hospitality space, staff office area, restrooms with lockers and changing space, storage, and miscellaneous building support spaces. This approximately 44,000 square foot facility is to be located adjacent to Eisenhower Middle School. The primary difference between this facility and the proposed facility at Douglass Park is the size of the court space.

Connectivity with, and consequently, adjacency to the existing middle school gymnasium is important for the shared-use nature of this facility. The proposed building would be sited in the open green space north of the existing school and parking. A link would be constructed to allow secure access to the new facility from the middle school. The courts could be securely divided so some courts are available during the day for use by community members while still allowing school students secure use of court space.

The exterior aesthetic for this facility should be designed using similar materials to that of the school, so they complement each other visually. Brick veneer is recommended.

Facility Functions

Walking & Running Track
Flexible Sporting Surface for Multi-Use
Space Available for 3 or 4 Regulation Size Courts (94’-0”)
Community Meeting Space

Pros & Cons

Pros:
• Separation between the Middle School and Multipurpose Facility is preferable for constructability
• Connecting link can be of minimal length
• Size of facility would address both Community and School District needs for court space
• Additional parking would benefit Norvell Field

Cons:
• Little flexibility of building positioning due to site constraints to the north and east
• Connecting link blocks access from existing parking to relocated outdoor tennis courts
Structural Requirements

The ground level floor will utilize a concrete slab-on-grade floor system. The foundation system for the building will be as recommended in the geotechnical engineering report which has not yet been developed. However, it is anticipated that the foundation system will consist of shallow footings bearing on native soils or engineered fill soils at a depth of 36 inches to 48 inches below the perimeter final grade elevations.

The roof structure for all areas of the building will utilize steel beam and joist framing which will support metal roof deck. At the court portion of the building area, there will not be any ceilings and an acoustical metal roof deck will be used. At the entry lobby, multi-purpose room, and support areas, ceiling systems will typically be used along with standard, non-acoustical metal roof deck. The court portion of the building area will have 25 feet clear from the floor to the bottom of the roof structure, which will create an approximately 31.5 feet to 32 feet tall volume within the space below the metal roof deck.

The court area will likely require approximately 34 feet to 36 feet tall exterior walls to create the noted interior clear heights. An elevated walking or running track around the perimeter of the court area would utilize a concrete slab on metal form deck supported by steel beam framing if implemented. The outside perimeter framing for the elevated track would be supported by the perimeter walls. The inside perimeter framing for the elevated track would be supported by steel hangers from the roof structure. A lower volume and roof level will be utilized at the entry lobby, multi-purpose room, and support areas for the building. The roof deck for the lower roof level areas will likely be around 15 feet to 16 feet above the floor level which will probably require approximately 18 feet tall exterior walls. Steel framed screen walls supported by the roof structure will be constructed above the roof levels to provide visual screening for the roof level mechanical units and equipment.

At the high volume court area, plant fabricated precast concrete wall panels or site-cast tilt-up concrete wall panels

conceptual floor plan: 3 court with 4th court alternate 33,000 square feet

alternate 4th court

11,000 added square feet
Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

The following components are recommended for this facility and included in all cost estimates.

**HVAC:**
- Packaged, single zone, natural gas-fired rooftop heating & air conditioning units equipped with full mechanical ventilation capability to condition all spaces
- Honeywell DDC energy management system

**Electrical:**
- Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter
- LED lighting
- Addressable fire alarm system
- General power for all areas
- Empty data/phone boxes & conduits to accessible ceilings
Parking Opportunities

The Eisenhower Middle School site currently has a main parking lot with 82 stalls. The proposed solution includes a widened entry drive and 120 additional parking stalls to include accessible spaces near the entry. This total of approximately 200 stalls may be insufficient for hosting tournament play. Additional parking could be supported on this site, if necessary and affordable.

Fire Protection:

- Dedicated fire protection service to building
- Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas

Plumbing:

- Dedicated sewer, water, & natural gas services to building, single meter
- On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s)
- Sewer & water piping to building fixtures
- Natural gas piping to rooftop units & water heaters
- Automatic flush valves & faucets

- Roof drainage & overflow roof drainage systems
## Projected Operating Costs and Revenue for Community Facility at Eisenhower Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$126,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Utilities               | $112,200 |
| Water/Sewer             | $5,000   |
| Employee Services       | $0       |
| Communication           | $1,800   |
| Contract Services       | $10,000  |
| Training/Conference     | $3,000   |
| Rental Equipment        | $2,500   |
| Advertising/Promotion   | $0       |
| Bank Charges            | $1,500   |
| Trash                   | $1,820   |
| Insurance               | $10,000  |
| Other                   | $2,500   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Program Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscription/Licenses</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capital Replacement      | $15,000 |

| Total Expenses           | $323,441 annually |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Potential Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Admissions</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passes</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs</td>
<td>$87,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Programs</td>
<td>$27,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Programs</td>
<td>$51,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions/Vending</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Revenue            | $255,438 annually |

| Difference               | ($68,003) annually |

# Estimated Construction Cost

**3-Court:** $8.2 million - $8.9 million  
**4-Court:** $10.1 million - $11.1 million  
See Operations, Expenditures, & Revenue narrative for Neighborhood Multipurpose Facility at Douglass Park (pp 13 & 14).
This chart illustrates an example of anticipated overall economic impact from sports tourism, on a per event and annual basis, that the available courts, including those proposed at Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools, can generate.

**Indoor Recreation Improvements**

**Background**
Indoor improvements include adding a 30,000-40,000 square foot space with sporting surface for multi-use sport courts to each middle school facility along with restroom facilities and support spaces. Based on the NRPA standards used during the 2014 Manhattan Parks and Recreation Master Plan, there is a shortage of basketball and volleyball courts within the City’s inventory. Creating this option creates enough space to exceed the NRPA standards for the community. However, it must be noted that many of the gymnasium spaces within the USD 383 system are located in elementary schools and lack the playing surface, size and quality for programming and game use. The Parks and Recreation Department is offering programs in 8 of the grade schools for practice only. Improvements will allow better community access and quality. Although the Parks and Recreation Master Plan identified a slight decrease in basketball and volleyball participation noted between 2004 and 2013, it is acknowledged that basketball and volleyball are rated 14th and 24th nationally in popularity of sport and leisure activities tracked by the NSGA. However, it is significant that the popularity in basketball is strong in Kansas and the demographics of Manhattan indicate a high concentration of families and children. These are favorable market conditions to support expansion of such indoor facilities. Specifically, the new gymnasium spaces will enhance the quality of play and experience for the community.

Through a cooperative agreement between the City of Manhattan and USD 383, the City will be responsible for operating the facilities and the school district will have exclusive...
use of the spaces until a designated time on weekdays. Evening and weekend times will be accessible to the community. The multiple gymnasium spaces will be adequate to accommodate Parks and Recreation programming while providing frequent and consistent access for the community.

**Expense and Revenue Magnitude**
Operating two new gymnasium facilities will increase expense for the City in the form of utilities, maintenance and staff costs. Estimated net expenses for each school will range from $50,000 to $150,000 annually depending upon final design and operation plan.

While there is not an anticipated increase in revenue from community programming, the massing of multiple gymnasium courts provides the resources necessary for hosting tournament play. The City of Manhattan Parks and Recreation will see an increase in rental revenue from tournaments and it is estimated that the City could host weekend tournament events.

