

STANSBURY PARK COMMUNITY MASTER PLAN

Adopted March 27, 2019





ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The current Agency leaders are to be commended for their commitment to developing a master plan for parks, trails, and open spaces for recreation and quality of life. Under the leadership of Chairman Neil Smart, citizens and staff have made strides to improve the current inventory and future of parks and trails.

The dedication of Stansbury leadership and volunteers is greatly appreciated, for without their insights and hard work, this plan would not have emerged. More than 410 households in Stansbury Park also deserve thanks for their response to the parks and trails needs assessment survey and for their input and support for these important community resources.

Stansbury Park Leadership

Neil Smart, Chairman

Aaron Spilker, Vice-Chairman

Brenda Spearman, Treasurer

Michael Johnson, Trustee

Cassandra Arnell, Trustee

Glenn Oscarson, Trustee

Agency Staff

Gary Jensen, General Manager

Tracey Schmidtke, Office Manager

Planning Consultants

MGB+A

Jay Bollwinkel, AICP, ASLA, LEED ND

Kathryn Knight Sonntag, MLA

CRSA

Kevin DeKold, AIA, NCARB

Kelly Gillman, ASLA, AICP

Melissa Fryer

Zions Public Finance, Inc.

Susie Becker, Vice President

Aaron Montgomery, Financial Analyst

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION.....1
 - ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN DOCUMENT.....2
 - STATEMENTS OF PURPOSE.....3
 - VISION & GOALS.....3
 - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE PLANNING PROCESS.....5

- 2. PARKS & RECREATION DEMAND: CURRENT & FUTURE CONDITIONS.....7
 - PARKS.....9
 - TRAILS.....18

- 3. PARKS & RECREATION TRENDS.....23
 - NERPA AGENCY PERFORMANCE REVIEW.....24
 - NATIONAL TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION.....24
 - YOUTH TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION.....26
 - STATE-WIDE TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION.....27

- 4. PARKS & RECREATION NEEDS.....29
 - LEVEL OF SERVICE & PARK NEEDS ANALYSIS.....30
 - PARK SERVICE AREA & DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS.....31
 - PARK SERVICE AREA GAPS.....31
 - PARK & TRAIL CONNECTIONS.....32
 - RECOMMENDED TRAIL NETWORK.....32
 - OPEN SPACE.....32

- 5. GOALS.....35
 - GOALS.....36

- 6. ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, MANAGEMENT & OPERATION NEEDS.....39
 - ESTIMATED COSTS FOR SPECIFIC NEEDS.....40
 - MAINTENANCE COSTS.....40
 - PARKS IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN (IFFP).....44
 - SUMMARY OF IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS (IFA).....51

- 7. ACTION PLAN.....61
 - STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.....62
 - KEY RECOMMENDATIONS & PRIORITIES.....62

APPENDIX.....	67
DEFINITIONS.....	68
DRAFT PLAN OPEN HOUSE MEETING - COMMENTS & NOTES.....	68
RESULTS FROM INFORMAL INTERNET SURVEY.....	72

LIST OF MAPS

Map 1. EXISTING STANSBURY PARKS - PUBLIC & PRIVATE.....	11
Map 2. EXISTING STANSBURY PARKS WITH SERVICE AREAS.....	13
Map 3. EXISTING & PROPOSED STANSBURY PARKS WITH SERVICE AREAS.....	15
Map 4. STANSBURY PARK SERVICE AREA GAPS	17
Map 5. PROPOSED STANSBURY PARKS.....	19
Map 6. EXISTING & PROPOSED TRAILS	21
Map 7. PROPOSED SERVICE AREA BOUNDARY.....	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: EXISTING MINI PARKS.....	10
Table 2: EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.....	12
Table 3: EXISTING COMMUNITY PARKS.....	14
Table 4: EXISTING SPECIAL USE PARKS.....	16
Table 5: ALL EXISTING PUBLIC PARKS COMBINED.....	71
Table 6: COST TO UPGRADE EXISTING MINI PARKS.....	40
Table 7: COST TO UPGRADE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.....	41
Table 8: COST TO UPGRADE EXISTING COMMUNITY PARKS.....	41
Table 9: SUMMARY COSTS TO UPGRADE EXISTING PARKS.....	42

Prepared by:





1. INTRODUCTION

ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

The Stansbury Park Community Master Plan (2019-2039) is organized into seven chapters, as follows:

1. Introduction provides background and baseline data, as well as a summary of the master plan process and purpose.

2. Parks & Recreation Demand: Current and Future Conditions addresses existing and future park needs, beginning with an analysis of existing conditions. The chapter includes maps and tables to illustrate the data.

3. Parks & Recreation Trends provides snapshots of national trends in recreation, youth trends in recreation participation, and Utah trends in recreation participation.

4. Parks & Recreation Needs summarizes community-identified needs gathered through an online survey and open house and follows with an analysis of need, a deter-

mination of Level of Service (LOS) for Stansbury's current and projected population in 2039. The chapter includes maps and tables to illustrate the data, and concludes with recommendations.

5. Goals outlines a parks and trails vision that extends from a detailed analysis of Stansbury Park to regional connections.

6. Acquisition, Construction, Management & Operation Needs outlines base construction costs for materials, management and operations. A detailed list of funding options, ranging from small to larger projects, is given.

7. Action Plan lays out specific projects, policies and programs that fit within a 5-, 10- and 20-year time frame, based on funding accessibility and community-identified needs.



Stansbury Boat Dock

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

PARKS & TRAILS STATEMENT

Stansbury residents should have access to high-quality, clean and safe park and recreation facilities. The Agency supports the development of an integrated trail network connecting Stansbury neighborhoods to parks, recreation areas, and community amenities to provide residents with the tools to be active.

VISION & GOALS

The purpose of this plan is to integrate public input, and the Service Agency Trustees' input with proposed short- and long-term goals. The survey and meetings identify critical community needs in recreational or fitness activities, parks and trails, the types of venues that are being used or could be built, and how to pay for both the building and long-term operation and maintenance costs.

Along with industry standards for parks and recreation, citizen input is critical to identifying areas in the community where trails, parks, athletic venues and open space are needed. (A complete list of goals for the Agency to achieve during the 20-year planning period is found in 5. Goals.)

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: *Aspire toward providing all Stansbury residents with adequate access to high-quality, clean, and safe park and recreation facilities.*

Objective 1.1: Maintain, and when possible, further develop existing parks and green space areas throughout the agency service boundaries.