**Economic Impact**
Hosting weekend tournaments that attract 24-32 teams will generate between $550,000 and $750,000 (annually - 6 weekends) in tourism for the City of Manhattan.
Improvements to safety and playability of existing fields and playing surfaces
Priority 2 focuses on improvements to outdoor sports facilities used for recreational and competitive leagues and programs. Many of these programs and venues are of great benefit to our community. The following are a few well-recognized benefits of recreation programs that occur at these facilities:

- Help youth grow in character by learning principles of teamwork, respect for authority figures, important lessons in winning & losing, identifying their strengths and weaknesses, and the value of hard work; such values are critical to social development in youths as they mature into adults
- Opportunity to promote healthy, active lifestyles
- Social interaction around the activities helps foster good familial relationships
- Economic return on the investment; many of these facilities are capable of hosting large sporting events and tournaments that draw many people from the surrounding region to Manhattan. This brings a benefit to portions of our business community, particularly businesses involved in the hospitality industry such as restaurants and hotels. Maintaining and improving Priority 2-type facilities is critical to successfully hosting and expanding such events.

The Strategic Facility Improvement Plan (SFIP) identified improvements to playing surfaces at Anneberg Park, City Park, and CiCo Park as the highest priority locations to consider short-term improvements.

“Based on high use by the community of playing surfaces at Frank Anneberg Park, City Park and CiCo Park, the highest priority to improve safety and playability of the playing surfaces at these locations should be pursued to maximize capital resources and benefits to the public. Once the improvements of the playing surfaces at these locations are completed, future improvements could be considered for playing surfaces at other parks” (SFIP page 257).

Currently, Anneberg Park is the most heavily programmed facility for baseball and softball activities. In recent years, more than 1,900 baseball/softball games were played on the six fields at the Twin Oaks and Colley Complex fields. Synthetic turf field conversions and new sports lighting have been completed at the Twin Oaks softball complex to increase the playability and capacity of these fields to meet current and future demand.

Initial reactions to the field improvements, including those from Manhattan High School teams, local players, and out-of-town guests, have been overwhelmingly positive.

City Park also hosts numerous games and practices throughout the year on three baseball/softball diamonds. The City is currently working towards completion of a master plan for City Park which will address
ballfield improvements, possibly through removal, renovation, or replacement of the existing fields.

There are currently five ballfields at CiCo Park, each sized to accommodate different ages of players. In recent years, participants, youth and adults, played games at CiCo Park through Parks and Recreation programs. The fields are frequently reserved for practices and games by non-City recreation leagues, and drop-in use from surrounding neighborhoods also occurs. The fields suffer from poor drainage and the infrastructure in the common areas is showing signs of age with failing concrete and an inefficient central building housing restrooms, concessions, and score boxes.

**Soccer and Football**

Anneberg Park is the primary location for soccer and Fairmont Park, managed by Riley County, is the primary location for recreational football. Over 650 soccer games have been played at the Anneberg Soccer Complex, including several large tournaments. Synthetic turf field conversions and new sports lighting were recently completed at Soccer Field #1 to improve playability and increase opportunities for community use. Soccer and/or football also occur at Griffith Park and Northeast Community Park, and limited practice space is available at City Park and CiCo Park. USD 383 also has open green space at various schools around the City that have been available for practice.

**Tennis**

The Strategic Facility Improvement Plan found that the number of tennis courts in the community is adequate, but the condition of the city’s existing courts is extremely poor. Three courts are located at CiCo Park and six at City Park. All nine courts are frequently used despite their poor condition. Manhattan High School currently uses the courts at City Park for their programs.

The existing tennis courts at both parks are showing common signs of distress including pavement faulting, playing surface deterioration, localized drainage issues, and damaged fencing. None of the courts are constructed using post-tension concrete, which is the preferred construction method for new courts due to its long term durability. The Bolton Memorial Pavilion, located in CiCo Park, in use during a summer tournament.
statistically valid survey, conducted as part of the Strategic Facility Improvement Plan, found that tennis users demonstrated the greatest need for facility improvements compared with all other sports activities that were evaluated. Nearly 3,600 households said they had a need for tennis courts. Of those households, 63% (2,267 households) feel their needs for tennis are being met 50% or less – the highest of any activity (SFIP pages 149, 159, 160).

To best serve both the general public and Manhattan High School, consolidation of the facilities was considered. To enhance the potential for greater use of the tennis facilities, including tournament play, an industry standard grouping of 8-courts was used for planning purposes. Eight courts consisting of four pairs of courts stacked in a square configuration would meet the minimum requirements of the Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA) for hosting a league or regional high school tennis tournament, 12-courts are required for a State tournament.

A preliminary evaluation of several locations and court configurations within CiCo Park initially suggested construction of eight new courts is viable at the same site as the existing courts. Space for twelve courts is available. The use of post-tensioned concrete reduces the potential for crack formation, eliminates jointing within the playing surface, and provides for better surface drainage due to better grade control during construction. Post-tensioned concrete slabs are cast on properly prepared sub-grade soils and reinforced with a grid of high-strength steel tendons or cables placed in the slab in each direction. After the concrete slab has been placed and reached a specific compressive strength, the tendons or cables are tensioned which “squeezes” the concrete slab together to induce compressive stresses into the concrete slab. This process results in holding any joints or crack lines within the concrete slab tight which improves the quality of the playing surface.

Additionally, acrylic surfacing systems offer an all-weather playing surface that provides consistent speed of play, texture, color, and resistance to fading. Combining these systems with vinyl coated fencing, reinforced concrete walkways and spectator areas, lighting, and ADA compliant access would result in a state-of-the-art, high quality tennis facility for recreational and competitive play.

Completely eliminating tennis from City Park and locating all courts at CiCo Park will preclude the equitable distribution of tennis facilities accessible to the community. Limited tennis opportunities should remain in other locations for recreational and drop-in play, either in city parks or at school sites. For flexibility, a multi-purpose court could be considered. Such a court might include a pair of tennis courts with basketball and perhaps a pickleball court or other court sport developed at each strategic site.

**Focusing on CiCo Park Improvements**

Knowledge of the recent improvements to athletic fields at Anneberg Park and ongoing planning at City Park led the Steering Committee to recommend development of an improvement plan for CiCo Park, focusing on both active and passive park uses. An improvement plan for CiCo Park would address several issues including improvements to the baseball/softball fields, tennis courts, and an indoor aquatics complex as recommended by the Steering Committee in Priority 4. Passive-use amenities like trails, picnic areas, playgrounds, and support facilities such as parking and restroom facilities could also be considered which would help address several Priority 3 improvements. Engaging the community in a process to plan improvements at CiCo Park presents an opportunity for potential partnership with USD 383 and Riley County as well.
CiCo Park Opportunities

CiCo Park is a large community park with ownership and operations divided between the City of Manhattan, USD 383 and Riley County. The park consists of approximately 90 acres and is the home to a host of public events and activities. The park is the site of the Riley County Fairgrounds, Kaw Valley Rodeo, USD 383 Bishop Stadium and also includes a community swimming pool, playgrounds, dog park, skate park, fitness trail, sledding hill, picnic areas, tennis, baseball and softball. Public activity occurs daily within CiCo Park.

The initial feasibility study (SFIP) identified CiCo Park as a primary location to address priorities cited herein. Addressing the SFIP priorities in a manner that can also serve the interests of USD 383 and Riley County is very important. Meetings were held with representatives of these jurisdictions to receive feedback, address concerns, and identify strategies and measures that would enable proposed improvements to serve needs beyond those of the City Parks and Recreation programs in an efficient, cost effective manner and avoid unnecessary redundancy within the Manhattan community. It became apparent during the study process that CiCo Park could become the central hub for most USD 383 outdoor sports programs, which significantly enhances their program management.