- *Policy: When appropriate, identify and prioritize park space needs and include them in an Agency-wide Capital Improvements Plan.*

Objective 1.2: Plan for the development of additional park spaces as the Agency grows to ensure all Stansbury residents have convenient access to parks.

- *Policy: As appropriate, identify and acquire sites for future parks and recreational facilities in areas of the Agency currently not well-served by parks.*

- *Policy: Encourage developers to set aside park space in areas of new development.*
- *Policy: Collect and balance the use of park impact fees to help ensure that new demand for a range of park and recreation facilities is addressed.*

Goal 2: *Support the development of an integrated trail network connecting Stansbury neighborhoods to parks, recreation areas, and community amenities.*

Objective 2.1: Support and encourage the development of a "green grid" plan identifying key pedestrian and bicycle routes throughout the Agency.

- *Policy: Encourage developers to set aside land for trails as new development occurs.*
- *Policy: When appropriate, the Agency should identify and prioritize alignments for future bicycle routes to be included in a Agency-wide Capital Improvement Plan.*
- *Policy: Cooperate with the Tooele County Trails Committee to coordinate the Tooele County Trails Master Plan.*
- *Policy: Explore options for funding sources for the development of future trails systems at the appropriate time.*

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE PARKS PLAN PROCESS

PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITIES INFORMAL INTERNET SURVEY - SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Community needs were assessed at one Open House meeting, held on June 27, 2018, along with an online survey hosted on SurveyMonkey which ran from July 2, 2018 to August 8, 2018. Several work meetings were also held with the agency's trustees to gather their insights. These efforts brought to light what activities are being provided for and which are inadequate.

The survey portion was designed to gather information about (1) current use of parks and recreation facilities, (2) participation in specific recreation activities, and (3) improvements needed in Agency parks, trails, and facilities.

ties. A full summary of survey results can be found in the Appendix.

Some of the key survey findings include the following:

- The majority of respondents (**97%**) are residents of Stansbury.
- **56%** of all respondents had members of his/her household enrolled in the Tooele County School District.
- **47%** of respondents said that the proximity (walkability) of parks to their current residences was very important. (**26%** more said it was important.)
- **69%** of respondents said they would like to see a splash pad in parks in the next five years.
- **60%** said they would like to see more trees in parks in the next five years.
- **81%** of respondents said they would be willing to bond for major recreation projects in the future.
- **39%** of respondents would be willing to support an annual user fee (per household) of \$50 (\$4.16 monthly). **26%** would be willing to support an annual user fee (per household) of \$100 (\$8.33 monthly).
- **33%** of respondents would be willing to bond for a Recreation Center.

Improvements and/or amenities wanted in parks in the next five years (in descending order, top 5 from survey):

- Splash Pad
- More Trees
- Benches
- Jungle gyms and/or swings
- Sporting fields or complexes

Future funding for improvements in the next 5, 10, and 20 years should be spent (in descending order):

- Expand recreational trail connections
- Improve current parks
- Splash pad
- Recreation center
- Clean up the lake

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING – SUMMARY OF INPUT RECEIVED

A public open house meeting was held on June 27, 2018 at the Clubhouse. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the public to express ideas and concerns in regards to parks and recreation.

The following is a summary of key issues, ideas and questions by general category (see Appendix for the full list of comments):

EXISTING PARK NEEDS

- The Agency's emphasis should be on improving existing parks and building Community Parks.
- The Agency should strengthen and increase the variety of amenities in Community Parks.

PROPOSED PARK NEEDS

- There is a need for park space and access to parks on the south and southwest side of Stansbury.

PARK AMENITIES/ELEMENTS

- The Agency should have better wayfinding and park signs.

TRAILS

- Continuous trails/connectivity is the number one priority for trails.
- Trails should connect neighborhoods to places where people want to go.
- Agency trails should link to County and regional systems.
- Stansbury needs a traffic-free bike path on the outskirts of town.
- Recreational trails should have a more natural feeling and "loop" around the Agency.
- Trails should be part of a comprehensive system that connects all parts of the community.

AGENCY STAFF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Stansbury Park trustees met and spoke frequently with the consultants to help guide the planning process and to provide valuable information and insight. The group met six times during the planning process, and was available for less formal discussions throughout the planning process.

PUBLIC HEARINGS & PLAN ADOPTION

The Agency adopted the plan on March 27, 2019 following a public hearing held on the same date.





2. PARKS & RECREATION DEMAND: CURRENT & FUTURE CONDITIONS



EXISTING AGENCY PARKS

Stansbury Park is fortunate to have many parks to help meet existing and future park and recreation needs. Map 1 shows the size and location of the Agency's existing parks (both public and private) and Map 2 shows the service area for the same. Existing private parks were considered, because they often help meet the recreational needs of the subdivisions for which they were created. This is often an important consideration, especially if the surrounding area is underserved by public parks. However, private parks are not generally available for use by residents outside the subdivision they serve, and, therefore, do not have a service area beyond the limits of the subdivision for which they were created. The following is a summary description of the Agency's existing parks. The descriptions begin with Mini Parks, continuing by size to address Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks, and concluding with Special Use Parks, which are not necessarily classified by size.



MINI PARKS

Mini Parks serve local neighborhoods with amenities specifically targeted to the demographics and interests of the nearby surroundings. There are fourteen (14) public Mini Parks in the Agency at present, encompassing a total of 11.64 acres. In addition, there are private Mini Parks of similar size and characteristics. Although these facilities are generally not available for public use, they nevertheless serve the subdivision where they are situated.

Mini Parks are intended to be located within walking distance of local neighborhoods, and should include grassy play areas, playgrounds, sport courts, benches, and

other small scale amenities such as pavilions and shade structures. Mini Parks have a typical service area of up to 0.25 miles (one-quarter mile) and are generally two (2) acres in size or smaller, although there may be small variances. Existing Public Mini Parks are illustrated on Maps 1 and 2, and their specific characteristics and amenities are indicated in Table 1.

Mini Parks meet a specific need in a neighborhood and tend to be used mainly by preschool children as long as they are accessible from a neighborhood (Delgada Park). As the neighborhood around a Mini Park grows older and children mature, these parks tend to get less use.