Priority 2 generally centers on improving or replacing facilities that have unsafe playing surfaces or the playability of said surfaces is compromised due to physical condition or weather conditions. The improvements focused upon herein are tennis, softball, and baseball.

At the January 10, 2017 City Commission Work Session, City Staff and members of the Design Team presented the Phase 2 document addressing Priorities 2 & 3. The outcome of this meeting brought a consensus of the City Commission that Concept “B” for ballfields was preferred and that rather than an 8-court tennis facility, a full 12-court configuration should be recommended.
Baseball & Softball Facilities

CiCo Park contains five ballfields to accommodate different ages of players. Four of the fields are arranged as a quad. The fifth field (Pluto Field) is a small tee-ball and coach-pitch field located immediately northwest of the quad. Blue Field (northeast field in the quad) is the largest and was at one time used by USD 383 for high school baseball. The center field fence is approximately 365 feet from home plate and home plate lies approximately 38 feet from the backstop. Yellow Field and Green Field (southeast and southwest fields in the existing quad) are similar in size with the center field fence approximately 250 feet from home plate and home plate lying approximately 33 feet from the backstop. Red Field (northwest field in the existing quad) is the smallest with the center field fence approximately 190 feet from home plate and home plate lying approximately 25 feet from the backstop. All five fields are lit and have scoreboards. None of the fields have fine aggregate warning tracks.

The softball and baseball fields all contain traditional fine aggregate infields and natural grass outfields. Although the Parks and Recreation Department does an excellent job in maintaining the facilities, surface drainage from these fields is marginal due to existing topography. This results in difficult maintenance conditions. The infields are difficult to dry out. The natural turf surface has become irregular over time, which affects player safety and play of the game. Portions of the ballfield fencing were recently
replaced. The core area between the fields is deteriorating with failing pavements and poor drainage. The restrooms and concessions facilities do not meet current codes. The Brett Bolton Memorial Pavilion constructed between Yellow Field and Green Field is a fairly recent addition and is in excellent condition. The memorial should be retained. A recently improved playground is also located within the complex. Retaining the playground with future improvements may not be feasible; however, consideration should be given to salvaging the playground equipment and surfacing for reinstallation.

Brett Bolton Memorial Pavilion upon approach from the central core

existing CiCo Park playground

Manhattan is host to large softball and baseball tournaments throughout the season. These tournaments are a major draw for teams and visitors from throughout the Midwest. Weekend tournaments have been a proven financial boon to our community. Unfortunately, rain can become a major detractor to these events. The ability to dry facilities, keep them playable and minimize downtime during rainy periods makes a significant contribution to the success of these tournaments and the ability to continue to draw visitors to the community. Recent improvements to Anneberg Park where fine aggregate areas were converted to synthetic turf have demonstrated the importance of this.

Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA) sets guidelines and recommendations for various athletic facilities used in high school competition. The KSHSAA guidelines were considered in the sizing of baseball and softball facilities and related amenities. However, the guidelines were not extended to all the ballfields, since the Parks and Recreation programs also serve younger ages, which require shorter dimensions in certain cases. Therefore, a variation in facility sizing and dimensions should be developed to optimize flexibility in meeting both Parks and Recreation and USD 383 programs. KSHSAA requires one regulation baseball field with minimum spectator seating for 800 to host state baseball playoffs, and two regulation softball fields with minimum spectator seating for 300 at each field for state softball playoffs.

existing CiCo Park Yellow Field

Proposed Concept

Traditionally over 1,200 participants – youth and adults – play over 200 games at CiCo Park through Parks and Recreation programs. The fields are frequently reserved for practices and games by non-City recreation leagues, and drop-in use from surrounding neighborhoods also occurs. The fields suffer from poor drainage and the infrastructure in the common areas is showing signs of age with failing concrete and an inefficient central building housing restrooms, concessions, and score boxes. Therefore, focus on CiCo Park took place in the Phase 2 process. Two concepts, A & B, related primarily to orientation of ballfields and increasing the number of tennis courts. The specifics of concept “B” follow that was selected by the Steering Committee and City Commission.
CiCo Park Improvement Scenarios

Knowledge of the recent improvements to athletic fields at Anneberg Park and ongoing planning at City Park led the Steering Committee to recommend development of improvement scenarios for CiCo Park, focusing on both active and passive park uses. This study addresses several issues including Priority 2 improvements to the baseball/softball fields & tennis courts. Passive-use amenities like trails, picnic areas, and playgrounds; and support facilities such as parking and restroom facilities, should also be considered to address several Priority 3 improvements. Engaging the community in a process to plan improvements at CiCo Park presents an opportunity for potential partnership with USD 383 and Riley County.

Recommendations for ball field reconfiguration are as follows:

- Replace the existing ballfield quad with two regulation baseball fields and two regulation softball fields.
- Maintain existing viable infrastructure in the process, where feasible.
- Consider artificial turf in fine aggregate areas with an option to extend artificial turf through the outfield of the primary baseball field. Due to field orientation, Blue Field (northeast) will remain the preferred site of the primary baseball field.
- USD 383 is very interested in bringing its baseball and softball programs to CiCo Park, particularly if artificial turf infields are developed and field dimensions meet its needs.
- The primary baseball field should have a minimum centerfield distance of 375 feet.
- Home plate should be a minimum of 40 feet from the backstop. The second baseball field would also serve as a junior varsity field and should have a minimum centerfield distance of 350 feet.
- A small public unisex restroom was requested to serve park user needs during all times the park is open. This restroom should be strategically located to provide adequate access and be easily maintained, as existing facilities are not always open and available to the public.
- The functions currently served by Pluto Field can be met elsewhere.

---

1. PARKING
   - existing parking lots revised for paving; will accommodate 320 striped parking stalls

2. CONCESSION BUILDING
   - houses concessions, restrooms, changing room, team meeting & umpire rooms, & support spaces

3. BLEACHERS
   - shaded stadium style bleachers with metal seating & integrated score keepers boxes

4. BATTING CAGES
   - batting cages accessible to teams & general public

5. BOLTON MEMORIAL PAVILION
   - existing pavilion to remain as a shade structure

6. PLAYGROUND
   - existing playground equipment to be relocated near the pavilion

7. MAINTENANCE BUILDING & ENTRY
   - Parks & Recreation maintenance building, entry gate, and public restroom

8. DOG PARK
   - existing dog park to remain

9. BISHOP STADIUM
   - existing Bishop Stadium to remain; restrooms will be unlocked during tennis tournaments

10. SKATE PARK
    - existing skate park to remain

11. TENNIS COURTS
    - twelve new tennis courts with shade structures

12. STADIUM SEATING
    - new stadium seating integrated into the hill

---

Recommended amenities shown at public meetings (labeled on concept B on the following page)
Concept B

• Two baseball fields, one with a 385-foot distance to centerfield (comparable to the existing “Blue” field) and one with a 350-foot distance to centerfield are oriented east towards Wreath Avenue. Infield and outfield artificial turf is recommended for the larger field while only infield artificial turf is recommended for the smaller field. Blue Field is capable of being restriped to accommodate football, soccer, and other sporting activities.

• Two softball fields, identical in size with a 220-foot distance to centerfield, are oriented west towards the parking lot. Infield artificial turf is recommended for these fields.

• Paved parking for up to 320 vehicles is provided.