Delgada Park

Table 1

EXISTING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	PARKING	BASKETBALL	VOLLEYBALL	TENNIS	BASEBALL / SOFTBALL	SOCCER	FOOTBALL	RESTROOMS	PICNIC TABLE	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	PAVILION	TRAIL ACCESS	OTHER AMENITIES
MINI PARKS (approx. 0-2 acres)															
STANSBURY PARK															
Brent Rose Park	across from Stansbury Elementary at 485 Country Club Drive.	1.57	Yes			2			1					Yes	
Brigham Park	Brigham Street, not of Benson Grist Mill and Stansbury Park Cemetery	1.36	No								2 covered		2		2 Charcoal Barbeques
Benson Mill Park	Intersection of Angell Way and Decker Lane	0.64													
Captains Island Park	Turnabout at north end of Island	0.47	No									1		Yes	
Delgada Park	North shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	0.28	No											Yes	Lake access, boat dock, nature trail, bird watching
Fairway Park	next to Golf Course at 629 Country Club Drive	0.93	No									1		No	2 Benches
Galley Park	Intersection of Galley Lane and Regatta Lane	0.92	No								2	1			4 Benches
Gateway Park	Intersection of Old Mill Road and Harvest Drive	0.83	No	1				1 Small			3	1		Yes	Large shade trees, 3 benches
Northport Park	West shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	1.02	Yes											Yes	Lake access, boat ramp
Ponderosa Park	Intersection of Ponderosa Lane and Horseshoe Drive	0.82	No	1				1 small			2	1		Yes	3 Benches
Regatta Park	Intersection of Regatta Lane and Bayshore Drive	0.45	No											No	Detention Basin
Rex Sutton Memorial Park		0.51	No				3				1	1			3 Benches
Oscarson Park	Bayshore Drive & Schooner Ln	0.57													
Woodland Park	Intersection of Country Club Drive and Miller Circle	1.27	No	1							5	1		Yes	Large shade trees, fire pit, 2 benches, 2 charcoal grills
Stansbury Park Total		11.64		3		2	3	2			17	7	2		



Map 1

Existing Stansbury Parks – Public & Private

Public

- ① Brigham Park
- ② Sagers Memorial Park
- ③ Gateway Park
- ④ Porter Way Park
- ⑤ Delgada Park
- ⑥ Northpoint Park
- ⑦ Captain's Island Park
- ⑧ Clubhouse Complex
- ⑨ Mill Pond Park
- ⑩ Brent Rose Park
- ⑪ Fairway Park
- ⑫ Park View Park
- ⑬ Regatta Park
- ⑭ Galley Park
- ⑮ Woodland Park
- ⑯ Rex Sutton Memorial Park
- ⑰ Village Park
- ⑱ Sandhill Park
- ⑲ Ponderosa Park
- ⑳ Lakeview Basketball Court
- ㉑ Schooner Park
- ㉒ Unnamed Park
- ㉓ Proposed Park

Private

- Stansbury Park Elementary School
- Rose Springs Elementary School
- Stansbury High School
- Old Mill Elementary School
- Bonneville Academy
- Benson Grist Mill
- Proposed Junior High School
- LDS Church- 390 Village Blvd
- LDS Church- 240 Interlochen Lane
- Ivory Homes Park
- Symphony Homes Park
- Richmond Homes Park

- Public Park**
- Private Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**

Stansbury Park
Parks Master Plan



NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Neighborhood Parks serve the broader neighborhood with large amenities or local amenities that reflect the specific demographics and interests of the neighborhood. Occasionally, these parks may include a regional draw, such as a skate park or splash pad. More typical amenities include grassy play areas, restroom, pavilions, playgrounds, sport courts (basketball, volleyball and tennis), sports fields (baseball, soccer, football and similar sports), picnic areas, seating and walking paths that are connected to other trails and open space. Neighborhood Parks have a service area of 0.5 mile and

are generally two to 15 acres in extent. As illustrated in Map 1 and 2 and described in Table 2, there are six (6) Neighborhood Parks in Stansbury at present, encompassing a total of 37.14 acres.


Neighborhood Parks are becoming more and more important to the success of a city's park and recreational program. They are the place where soccer, baseball, football and other field sports occur. They are also places where people gather for family reunions, neighborhood and religious parties and many other activities.



Millpond Park

Table 2

EXISTING PUBLIC PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	PARKING	BASKETBALL	VOLLEYBALL	TENNIS	BASEBALL / SOFTBALL	SOCCER	FOOTBALL	RESTROOMS	PICNIC TABLE	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	PAVILION	TRAIL ACCESS	OTHER AMENITIES
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK (approx. 2-15 acres)															
STANSBURY PARK															
Millpond Park		7.12													
Park View Park	Intersection of Parkview and Regatta Lane	5.62	Yes	1			1		2	2	2	1		Yes	3 Horseshoe Pits, walking paths, 1 Bench
Sagers Memorial Park	Next to Mill Pond at #10 Plaza	9.94	Yes				4			3	4	1	1	Yes	Large shade trees, skateboard and scooter course, betting cage
Sandhill Park	Intersection of Sandhill Way and Calais Lane	2.4	No						1					Yes	
Oscarson Park	Bayshore Drive & Schooner Ln	5.3													
Village Park	Intersection of Village Blvd. and Stallion Way	6.76	Yes				2		2	3		1		Yes	2 Benches
Stansbury Park Total		37.14		1			7		5	8	6	3	1		



Map 2

Existing Stansbury Parks with Service Areas

Public

- 1 Brigham Park
- 2 Sagers Memorial Park
- 3 Gateway Park
- 4 Porter Way Park
- 5 Delgada Park
- 6 Northpoint Park
- 7 Captain's Island Park
- 8 Clubhouse Complex
- 9 Mill Pond Park
- 10 Brent Rose Park
- 11 Fairway Park
- 12 Park View Park
- 13 Regatta Park
- 14 Galley Park
- 15 Woodland Park
- 16 Rex Sutton Memorial Park
- 17 Village Park
- 18 Sandhill Park
- 19 Ponderosa Park
- 20 Lakeview Basketball Court
- 21 Schooner Park
- 22 Unnamed Park
- 23 Proposed Park

Private

- Stansbury Park Elementary School
- Rose Springs Elementary School
- Stansbury High School
- Old Mill Elementary School
- Bonneville Academy
- Benson Grist Mill
- Proposed Junior High School
- LDS Church- 390 Village Blvd
- LDS Church- 240 Interlochen Lane
- Ivory Homes Park
- Symphony Homes Park
- Richmond Homes Park

- Public Park**
- Private Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**

Park Service Area

- Mini Park (1/4 Mile Radius)
- Neighborhood Park (1/2 Mile Radius)
- Community Park (1 Mile Radius)

COMMUNITY PARKS

Community Parks serve cities and often regions with special amenities and features. Typical amenities include a restroom, sports fields, active and passive recreation areas, picnic facilities, playgrounds, gathering areas, recreation/community centers, and special facilities such as skate parks, cycling tracks, fishing ponds, equestrian facilities, space for hosting special events, tennis courts, basketball courts, volleyball courts and other recreation facilities. Community Parks generally have a service area of 0.75 mile, or a 20-25 minute walk time, and are 15+ acres in size. The one existing

Community Park in Stansbury, Porter Way Park, is shown in Map 1 and Map 2 and described in Table 3. It encompasses a total 28.66 acres.