• Maintenance access is shown as a controlled walk/drive rather than available for parking along the east entry. Parking for the ballfield complex is from the west.

• The central complex includes four scoring booths, concrete stairs and risers with affixed bench seating that steps down to the field level, and optional seating shade structures.

• The center of the complex is elevated, housing reinforced masonry concessions, restrooms, meeting/coaches room, storage areas, and steel-framed covered spectator picnic table seating with available views of all four fields.

• Concrete retaining wall dugouts at each field incorporate batting/warm-up cages.

• A secure playground with optional splash park inhabits the space between the softball fields.

• A reinforced masonry maintenance building for Parks & Recreation use includes a public unisex restroom.

• Security fencing will allow the complex to remain open for public use during normal park hours but strategically located gates can be closed for control purposes during tournaments.

• Twelve new tennis courts will replace the existing three courts. Steel shade structures are incorporated into the tennis complex.

• Stadium seating is incorporated along the east side of the tennis courts with concrete risers and fixed bleachers on grade on the west.

• Detention pond configuration and parking access from Kimball Avenue requires 33,500 cubic yards of cut/excavation and 21,500 cubic yards of fill, detention is expanded to the east. Approximately 4,000 cubic yards of excess fill will need to be removed from the site when accounting for compaction/shrinkage losses.

• The access drive to Kimball aligns with the existing traffic-light intersection at Candlewood and allows for adequate stacking, thus avoiding a need for an additional traffic signal at Avery and Kimball Avenue.

• The reconfigured detention pond meets the edge of the Wreath Avenue right-of-way and is further impacted by the baseball field in the southeast quadrant. However, the detention pond configuration takes into account maintaining the capacity of the existing detention pond while also allowing for increased run-off from new paved parking surfaces. Future planned detention pond improvements will increase capacity.
Tennis Courts

The existing tennis facility contains three lighted courts and is in poor condition. Use has declined due to its condition. The court is a conventional concrete slab that has begun to fail and the court surfacing is delaminating.

The SFIP identified eight tennis courts in a single location as a minimum to meet community needs. The initial feasibility study identified replacement of the existing tennis courts with an 8-plex of courts. A centrally located 8-plex also better serves USD 383 and provides the opportunity for hosting high school regional tournaments. USD 383 indicated the desire for 12 courts which would be required for hosting state-level tournaments and this was concurred upon by the Steering Committee, City Commission and Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

The concept has trail connections shown in the plan view. The tennis facilities have parking provision for approximately 90 vehicles. Adequate fill material can be generated on-site for the pad.

The City is also currently working towards completion of a master plan for City Park which will address tennis court improvements, possibly through removal, renovation, or replacement of the existing courts.

Storm Water Management

The existing storm water management system was developed in CiCo Park to address flooding and bank destabilization that had been occurring within the neighborhood south of CiCo Park. Proposed facility improvements within CiCo Park need to be performed in a manner that does not compromise the performance of this facility and potentially enhance it.
Budget Analysis

Concept B

The following chart illustrates anticipated construction costs for Concept B of Priorities 2 & 3 as they relate to CiCo Park. The Concept addresses components for implementation and the possible alternate to provide synthetic turf for the larger baseball field, “Blue Field,” which is advantageous for tournament play. The amounts shown include twelve tennis courts and site preparation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball Fields</td>
<td>$3,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Complex</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking &amp; Lighting</td>
<td>$923,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Improvements &amp; Lighting</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates: $750,000 – $800,000

1. Synthetic Turf Outfield, Blue Field only (Add)
2. Seeding – Sports Field (Deduct)
3. Irrigation – Sports Field (Deduct)
4. Laser Grading (Deduct)

CiCo Park Baseball & Softball Fields

Background

Proposed CiCo Park improvements include 4 new ball fields, concession area, and support spaces. Based on the NRPA standards used during the Manhattan Parks and Recreation SFIP, there is a shortage of softball and baseball fields noted within the Parks and Recreation Department. Overlaying the USD 383 ball fields into the inventory adds enough fields to fall within the industry standards.

However, it should be noted that many of the USD 383 fields can be classified as practice fields and do not have the playing surfaces, infield quality, and spectator amenities to support Parks and Recreation programming and games. The improvements to CiCo Park will enhance the quality of the ball fields and community programming. The new lighting system and possible synthetic turf planned for the park will increase the playability of the fields and community access.

Expense/Revenue Magnitude

Operating the new ball fields will have no impact on the existing Park Maintenance budget and could potentially reduce operating costs for the City by eliminating mowing and field prep required for grass fields if synthetic turf were to be installed. The level of maintenance service will remain essentially the same. Utility costs are estimated to be in the $25,000 to $40,000 range per year depending on the lighting system selected, length of the season, and hours of operation.

The improvements to the ball fields at CiCo Park are being driven by a desire to improve the quality of facilities for the community. Having synthetic turf fields will expand the playability of the fields because of fewer game cancelations from rain. The synthetic fields also improve the overall quality and experience for the players. Since adding
synthetic fields to Twin Oaks the City has drawn an additional 220 teams due largely to the improved quality of the fields and overall player experience.

Even more impressive is that the increase in tournament teams is coming at a time when participation in baseball and softball is declining on a national level per NSGA (National Sporting Goods Association) statistics as reported in the 2014 Manhattan Parks and Recreation Master Plan. In addition, having two, 90-foot base path fields will enhance other baseball events in the community and support tournament events at Twin Oaks. There is reason to believe that the improvements to CiCo Park will result in attracting more teams for tournaments.

While there is not an anticipated increase in revenue from community programming, the potential to increase the size of tournaments and concession sales will generate additional revenue for the Parks and Recreation Department. Based on the experience from the improvements to Twin Oaks Park, and the increased number of teams signing up for tournaments, it is reasonable to think the tournaments hosted in the City will experience a similar result from the CiCo Park improvements. The City of Manhattan could see an increase of between 90 and 135 teams above the current number of teams for tournaments. Estimated revenue from field and light rental generated from the increased number of teams will be in the range of $7,500 to $12,000 per year for the Parks and Recreation Department. The City’s commission on concession sales will also increase in the range of $2,500 to $4,000 per year.

**Economic Impact**

Traditionally there are 18 tournaments held at Twin Oaks annually. The new fields at CiCo Park will enhance the events scheduled at Twin Oaks by attracting more teams and larger events. A 90-135 team annual increase in the number of teams coming to Manhattan to participate in tournament play will create an economic impact in the range of $335,000 to $500,000 per year. These calculations are based on the Randall Travel Marketing report that was presented to the City Commission.

**CiCo Park Tennis Courts Background**

Proposed CiCo Park improvements include 12 new lighted tennis courts. Based on the NRPA (National Parks and Recreation Association) standards used during the Manhattan Parks and Recreation SFIP, a significant shortage of tennis courts was noted within the Parks and Recreation Department. However, when considering the inventory of tennis courts that USD 383 has that the community has access to use, the overall shortage of tennis courts available to the community is slightly lower than the NRPA Standards (-3). CiCo Park improvements include 12 new lighted tennis courts.

These 12 new courts would replace the existing three courts in CiCo Park, and add 9 courts to the City’s inventory of tennis courts. This would bring the total number of tennis courts available to the community within the NRPA Standards and comparable to other benchmark communities used in the SFIP. It should be noted that participation trends for tennis indicate an increased participation of 31% between 2004 and 2013.

The new tennis courts at CiCo Park will improve community access significantly. Tennis facilities that group multiple courts at one location tend to attract more tennis players than single or double court configurations. In addition, the City of Manhattan will have the ability to host tennis tournaments, offer league tennis and supplement the USD 383 tennis program. Currently USD 383 only hosts one tennis meet per season in Manhattan because of lack of courts at a single location (volume) and overall quality of the courts. Most all of the tennis meets and qualifying meets require Manhattan teams to travel.

**Expense/Revenue Magnitude**

Operating the tennis courts will have a minimal impact on the existing City budget. Maintenance cost for the 12-new tennis courts will be primarily trash pick-up and lighting. Trash pick-up is something already provided by Park Maintenance crews. According to consulting Engineers, annual utility costs for lighting the tennis courts will range from
$13,000 to $16,500 per year depending on the type of lights selected during the design phase of the project and length of the tennis season based on demand and use patterns from the community.

Revenue increases will be restricted to Parks and Recreation leagues and hosting 2-3 USTA (United States Tennis Association) events per year. Typically, there are no fees charged for community use of tennis courts. League play, private lessons and tournament fees could net revenue in the $10,000 to $25,000 per year range depending on the program fee structure, rental fees and number of events scheduled. However, schedule of the events and leagues must be balanced with access to the community and care exercised to assure the community has access to the tennis courts.

**Economic Impact**

Having the ability to attract 2-3 USTA events will generate an economic trade for the community depending on the number and size of the USTA events scheduled. The 12 new tennis courts provide the mass/number and quality of courts to host not only dual meets but also conference and regional state qualifying meets and will allow the volume. Hosting 2-3 USTA events and hosting one HS tennis invitational meet will generate about 415-665 visitors and have an economic impact in the range of $150,000 to $240,000 per year using the estimated daily visitor revenue as reported by the Randall Travel Marketing report to the City Commission. It should be noted that these tourism dollars' roll-over multiple times in a community so the total economic impact could be much larger when considering the roll-over effect.
Improve availability and condition of community parks, trails, and neighborhood parks
Trails & Connectivity

Project Overview

The nature of the outdoor parks and recreation facilities identified herein differs from those in Priority 2. These focus on a broader range of facilities that are largely catered to more passive recreation and include playgrounds, picnic shelters, trails, and similar venues. These are not directly related to highly programmed, competitive sports venues. Additionally, this assessment includes community-level and neighborhood-level parks. Such parks might contain the other, more specific facility venues associated within Priority 3, but also contain facilities directly related to Priorities 1, 2, and/or 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>% of Households Have Used It</th>
<th>% of Households Use It Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Areas/Shelters</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this priority was evaluated by the Steering Committee, staff, and the design team, a clear area of need for benefit to the community was improved connectivity to existing facilities. Focus was placed on trails, walking and bicycle paths, and their connectivity to existing and potential parks and recreation facilities, particularly those addressed in Priorities 1, 2, and 4.

Trail & Connectivity Functions

Connectivity of the sites to the surrounding areas

Priority 3 type facilities in many cases may also be developed or improved using additional funding sources. The Parks & Recreation Department should continue to make incremental improvements to neighborhood parks, community parks, and trails by maintaining or increasing operations budgets and continuing support for CIP projects to address these community needs.

The City of Manhattan has an existing Bicycle Master Plan (prepared in 1998 for the City of Manhattan and KSU), Linear Trail Phase 2 Master Plan (also prepared in 1998) and several subsequent documents that focus on bicycle and pedestrian trails around and through the Manhattan community. There has also been growing emphasis, both locally and nationally, regarding public improvements that create walkable communities. The current linear trail is a part of the overall bicycle/pedestrian system. The City has continued to implement and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities over the years and further improvements are planned through the 2016 Five-Year Strategic Plan for Bicycles Update. Both the 2015 Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy (MATS) and the 2015 Manhattan Urban Area Comprehensive...
Plan (MUACP) included extensive public involvement in their compilation. Both documents recommend setting clear goals for non-vehicular infrastructure to foster both recreation and non-vehicular modes of transportation.

The current linear trail system consists largely of dedicated shared-use trails by which cyclists, pedestrians and other trail users can minimize the interface with vehicular traffic. Although the network of shared-use trails will continue to expand over time, many areas are not readily served by this type of trail system due to the nature of existing development and its environs. Therefore, other bicycle/pedestrian friendly alternatives are either in place or in the Bicycle Master Plan to serve such areas, as well as provide links to the overall Linear Trail system. Phase 1 of the Facility Feasibility Study considered the existing and master-planned bicycle and pedestrian system network. The focus was in regard to the potential connectivity of these systems to the various sites specifically evaluated within the study.

Priority 3 addresses trails and connectivity. The City continues to plan and develop trail improvements throughout the City on a macro scale, creating a network of pedestrian/bicycle routes linking neighborhoods, schools, parks, and various public facilities.
Douglass Park

This site currently has neighborhood sidewalks on all four sides of the block. Although an existing fence separates the site from the walk along Fort Riley Boulevard, the other perimeter walks connect to this walk at the 9th Street and 10th Street intersections. The walk along the west side of 9th Street does not extend all the way to Fort Riley Boulevard, but the walk on the east side does.

There is no current completed connectivity to the Linear Trail south of Douglass Park. The best pedestrian access appears to be west along the north side of Fort Riley Boulevard to the signalized intersection at South Manhattan Avenue.

However, a pedestrian link is missing between the southwest corner of Griffith Park and the trailhead at Pottawatomie Avenue. Although a short segment of walk may accomplish this, it will have to cross the UPRR tracks, which would likely be an expensive crossing. Bicycle connectivity is somewhat feasible, but will require the use of local streets. The 1998 Bicycle Master Plan has recommended the development of a bike route along Juliette Avenue south to Pottawatomie Avenue. They are also included in the Five-Year Strategic Bicycles Update, scheduled for implementation by 2020.
Anthony Middle School

This site is reasonably well connected to the existing and proposed trail system. A shared-use trail exists on the east and south sides and extends west across (beneath) Seth Child Road into the Candlewood area, that then connects to the Hudson trail using local sidewalks. A sidewalk also extends north from the northeast corner of the site along Browning Avenue to Marlatt Avenue.

A future bicycle boulevard is proposed along Willow Grove Road directly east of the school that will connect to a future shared-use trail shown in the Bicycle Master Plan extending through KSU property toward an existing trail segment at the intersection of Marlatt Avenue and Tuttle Creek Boulevard. The Linear Park Phase Two Master Plan shows a future trail extension along Marlatt Avenue that would also link Anthony Middle School to the intersection of Marlatt Avenue and Tuttle Creek Boulevard. Both routes would complete a walkable/bikeable connection between Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools. Further evaluation of these routes should be considered in the short-term to determine the most viable and cost-effective linkage.
Eisenhower Middle School

This site currently has a walkable connection to the existing trail segment described above at the intersection of Marlatt Avenue and Tuttle Creek Boulevard. As previously stated, a trail extension is planned along Marlatt Avenue, west of Tuttle Creek Boulevard to Browning Avenue. A portion of that extension is proposed to occur with intersection improvements at Marlatt Avenue and Denison Avenue, that will be in design in 2017.

An existing sidewalk along the south side of Marlatt Avenue links the school to that trail segment. The sidewalk is accessed by a pedestrian bridge across the Marlatt Drainageway on the north side of the school site.