The larger multi-service Community Parks have become popular because they provide a wide range of activities for all seasons, especially the ones with indoor facilities and large sports fields.



Porter Way Park

Table 3

EXISTING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	PARKING	BASKETBALL	VOLLEYBALL	TENNIS	BASEBALL / SOFTBALL	SOCCER	FOOTBALL	RESTROOMS	PICNIC TABLE	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	PAVILION	TRAIL ACCESS	OTHER AMENITIES
COMMUNITY PARK (approx. 15+ acres)															
STANSBURY PARK															
Porter Way Park	Intersection of Porter Way and Star Discovery Way	28.66	Yes			2	1	2	2	2	19	1	1	Yes	Wedding stream, 18-hole Disc Golf Course, 14 Benches, plumbed for splash pad
Stansbury Park Total		28.66				2	1	2	2	2	19	1	1		



Map 3

Existing & Proposed Stansbury Parks with Service Areas

Public

- ① Brigham Park
- ② Sagers Memorial Park
- ③ Gateway Park
- ④ Porter Way Park
- ⑤ Delgada Park
- ⑥ Northpoint Park
- ⑦ Captain's Island Park
- ⑧ Clubhouse Complex
- ⑨ Mill Pond Park
- ⑩ Brent Rose Park
- ⑪ Fairway Park
- ⑫ Park View Park
- ⑬ Regatta Park
- ⑭ Galley Park
- ⑮ Woodland Park
- ⑯ Rex Sutton Memorial Park
- ⑰ Village Park
- ⑱ Sandhill Park
- ⑲ Ponderosa Park
- ⑳ Lakeview Basketball Court
- ㉑ Schooner Park
- ㉒ Unnamed Park
- ㉓ Proposed Park

Private

- Stansbury Park Elementary School
- Rose Springs Elementary School
- Stansbury High School
- Old Mill Elementary School
- Bonneville Academy
- Benson Grist Mill
- Proposed Junior High School
- LDS Church- 390 Village Blvd
- LDS Church- 240 Interlochen Lane
- Ivory Homes Park
- Symphony Homes Park
- Richmond Homes Park

- Public Park**
- Private Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**

Park Service Area

- Mini Park (1/4 Mile Radius)
- Neighborhood Park (1/2 Mile Radius)
- Community Park (1 Mile Radius)

SPECIAL USE PARKS


Special Use Parks typically range from very small to large and tend to serve a special interest or use, such as a large sports complex or a non-traditional park. These parks typically have large parking lots to accommodate special events and needs, such as the golf course. Please note that the acreage of the Stansbury Golf Course is not included in the LOS due to the skewing effect it has on park land that is consistently available for public use.



Clubhouse Complex

Table 4

EXISTING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	PARKING	BASKETBALL	VOLLEYBALL	TENNIS	BASEBALL / SOFTBALL	SOCCER	FOOTBALL	RESTROOMS	PICNIC TABLE	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	PAVILION	TRAIL ACCESS	OTHER AMENITIES
SPECIAL USE PARK															
STANSBURY PARK															
Clubhouse Complex	Across street from the Golf Course Pro Shop at #1 Country Club Drive	6.95	Yes	4	1	2				8	6		1	Yes	Clubhouse Event Center, Lake access, Boat Ramp, Boat Dock, Sport Court, Public Pool, Bridge, 6 Benches
Stansbury Park Total		6.95		4	1	2				8	6		1		



Map 4

Stansbury Park Service Area Gaps

Public

- ① Brigham Park
- ② Sagers Memorial Park
- ③ Gateway Park
- ④ Porter Way Park
- ⑤ Delgada Park
- ⑥ Northpoint Park
- ⑦ Captain's Island Park
- ⑧ Clubhouse Complex
- ⑨ Mill Pond Park
- ⑩ Brent Rose Park
- ⑪ Fairway Park
- ⑫ Park View Park
- ⑬ Regatta Park
- ⑭ Galley Park
- ⑮ Woodland Park
- ⑯ Rex Sutton Memorial Park
- ⑰ Village Park
- ⑱ Sandhill Park
- ⑲ Ponderosa Park
- ⑳ Lakeview Basketball Court
- ㉑ Schooner Park
- ㉒ Unnamed Park
- ㉓ Proposed Park

Private

- Stansbury Park Elementary School
- Rose Springs Elementary School
- Stansbury High School
- Old Mill Elementary School
- Bonneville Academy
- Benson Grist Mill
- Proposed Junior High School
- LDS Church- 390 Village Blvd
- LDS Church- 240 Interlochen Lane
- Ivory Homes Park
- Symphony Homes Park
- Richmond Homes Park

- Public Park**
- Private Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**

Park Service Area

- Mini Park (1/4 Mile Radius)
- Neighborhood Park (1/2 Mile Radius)
- Community Park (1 Mile Radius)

Park Service Area Gaps



RECREATION PROGRAMS

NRPA standards recommend one (1) softball/baseball field per 5,000 residents. NRPA also recommends one (1) per 5,000 residents for a soccer/football/lacrosse field. Based on these standards, the recommended number of baseball fields for Stansbury’s current population of 10,210 would be two (2). Stansbury currently has eight (8) municipal baseball fields. The number of recommended soccer/football/lacrosse fields is also two (2). Stansbury currently has twelve (12). Based on this analysis and the number of proposed new fields in the next few years, the Agency is comfortable with the current balance of supply and demand.