Sidewalks within the site also connect to the local sidewalk system within the neighborhoods south of the school. A future bicycle boulevard along Butterfield Road is included in year 2017 in the current Five-Year Strategic Bike Plan. This bicycle boulevard will connect to existing and other proposed bicycle systems that connect directly to the Linear Trail.
Specific trail and pedestrian/bicycle connectivity needs were identified within CiCo Park itself. CiCo Park is a popular place for walkers, runners and cyclists. Although there are a number of sidewalks and trails within CiCo Park, many of the existing facilities are not connected to one another. In addition, pedestrians often use the roadways within and surrounding the park due to the lack of suitable pedestrian facilities.

This site currently has a fair amount of internal pedestrian trail development that connects various facilities within the park and provides fitness apparatus. This study did not focus on the internal network until Phase 2 of the study, but again looked at the connectivity to the larger, macro-scale bicycle/pedestrian system.

The park has sidewalks along the north, east, and south perimeter following Kimball Avenue, Wreath Avenue, and Dickens Avenue. This perimeter walk links to surrounding neighborhoods and connects to the existing Hudson Trail. A Safe Routes to School sidewalk project is scheduled along the east side of Wreath Avenue with a crosswalk and pedestrian refuge island in the center lane across from the Manhattan Area Technical College.

No designated bicycle route currently exists. Cyclists traveling to CiCo Park are currently required to use local streets. The Five-Year Strategic Plan Bicycle Update has budgeted creating a bike route along Dickens Avenue by 2018 along the south side of the park.
The enhanced trail system shown improves connectivity to various destination points in the park while improving lighting within and around the perimeter of the park.

Trail and sidewalk connections should be completed to all the proposed facility improvements. Additional connections should be considered to other existing facilities within CiCo Park that are otherwise not directly impacted by proposed improvements.

Although walks and trails should be a minimum of 5-feet wide, preferred widths would be 8 to 10 feet wide where appropriate to allow for shared use by cyclists and pedestrians, as well as facilitate maintenance vehicles. Trails and walks along the Robinson and Avery Street corridors to accommodate pedestrians should be added. Budget figures in an adjacent section of this report include area lighting along the existing and proposed trails and walks.
Development of indoor aquatic facilities
City Park Pool Enclosure

Project Overview
With respect to development of new indoor aquatic facilities two initial considerations were addressed. Covering the existing 50-meter City Park lap pool was one option that was analyzed.

City Park, located in the central part of the city is within walking distance of a significant portion of the community and is heavily used. City Park pool facilities are well used also.

The visual impact of the scale of this facility would be significant and impact the use of the existing pool during construction and permanently with the shade provided during summer months. The Steering Committee did not recommend further consideration of this option.

Pros & Cons
Pros:
• Use of existing site does not require finding an alternative location
• Utilizes existing regulation 50-meter lap pool and diving well
• Central location for easy accessibility
• The layout of the lap pool may allow for a new structure to be placed on the site

Cons:
• Places a large out of scale structure in City Park

Facility Functions
50 Meter Lap Pool
Diving Well
Spectator Space
• New foundations would need to be constructed to support the enclosure and significantly impact the existing infrastructure.
• The new enclosure would shade the existing leisure pool to the north during summer months
• The year-round enclosure would not be large enough to house an indoor leisure pool
• Parking lot may not accommodate school buses and visitor parking during sporting events

Structural Requirements
Consideration was given to constructing a building enclosure over the existing 50M lap pool. The selection of the building materials and the structural framing system over pool areas needs careful consideration due to the high humidity and corrosive environment which is created by the pool elements. An all precast concrete structural framing system using precast double TEES for the roof framing members which are supported by precast beams, columns, and wall panels would provide a good choice for the building structure. The precast concrete structure would
provide a durable structure which would probably require the least amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility.

A glulam timber framed structure supported by precast concrete columns and wall panels could provide an aesthetically pleasing solution to the structural framing system which could also provide good durability within the pool environment. The glulam timber framed roof structure would likely cost more than the precast concrete framed roof structure.

A steel framed roof structure with metal roof deck used in combination with steel or precast columns and bracing along with precast wall panels would be another option which could be considered. However, the steel framed roof structure and metal roof deck option would likely require the most amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility and would probably have the shortest length useful life span of the discussed roof framing options.

Another consideration on the steel framed roof structure is the potential challenges in cleaning and repainting the steel roof framing system over the pools which would likely be required on a periodic basis during the life of the structure.

The foundation system for the new pool enclosure building over the existing lap pool will require detailed coordination with the existing conditions. The footing bearing elevation of the new building will need to bear on soils at an elevation near the bottom of any adjacent pools to ensure that the footings are not bearing on undocumented backfill soils from when the pool was originally constructed and to ensure that the new building footings do not exert any surcharge loading pressure on the pool walls or any adjacent below grade pits.

The deck surrounding the existing pool would need to be removed to accommodate the new building foundation construction. The location of all below deck pool piping will also need to be identified as much as possible to allow for coordination and conflict avoidance with the building foundation.

Other adjacent buildings and their foundation systems, below grade pool pits and tanks, site retaining walls, and other existing structures will need to be documented and closely coordinated with the size and location of the new pool enclosure building.

**Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing Components**

The following components would be recommended for this facility, if implemented, and included in all cost estimates.

**GENERAL:**

1. Corrosion resistant materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**HVAC:**

1. The system should be selected to provide efficient operation and control of space temperature and humidity.
2. Natatorium conditioning units incorporating heat recovery coupled with pool and/or domestic water heating systems.
3. Exhaust system for toilet and locker rooms.
4. Honeywell/BACnet DDC energy management system.
5. Corrosion resistant materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**ELECTRICAL:**
1. Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter.
2. LED lighting. Consider maintenance access in placement of fixtures over pool surfaces.
3. Addressable fire alarm system.
4. General power for all areas.
5. Empty data/phone boxes and conduits to accessible ceilings for owner system installation.
6. Power and control circuitry for pool equipment.
7. Paging/sound system.
8. Electrical provisions for timer displays and audio/visual systems.
9. LED parking lot lighting (cost is included in parking lot cost).
10. New LED, wall-mounted exterior lighting will be provided at the building entrances.

**PLUMBING:**
1. Dedicated sewer, water and natural gas services to building, single meter.
2. On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s).
3. Sewer and water piping to building fixtures.
4. Natural gas piping to HVAC equipment, pool heaters and water heaters.
5. Automatic flush valves and faucets.
6. Roof drainage and overflow roof drainage systems.

**FIRE PROTECTION:**
1. Dedicated fire protection service to building.
2. Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas.

**Parking Opportunities**
The parking lot has been improved to serve current pool functions; any capability of expanding the parking would impose on existing green space.

---

**Estimated Construction Cost**

$6.8 million - $7.5 million

**Operating Costs**
(Revenue calculations are omitted as this option is not recommended.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$262,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$66,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conference</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotion</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. Program Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscriptions/Licenses</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>$564,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capital Replacement | $15,000 |
| Total Expenses | $579,048 annually |
Project Overview
The enclosure of the existing CiCo Park facility would house both the leisure pool and lap pools while making use of the restrooms and locker rooms currently in place. However, the existing building is not insulated nor capable of being conditioned, thus resulting in a renovation of it as well creating additional construction costs for a suitable building. The steering committee did not recommend further consideration of this option.