Facility	Public Quantity	NRPA Recommended Supply (Based on 1/5,000 residents)
Softball/Baseball fields	8	1
Soccer/Football/Lacrosse fields	12	1

TRAILS

Trails offer aesthetic and recreational opportunities, as well as commuter options. Residents who wish to walk or bike to work, go for family outings, or travel to school, will benefit from safe, connecting trails. Research has shown that trails often help raise property values, provide common space for social interactions, improve community safety and encourage healthy lifestyles.

A high-quality trail system is a marker of a great community. The term “trail” describes shared-use paths, multi-use paths, multi-use trails, sidewalks, and hiking pedestrian paths designed for non-motorized usage. Sidewalks or paths directly adjacent to roadways are included when they provide a link between trails or between a trail and a destination. Trail users may include but are not limited to: bicyclists, non-motorized scooters, in-line skaters, users of other wheeled devices like Segways or electric assist-bicycles, roller skaters, wheelchair users (both non-motorized and motorized), walkers, and runners.

SUMMARY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

At a little over 2.5 square miles, Stansbury is geographically compact. The Agency currently has very few trails, located mainly along portions of some parks and easements. Many of these trails provide pleasant walking opportunities. But there are many gaps that need to be addressed, as connections remain to be made between

these trails and homes, schools, churches and places of business.

Many of the existing, paved trails are in good condition and feel safe and inviting to trail users but they do not provide larger community connections; Stansbury lacks a trail system.

EXISTING TRAILS

There are several types of trails in Stansbury: on-road shoulders, sidewalks, paved park trails, access-ways and informal “demand” pedestrian trails.

Sidewalks are distinguished from shoulder pathways in that they usually have a curb and are physically elevated from the roadway. Sidewalk connections for pedestrians are fairly comprehensive in most neighborhoods. In older sections of the agency, sidewalks are absent in many locations, as well as along Stansbury Parkway.

Access-ways provide direct connections to local roads, schools, parks and other community destinations. Currently there is no requirement for dedicated access-ways for new development.

Stansbury residents have indicated they wish to see improved and additional bicycle lanes on identified routes through town. The Stansbury Park Trail System Master Plan incorporates routes along major connectors, such as Stansbury Parkway. After further discussion with the public and the Board of Trustees, a map of proposed trails was created (see Map 6 Existing and Proposed Trails).


Residents of Stansbury have indicated that they wish to see the creation of a trail system to better connect the community. Schools, parks and commercial nodes should be connected to neighborhoods.

ACCESS

Much of the sidewalk and bicycle lane network is incomplete or nonexistent, making it difficult to walk or bicycle to these trails. Many of the existing trails lack amenities like lighting, signage, and benches to invite users.

LIMITED PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND ENCROACHMENT

Stansbury Park, like many well-established communities, has the challenge of accommodating and balancing the needs of different roadway uses within limited public rights-of-way. Pedestrians and bicyclists are often left without proper facilities. Even more problematic is the issue of private property encroachment into the public right-



Map 5

Proposed Stansbury Parks

Public

- ① Brigham Park
- ② Sagers Memorial Park
- ③ Gateway Park
- ④ Porter Way Park
- ⑤ Delgada Park
- ⑥ Northpoint Park
- ⑦ Captain's Island Park
- ⑧ Clubhouse Complex
- ⑨ Mill Pond Park
- ⑩ Brent Rose Park
- ⑪ Fairway Park
- ⑫ Park View Park
- ⑬ Regatta Park
- ⑭ Galley Park
- ⑮ Woodland Park
- ⑯ Rex Sutton Memorial Park
- ⑰ Village Park
- ⑱ Sandhill Park
- ⑲ Ponderosa Park

Private

- Stansbury Park Elementary School
- Rose Springs Elementary School
- Stansbury High School
- LDS Church- 390 Village Blvd
- LDS Church- 240 Interlochen Lane

- Public Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**


Park Service Area

- Mini Park (1/4 Mile Radius)
- Neighborhood Park (1/2 Mile Radius)
- Community Park (1 Mile Radius)

Stansbury Park
Parks Master Plan



of-way, such as a property owner placing trees, shrubs, fences, or walls in the public right-of-way. This is particularly true in older areas without sidewalks, where there is no visual delineation between private property and the public right-of-way. Although it is within the Agency's right to reclaim this space, it can be politically challenging to do so, particularly if the residents perceive that a trail or improved facility will bring more people through the area.



Map 6
Existing & Proposed Trails

- Public Park
- School (Park)
- Church (Park)
- Existing Trail
- Proposed Trail
- Proposed Trailhead



3. PARKS & RECREATION TRENDS

NRPA AGENCY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

On average, Americans visit their local park and recreation facilities twice a month. Seven in 10 Americans can walk to a local park, open space or recreation center (Source: NRPA Americans' Engagement with Parks Survey, 2017).

Easy access to parks is associated with increased park use. Park visitation is much more frequent and physical activity levels are much higher for those who live within walking distance to a park (Source: National Recreation and Park Association, 2016). Recreation is a strong part of our personal, family, and civic lives. Stansbury Park places significant value on its recreational opportunities and has seen how parks and trails increase property values as well as quality of life. Stansbury Park also takes pride in its strong sense of community.

In 2016, nearly half of all Americans—48.6%—reported participating in at least one outdoor activity. On a national level, there is typically one park for every 2,266 residents. The typical park and recreation agency has 9.6 acres of park land for every thousand residents in the jurisdiction (source: National Recreation and Park Association, 2017). Stansbury currently has 9.54 acres of park land for every thousand residents.

Stansbury Park has developed a number of parks and recreation facilities over the years. Key to their successful implementation and upkeep will be this first Community Master Plan, which will pave the way for the successful implementation and maintenance of trails, parks, and recreation facilities.

This Master Plan is a vision that reflects the “big picture” expectations of active Stansbury residents. The purpose of this plan is to guide future decisions that will be made to stay ahead of demand for sports, parks, recreation and trails. The execution of each project, policy, and program listed in this plan is subject to the effects of the economy, politics and fiscal policy, as much as it is to planning. This Master Plan should, therefore, be updated regularly - every 5 to 10 years - to keep current with the changing needs and actualities of the Agency.

Over the last year (2017), Utah was the nation's third fastest growing state, with a population increase of 2.2 percent. Tooele County's population grew to 62,952.

Stansbury Park's population is currently 8,223. It is expected to decrease to approximately 8,060 by 2038 (Source: TAZ).

NATIONAL TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION

NATIONAL PARKS

Overall, year-to-date visitation to the National Park System (NPS) units is up 7.7% over 2016, an increase of 23.7 million visits. According to the Annual Information Exchange (AIX) Report, operating expenditures for state parks added up to \$2.46 billion, less than 50% of which comes from states' general funds.

STATE PARKS

America's state parks are one of the fastest growing venues for outdoor recreation on public lands and waters. More than 10,000 areas, including more than 9,000 trails over 38,000 miles in total length, provide outdoor recreation experiences and unique education opportunities. Their 18.5 million acres provide for great diversity and were enjoyed by nearly 791 million visitors in 2016, 373 million of which were fee-collecting areas.

More and more, the importance of state parks and their growing attendance is being recognized by state legislatures, with total capital expenditures for state park operations increasing by \$580 million. This is a result of increased funds and bonds thanks to the recovering economy.

VEHICLE SALES

The RV industry's shipments are expected to continue rising through 2018, according to a new Recreation Vehicle Industry Association (RVIA) forecast. RV shipments are expected to total 479,700 in 2017, an 11.38% gain over 2016, the best year on comparable record. The largest unit gains in 2016 and 2017 are expected in conventional travel trailers.

CAMPING

KOA – the nation's largest private campground system – reports a very strong year across the board, with an increase of 4.5%. According to KOA's 2017 North American Camping Report, camping remains one of the most popular, affordable and accessible pastimes in North America. An estimated 13 million U.S. households planned to camp more in 2017 than they did in 2016, and more than 1 million new households have started camping each year since 2014. Millennials are driving this growth as they

take to the outdoors in greater numbers, and they have no intention of letting up.

Camping is becoming a more social activity, and outdoor recreation-while-camping is shifting to more physically active activities. In this year's results, hiking outranked fishing as the most popular type of camping recreation for the first time. Kayaking and mountain biking also saw significant increases.

In an even more promising outlook for the future of camping and outdoor recreation in America, Generation Z teens (ages 13-17) are highly enthusiastic about camping and place a great deal of importance on people their age spending time outdoors. The findings indicate that teens share their adult counterparts' feelings about the benefits and emotional connections to camping. This finding suggests that as more families experience the outdoors, they are more likely to continue those activities and consequently, this trend will result in continued increased overall incidence of camping nationally, and particularly among families.

FISHING

Fishing participation increased by 1.5 million in 2016, according to the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation (RBFF) and the Outdoor Foundation's 2017 Special Report on Fishing. While fishing is still the second-most-popular outdoor activity among adults, it's gaining ground on the number one spot – jogging.

Perhaps most importantly, RBFF's work to target youth, women and Hispanics is working. Youth participation rose 3% while Hispanic participation increased by 11%. Not only are more Hispanics taking up fishing, but they go on six more outings per year than anglers in the general market. Newcomers to the sport accounted for 5.3% of total participants and tended to be young and female.

BIKING

According to a study commissioned by PeopleForBikes, 103 million Americans rode a bike at least once in 2014. Bike riding in large U.S. cities has doubled in the last 15 years. Safer bike infrastructure and onset of bike-sharing systems (in at least 70 U.S. cities) are key factors in this growth, a trend that is expected to continue. While the number and percentage of children who bike to school has fallen dramatically during the last 40 years, overall kids riding remains strong. Children now ride more often with parents instead of unsupervised.

Also, many new bike parks have been built coast to coast. These parks provide safe and appealing bike riding



opportunities for children and adults of all ages and abilities. Many more will be built in the coming years.

Bicycle-related tourism is growing. State governments increasingly recognize that they can attract residents and visitors to appealing bike-riding destinations. States are spending more money on bike tourism promotion, maps, signage, and some are even hiring full-time liaisons with outdoor recreation businesses.

OUTDOOR ADVENTURE SPORTS

Active and adventure travel outfitters experienced a very strong year in 2017 as industry diversification continues to offer new experiences in the outdoors. Demand for lodging, particularly cabins packaged with outdoor recreation activities, continues to outpace other services. That trend is expected to continue through 2018. Other strong activity segments include water-based day trips near urban areas or near-destination attractions. Guided hiking, jeep tours, horseback riding and iconic multi-day trips, such as rafting the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon, continue to experience strong demand, trends which should prevail through 2018. Late summer fires in Montana and California created some disruptions, but many land-based outfitters

were able to relocate their trips to other locations.

SKIING

U.S. ski areas tallied 54.8 million skier and snowboarder visits during the 2016-17 season, up 3.7% from last season. This past season, ski areas in the Northeast region experienced an impressive rebound, as skier visits grew by 28% to 11.9 million visits. In addition, the Rocky Mountain region had its second-best winter in terms of skier visits (21.7 million). Visits were up from last winter in the Southeast region, but down slightly in the Midwest, Pacific Northwest, and Pacific Southwest regions.

Encouragingly, the number of open and operating U.S. ski areas rose to 481 in the 2016-17 season, up from 463 last season. The Northeast region has witnessed a rebirth of several formerly defunct ski areas in the past few seasons – a positive sign for skiers and snowboarders seeking out new places to visit and for local populations who want to learn to slide on snow.

The number of lessons taught at U.S. ski areas increased this season, indicative of the growing appetite to learn to ski and snowboard. Average resort snowfall increased by 40% nationally, which contributed to ski areas being open an extra week, on average, compared to the 2015-16 season. The increased length of the operating season was most pronounced in the Southeast (23 days longer) and Northeast (17 days longer) regions.

Following the 2011 passage of the Ski Area Recreational Opportunity Enhancement Act (SAROE) authorizing summer uses on Forest Service lands, summer visitation at ski areas has jumped by 20%, with resorts investing in non-skiing related infrastructure such as zip lines, ropes courses, mountain coasters, alpine slides, mountain bike trails and parks and other amenities. The percent of annual revenue attributable to summer operations has increased from 7%, 15 years ago, to 12.7% in the 2016/17 fiscal year, with a particular rise noted in the past four years. Eighty percent of all ski areas now operate during the non-winter months, and 34% of resorts offer a summer season pass.

SNOWMOBILING

Sales of new snowmobiles in 2017 declined slightly due to poor snow cover and higher-than-normal temperatures in the Northeast region of the United States, according to the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association. Annual registration of snowmobiles remains constant at 1.36 million. There was a decline in snowmobile registrations in the Northeast US with an increase in registrations in the West. Average use of snowmobiles remained steady with a slight increase in the Western

snowmobile states.