Pros & Cons
Pros:
• Lap and leisure pools could be enclosed for year-round use
• Existing restroom and locker room facilities could be renovated to accommodate the new structure
• The site is established
• An expansive parking lot would accommodate large event parking
• Sporting events as well as daily users could use the space simultaneously

Cons:
• A large structure would need to be constructed to have a clear span over both pools
• The existing restrooms and locker rooms are not conditioned spaces; HVAC components would need to be installed which would add costs to construction
• The loss of an outdoor facility for the entire neighborhood

Facility Functions
25-Yard Lap Pool & Separate Leisure Pool
Diving Well
Spectator Space
Accessory Spaces

• Existing lap lane depths are not very suitable for high school competitive swimming program
• Structural foundations would need to be constructed for the new cover

Structural Requirements
Consideration was given to constructing a building enclosure over the existing lap pool and leisure pool. The selection of the building materials and the structural framing system over pool areas needs careful consideration due to the high humidity and corrosive environment which is created by the pool elements. An all precast concrete structural framing system using precast double TEES for the roof framing members which are supported by precast beams, columns, and wall panels would provide a good choice for the building structure. The precast concrete structure would provide a durable structure which would probably require the least amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility.

A glulam timber framed structure supported by precast concrete columns and wall panels
could provide an aesthetically pleasing solution to the structural framing system which could also provide good durability within the pool environment. The glulam timber framed roof structure would likely cost more than the precast concrete framed roof structure.

A steel framed roof structure with metal roof deck used in combination with steel or precast columns and bracing along with precast wall panels would be another option which could be considered. However, the steel framed roof structure and metal roof deck option would likely require the most amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility and would probably have the shortest length useful life span of the discussed roof framing options.

Another consideration on the steel framed roof structure is the potential challenges in cleaning and repainting the steel roof framing system over the pools which would likely be required on a periodic basis during the life of the structure.

The foundation system for the new pool enclosure building over the existing lap pool and leisure pool will require detailed coordination with the existing conditions. The footing bearing elevation on the new building will need to bear on soils at an elevation near the bottom of any adjacent pools to ensure that the footings are not bearing on undocumented backfill soils from when the pool was originally constructed and to ensure that the new building footings do not exert any surcharge loading pressure on the pool walls or any adjacent below grade pits.

The deck surrounding the existing pool would need to be removed to accommodate the new building foundation construction. The location of all below deck pool piping will also need to be identified as much as possible to allow for coordination and conflict avoidance with the building foundation.

Other adjacent buildings and their foundation systems, below grade pool pits and tanks, site retaining walls, and other existing structures will need to be documented and closely coordinated with the size and location of the new pool enclosure building.

**Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing Components**

**GENERAL:**
1. Corrosion resistant materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**HVAC:**
1. The system should be selected to provide efficient operation and control of space temperature and humidity.
2. Natatorium conditioning units incorporating heat recovery coupled
with pool and/or domestic water heating systems.
3. Exhaust system for toilet and locker rooms.
4. Honeywell/BACnet DDC energy management system.
5. Corrosion resistant materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**ELECTRICAL:**
1. Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter.
2. LED lighting. Consider maintenance access in placement of fixtures over pool surfaces.
3. Addressable fire alarm system.
4. General power for all areas.
5. Empty data/phone boxes and conduits to accessible ceilings for owner system installation.
6. Power and control circuitry for pool equipment.
7. Paging/sound system.
8. Electrical provisions for timer displays and audio/visual systems.
9. LED parking lot lighting (cost is included in parking lot cost).
10. New LED, wall-mounted exterior lighting will be provided at the building entrances.

**PLUMBING:**
1. Dedicated sewer, water and natural gas services to building, single meter.
2. On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s).
3. Sewer and water piping to building fixtures.
4. Natural gas piping to HVAC equipment, pool heaters and water heaters.
5. Automatic flush valves and faucets.
6. Roof drainage and overflow roof drainage systems.

**FIRE PROTECTION:**
1. Dedicated fire protection service to building.
2. Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas.

**Parking Opportunities**
The parking lot adjacent to the existing pool facility would not be impacted by the addition of a pool enclosure. The parking is used for a variety of City, County, and District events.

---

**Estimated Construction Cost**

$7.1 million - $7.8 million

**Operating Costs**
(Revenue calculations are omitted as this option is not recommended.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$262,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$71,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conference</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotion</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Program Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscription/Licenses</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>$569,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Replacement</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$584,573 annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Aquatics Facility at CiCo Park

Project Overview

After analysis of constructing enclosures over the two existing pools, and the realization that a foundation system would need to be installed at both, the option of an entirely new facility was recommended by the Steering Committee and investigated during Phase 1 of this Feasibility Study.

The new facility could be positioned in the large parking lot west of the existing aquatics facility at CiCo Park. The site is large enough to house such a facility. In addition, the facility could be designed to best serve its users instead of renovating existing facilities that might not accomplish the mission set forth by City staff and the steering committee as well as not fully satisfying the survey results.

A new facility would provide an indoor regulation 25-yard lap pool, diving well, and leisure pool. Restrooms, changing rooms, spectator seating, and staff support spaces would allow for year-round use for everyday users as well as sporting events.

Pros & Cons

Pros:
• Foundation systems would need to be constructed and impact City & CiCo pools. New construction will not impact either existing facility

Cons:
• Construction cost is more than a retrofit of existing facilities
• A minor loss of parking in the existing lot
• Grading of the site would be required to create a level surface for the pools

Structural Requirements

Consideration was given to constructing a new indoor aquatic center at CiCo Park. The size and length of the lap pool and whether a leisure pool or therapeutic pools will be included has not yet been determined.

Facility Functions

25-Yard Lap Pool
Diving Well
Spectator Space
Leisure Pool
Accessory Spaces

• The large parking lot lends itself to the construction of a new facility
• The site is established.
• The facility could be designed to accommodate the needs of users instead of retrofitting the two existing pools
• The parking lot could accommodate event capacity use
• Facility could house a lap pool and a leisure pool
However, the selection of the building materials and the structural framing system over pool areas needs careful consideration due to the high humidity and corrosive environment which is created by the pool elements. An all precast concrete structural framing system using precast double TEES for the roof framing members which are supported by precast beams, columns, and wall panels would provide a good choice for the building structure. The precast concrete structure would provide a durable structure which would probably require the least amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility.

A glulam timber framed structure supported by precast concrete columns and wall panels could provide an aesthetically pleasing solution to the structural framing system which could also provide good durability within the pool environment. The glulam timber framed roof structure would likely cost more than the precast concrete framed roof structure.

A steel framed roof structure with metal roof deck used in combination with steel or precast columns and bracing along with precast wall panels would be another option which could be considered. However, the steel framed roof structure and metal roof deck option would likely require the most amount of ongoing maintenance during the life of the facility and would probably have the shortest length useful life span of the discussed roof framing options.

Another consideration on the steel framed roof structure is the potential challenges in cleaning and repainting the steel roof framing system over the pools which would likely be required on a periodic basis during the life of the structure.

The below grade pool related pits and tanks would typically be constructed integral and in coordination with the building foundation system. The concrete pool structures would typically be designed and constructed to be separate and independent of the building foundation system. The building foundation system will need to be closely coordinated with the depth and geometry of the adjacent pools and pool related pits. Indoor pools are typically constructed after the building foundations and building structure have been constructed. Therefore, the building foundations will need to be at an adequate depth below grade to allow for the pool excavations and construction to take place without having any detrimental impact on the stability and soil support of the building foundations.

**Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing Components**

**GENERAL:**
1. Corrosion resistant materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**HVAC:**
1. The system should be selected to provide efficient operation and control of space temperature and humidity.
2. Natatorium conditioning units incorporating heat recovery coupled with pool and/or domestic water heating systems.
3. Exhaust system for toilet and locker rooms.
4. Honeywell/BACnet DDC energy management system.
5. Corrosion resistant
materials for equipment and systems exposed to the pool environment.