Fall shows for the 2018 sales year are reporting large, enthusiastic crowds with sales increasing 10% compared to last year's shows. The winter weather forecast for Winter 2018 calls for above average snowfall and seasonal temperatures. The Mountain regions of the country are receiving record levels of early snowfall and the industry's customers are responding positively to the initial snow cover.

ARCHERY

Archery participation in America climbed over 20% from 2012 to 2015, boosting the number of archers to 23.8 million, an increase that can partially be attributed to the prominence of archery in pop culture. According to a study from the Archery Trade Association (ATA), 64% of archery participants are male, and 36% are female. Overall, archery participants are typically younger and from rural communities. Of the more than 21 million archers in the U.S., 76% shoot as recreational archers, while 35% identify strictly as bowhunters.

YOUTH TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION

The following data on youth trends in recreation come from the Outdoor Recreation and Participation Topline Report 2017 and report 2016 numbers.

Most Popular Youth Outdoor Activities by Participation Rate, Ages 6 to 24

1. Running, Jogging and Trail Running
25.3% of youth, 20.3 million participants
2. Bicycling (Road, Mountain and BMX)
22.6% of youth, 18.2 million participants
3. Fishing (Fresh, Salt and Fly)
19.5% of youth, 15.6 million participants
4. Camping (Car, Backyard and RV)
19.0% of youth, 15.3 million participants
5. Hiking
15.5% of youth, 12.5 million participants

Favorite Youth Outdoor Activities

By Frequency of Participation, Ages 6 to 24

1. Running, Jogging and Trail Running
81.3 average outings per runner, 1.7 billion total outings
2. Bicycling (Road, Mountain and BMX)
58.0 average outings per cyclist,
1.1 billion total outings
3. Fishing (Fresh, Salt and Fly)
16.1 average outings per fishing participant, 251.4 million total outings
4. Skateboarding
46.8 average outings per skateboarder,
212.2 million total outings
5. Camping (Car, Backyard and RV)
12.4 average outings per camper,
189.0 million total outings

snowboarding have been able to gain broader appeal. According to the survey, while golf is played much more frequently by those with incomes greater than \$100,000, skiing and snowboarding are more commonly enjoyed by Utahns across all income brackets.

While 92 percent of Utahns are satisfied with outdoor recreation opportunities in the state, for some, improvements are possible. The most popular suggestions for improvement include constructing more walking paths (23%), building bike trails (14%), adding camping sites (14%), and developing more urban parks (10%). However, the suggestion to “do nothing” ranked second highest among survey respondents at 17 percent. Those that indicated the state should do nothing to improve recreation options stemmed predominantly from Utahns who identify as politically conservative—more than moderates and liberals combined.

STATE-WIDE TRENDS IN RECREATION PARTICIPATION

Dan Jones & Associates, in conjunction with the David Eccles School of Business at the University of Utah, conducted a statewide poll (2014) to determine Utahns’ sentiments regarding outdoor recreation in the state. The survey shows that the majority of Utah citizens participate in outdoor recreation at least once a week, and nearly 90 percent of them say outdoor recreation is very important to them. The survey shows that across the board, Utahns agree that their state offers outdoor scenery and recreation second to none.

In another finding of the poll, over 90 percent of Utahns are satisfied with recreational opportunities currently available in Utah. Sixty-five percent of Utahns participate in outdoor recreation at least once a week. Conversely, just 12 percent of Utahns participate in outdoor recreation less than once a month or never.

Overwhelmingly, Utahns participate in hiking more than any other recreational activity (36%) over bicycling (14%), running or walking (10%), and golf (10%) combined – the next three most common recreational activities. This may in part be due to the high cost of some outdoor activities, such as skiing, golfing, or boating.

Despite the high cost of “wealthier” sports, skiing and



4. PARKS & RECREATION NEEDS

LEVEL OF SERVICE & PARK NEEDS ANALYSIS

Communities vary dramatically in the Level of Service (LOS) they provide for residents, and they should, since no two communities are alike. In the past, standards developed by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) were used to develop LOS, although this approach has fallen out of favor since it has proven difficult to address the unique qualities of an individual community using this model. Stansbury Park has a mix of household sizes and little new land available, within its current boundary, that is developable.

In addition to local demographic differences and unique community characteristics, other factors may also affect LOS. These include recreational resources that are available to residents outside of the Agency or on public lands, private parks and recreation facilities that are available, and the preferences of residents that require specific resources to meet special needs.

PRELIMINARY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Currently, NRPA research shows that cities within Stansbury Park's population range (less than 20,000 residents) have a median of 10.1 acres of park land per 1,000 residents.

The current LOS for Stansbury was determined by dividing the acreage of existing public parks (83.8) by the 2019 population (10,210), which was then divided by 1,000 to reflect the number of acres of park currently provided for every 1,000 residents. The resulting level of service is **8.21** acres per 1,000 population $83.8 (83.8 / 10,210 \times 1,000 = 8.21)$. To just maintain this LOS through the given planning period, additional acres should be added, due to population growth. Without increasing the amount of park acreage during the 20-year planning period, the resulting acreage per 1,000 residents in Stansbury Park will decrease to **4.44**.

The population of the proposed Stansbury Park Service Area is currently 11,321 and projected to increase to 42,208 by 2039 (see Map 7). Currently, NRPA research shows that cities within the proposed Agency boundary population range (20,000-49,999 residents) have a median of 9.6 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. If the proposed boundary is adopted, it is recommended to add to the additional existing park acreage and further assess park development as it is proposed to best

distribute and plan for park land designation and trail connections. Currently, there are no known proposed parks in the proposed additional acreage of unincorporated Tooele County.

To find the LOS for the area within the proposed Stansbury boundary, the acreage of existing public parks (83.8) was divided by the 2019 population (11,321), which was then divided by 1,000 to reflect the number of acres of park currently provided for every 1,000 residents. The resulting level of service is **7.4** acres per 1,000 population $(83.8 / 11,321 \times 1000 = 7.4)$.

A total of **380** acres of public park land is necessary to meet an LOS of 7 through 2039 $(42,208/1,000 \times 7 = 296)$. Subtracting the 83.8 acres of existing public park land from this figure, an additional **212** acres are required to meet projected needs by the end of the twenty-year planning horizon. This equates to approximately 10-15 Neighborhood Parks or 3 to 5 Community Park, and the creation of 1-2 Regional Parks.