**ELECTRICAL:**
1. Dedicated 3-phase, underground electrical service to building, single meter.
2. LED lighting. Consider maintenance access in placement of fixtures over pool surfaces.
3. Addressable fire alarm system.
4. General power for all areas.
5. Empty data/phone boxes and conduits to accessible ceilings for owner system installation.
6. Power and control circuitry for pool equipment.
7. Paging/sound system.
8. Electrical provisions for timer displays and audio/visual systems.
9. LED parking lot lighting (cost is included in parking lot cost).
10. New LED, wall-mounted exterior lighting will be provided at the building entrances.

**PLUMBING:**
1. Dedicated sewer, water and natural gas services to building, single meter.
2. On-demand, natural gas-fired water heater(s).
3. Sewer and water piping to building fixtures.
4. Natural gas piping to HVAC equipment, pool heaters and water heaters.
5. Automatic flush valves and faucets.
6. Roof drainage and overflow roof drainage systems.

**FIRE PROTECTION:**
1. Dedicated fire protection service to building.
2. Wet fire sprinkler system serving all building areas.

**Parking Opportunities**
Adequate parking is available.

---

### Estimated Construction Cost

$9.6 million - $10.1 million

### Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>$295,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$124,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Conference</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Equipment</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotion</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Program Supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint./Repair</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Chemicals</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Subscription/Licenses</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Replacement</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$729,441 annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Potential Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Admissions</td>
<td>$88,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passes</td>
<td>$243,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>$14,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Programs</td>
<td>$50,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Shop</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions/Vending</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Parties</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Revenue       | $440,638 annually |

| Difference          | ($288,803) annually |

---

**Priority 4 | 55**
Summary

Parks & Recreation Feasibility Study
Summary & Recommendations

Project Summary

The City of Manhattan, through the Parks & Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan process, formed a 15-member community-based Steering Committee to guide an assessment of community needs for Parks & Recreation facilities. Addressed were parks, trails, recreation centers, playing fields, and aquatic facilities. Broad demographic sampling of the community was conducted. Results of the Plan focused on short-term (0-5 years), mid-term (5-15 years), and long-term (over 15 years) community needs for recreational facilities.

From this information, the Steering Committee identified the four priorities addressed herein for further evaluation prior to implementation:

Priority 1: Creation of Indoor Space
Geographically Located to Meet Unmet Needs in the Community

Priority 2: Improvements to the Safety & Playability of Existing Field Playing Surfaces

Priority 3: Improve Availability & Condition of Community Parks, Trails, & Neighborhood Parks

Priority 4: Development of New Indoor Aquatic Facilities

By re-engaging and expanding the Steering Committee and coordinating with the City, in-depth study of each priority was achieved, with Phase 1 focusing on Priority 1. Phase 2 addressed Priorities 2 & 3 in more depth.

USD 383 senior administrative and coaching staff were involved with this study to assess partnering in locating two of the recommended community centers at Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools. USD 383 supports this partnership by using available space at each site. It also supports establishing a facility at Douglass Park and as reported, has been submitted to H.U.D. through a Community Development Block Grant application.

Priorities 2 & 3 address needed improvements to existing outdoor field and court playing surfaces, focusing on tennis as a strong community and school district need for both recreational and competitive use. The Strategic Facility Improvement Plan (SFIP) identified a need for further planning at CiCo Park. Therefore, CiCo Park was identified as the focus for addressing Priorities 2 & 3.

Priority 4 was addressed by the Steering Committee with respect to indoor aquatics. It was verified that the structural foundation at City Park Pool was not designed to accept an enclosure. A concept was reviewed that was notably out of scale with the Park and neighborhood. Covering the entire CiCo Park Pool complex was also reviewed and rejected as negating all outdoor use of the facility.

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.

Final Steering Committee Recommendations

- Provide community facilities located at Anthony & Eisenhower Middle Schools, each with three (3) or four (4) multi-use regulation-size courts, preferred elevated walking tracks, & support spaces.
- Provide a neighborhood facility at Douglass Park with one (1) multi-use regulation-size court and two (2) cross courts, on grade walking track, & support spaces to align with CDBG funding availability.
- Provide new/expanded connecting links from facilities noted in this study to existing walking/biking/jogging trails in the community, understanding that the Linear Trail, an important community amenity, will be completed as part of current & future CIPs.
- Provide safe & upgraded outdoor playing fields & courts, particularly 12 court tennis.
- If implemented, provide a new indoor aquatics center with a 25-yard competition pool & separate leisure pool at CiCo Park.
- Complete an Improvement Plan for CiCo Park addressing new ballfields, core complex, tennis courts, detention pond, and parking.
Introduction

Upon issuance of the Parks & Recreation Strategic Facility Improvement Plan that evaluated all facilities within the purview of the Parks & Recreation Department it was understood that further analysis and evaluation would be required to be able to focus on those needs for improvement described in the study.

Although each location or facility identified had recommendations for enhancement and improvement, four areas of emphasis surfaced as being of the most benefit to the community at large. This study has focused on the following in two phases with Phase 1 being an overview and analysis of all Four Priorities with an emphasis on Priority 1, and Phase 2 focusing on Priorities 2 & 3 allowing Priority 4 to be deferred. The following describes each.

Priority 1: Creation of Indoor Space Geographically Located to Meet Unmet Needs in the Community

Priority 1 addresses partnering with USD 383 Manhattan/Ogden School District. With its own needs for more court space for school and public functions, Anthony and Eisenhower Middle Schools provide an opportunity to meet community-wide facility needs for school and community court requirements. Court availability for basketball, volleyball, and other court sports is extremely limited and providing space to be used by the School District as well as the City allows for the best use of available resources. Priority 1 also includes the study completed for the Neighborhood Multipurpose Facility at Douglass Park that proceeded separately to provide necessary information for a Community Development Block Grant application.

Priority 2: Improvements to the Safety & Playability of Existing Field Playing Surfaces

Priority 2 acknowledges that City Staff continue to work with City Park and Anneberg Park improvements. CiCo Park, however, is a needed focus for planning. Improvement and realignment/relocation of four ball fields and twelve tennis courts is addressed as well as suitability of playing surfaces for these venues. Storm water detention is addressed to avoid impact to neighboring properties.

Priority 3: Improve Availability & Conditions of Community Parks, Trails, & Neighborhood Parks

Priority 3 addresses trail improvements and connectivity as applied specifically to CiCo Park in the Phase 2 study. All sites were addressed in the study as well.

Priority 4: Development of New Indoor Aquatic Facilities

Although the community at large has expressed a need for indoor aquatics that afford year-round access to competitive and leisure activities for several years, the Steering Committee has addressed this need with a recommendation to postpone further analysis.

Final Presentations

At the August 26, 2016 City Commission Work Session, a completed analysis of Facility Improvements was presented with a focus on Priority 1. On November 4, 2016, the Douglass Park Neighborhood Center was presented in order to apply for a separately funded Community Development Block Grant. On January 10, 2017, a completed analysis was presented focusing on Priorities 2 & 3. Priority 4, Aquatics, has been deemed to require further consideration for possible implementation at a later date.

On April 11, 2017 the final Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study was presented to the Manhattan City Commission in order to allow determination of a possible initiative to be presented to the voters of Manhattan. The Commission’s action will determine the scope of proposed components of this study that may be provided to voters for consideration in November, 2017.