(Please note that this is a LOS for park planning purposes, not a LOS to help determine impact fees.)

SELECTED LEVEL OF SERVICE

Discussions with the Board indicate that the current LOS for the existing Stansbury Park area is sufficient to meet resident needs. However, Stansbury seeks to incorporate a large portion of surrounding unincorporated Tooele County.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE PARKS AND SCHOOL PARKS FOR MEETING THE SELECTED LOS

As illustrated on Maps 1 and 2, and 4 **Private Parks** are located in Stansbury, encompassing approximately **2.49 acres** of land. These are all Mini Parks. Since Private Parks are typically not accessible by the general population, they were not included when calculating the LOS. Likewise, park acreage related to public schools was omitted when calculating the existing LOS, since it is assumed that school facilities are not intended to meet local park and recreation needs, and are not necessarily available for public use. Nevertheless, both private parks and school yards can play a role in the provision of park services, and can be particularly important in areas of the Agency where gaps exist and new park sites are not readily available.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SELECTED LOS & PROPOSED PARKS

In order to ensure the long-term need for new parks is met, future park sites should be identified and reserved as soon as possible. Maintaining an LOS of **8** is sufficient within the Agency's current boundary. If the proposed boundary is adopted, a new LOS will need to be calculated.

PARK SERVICE AREA & DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

The need for parks was also analyzed based on park distribution. As illustrated in Maps 2 and 3, service areas are portrayed as circles, with the radius of the circles corresponding to the service area of each park type. Mini Parks serve an area up to a 0.25 mile radius, Neighborhood Parks serve an area of with a radius of approximately 0.5 mile, and Community Parks serve an area with a 1 mile radius. It should be noted that this analysis was modified to reflect the fact that large roadways restrict access to parks from one side to the other.

Further review of Maps 2 and 3 indicate that most northern and central residential areas of Stansbury have adequate access to existing parks within .25 mile, .5 mile and

1 mile radii, and that the western and southern portion of Stansbury will be better served by new parks during the 20-year planning horizon. New parks proposed for this area will help provide better access to parks and eliminate some of the existing gaps.

PARK SERVICE AREA GAPS

Map 4 illustrates that the northern and southwestern portion of Stansbury has park service gaps once the distribution of existing and recommended park areas have been accounted for. In order to ensure that access to parks is balanced, attempts should be made to locate future parks in these portions, thereby "filling the gap." If the new proposed boundary for Stansbury is adopted, another park service area gaps analysis will need to be conducted to further assess the annexed areas' park needs.

This plan suggests that Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks should be developed in the future, as such facilities better serve the community as they offer more facilities and recreational opportunities for the community as a whole. This is supported by the public comments received through the survey and the Public Open House Meeting, which indicate Community Parks are preferred as they provide a greater range of services. Fortunately,



Fairway Park

there are many sites large enough to accommodate such parks in the areas where gaps exist.

PARK AND TRAIL CONNECTIONS

Map 6 illustrates the proposed Stansbury trail system, and how the various trail segments link with the existing and proposed park system.

RECOMMENDED TRAIL NETWORK

RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

The recommended trail network, herein proposed, fulfills the vision and goals of this Plan, the Stansbury Park Trail System Master Plan, and the larger Tooele County trails vision (see Map 6 Proposed Trails). It provides a comprehensive network of trails that connects to schools, parks, community centers, historical sites and natural resources. It connects to portions of unincorporated Tooele County.

The following details of the network should be noted:

- The Proposed Trails Map includes recommended trails (shown as dashed lines).
- Some trails shown are largely conceptual. These conceptual trails need to be further studied and designed. The location of the trail may change as a result.
- Some sidewalks are shown as part of the trail system because they fulfill the needs of pedestrian circulation and connections in an already “built” environment.


DEVELOPMENT

Many of the trails shown on the Proposed Trails Map, particularly local trails located along roadways or intended as accessways, will be developed over time by Stansbury Park, property owners and new development, much like the sidewalk system that has been developed. In some cases, the Agency will be able to require the property owner to construct the trail as part of the development review process. In other cases, the Agency will need to work with the property owner to ensure the Agency can develop the trail itself in the future.

OPEN SPACE


Stansbury Park should do the following;

- Preserve views of existing open space
- Preserve open space that is important to the community
- Preserve access to State- and Federally-owned open space
- Acquire open space where possible along water ways



Map 7
City Boundaries

- Public Park**
- School (Park)**
- Church (Park)**
- Current Service District**
- Proposed Boundary**





5. GOALS

The goals listed below are a result of public input, Agency Board of Trustees recommendations, and the inventory and analysis of parks and recreation facilities. They are part of the larger set of recommendations for park growth and development over the next 20 years (see Chapter 7. Action Plan).

GOAL 1

Connecting Tooele County and Stansbury Park parks and facilities;

- Update Park Impact Fee Study and Ordinance.
- Help staff understand how to direct developers who want to give park space to the Agency, and how these effects the park system as a whole;
- Create a 20-year Capital Improvement Plan, consistent with a revised park impact plan that will:
 - A. Plan for additional park space and park amenities in an organized, data driven approach;
 - B. Take into account current and anticipated park and recreation trends.

GOAL 2

Stansbury neighborhoods shall have adequate park, trail and open space access or distribution.

- Identify neighborhood/community park locations to address current and future park needs.
- Based on growth patterns, prioritize park development.
- Connect parks and neighborhoods with trails.
- Trails should also connect schools and commercial nodes to neighborhoods and parks.
- Realize the development of an integrated trail network connecting Stansbury neighborhoods to parks, recreation areas, and community amenities such as the Clubhouse Complex and commercial areas.

GOAL 3

Create a good first impression into the Agency through specified gateway areas.

- Continue efforts in beautifying entryways with continuity in signage.
- Redo Agency entry presentation with new landscaping and/or urban artwork that requires less maintenance.
- Plan and place pleasing and intuitive signage for all venues including park entry signs.

GOAL 4

Beautify and enhance appearance and environment.

- Identify aesthetic standards for public facilities.
- Encourage private property maintenance through existing ordinances.

GOAL 5

Develop concept plans for new venues or venues to be renovated.

- Evaluate and master plan existing parks, trails or athletic venues.
- Seek innovative and high-quality designs for park and recreation areas.
- Update existing venues to appropriate Agency- or County-adopted standards.

GOAL 6

Ensure public venues are safe, cost effective, functional and desired facilities.

- Inspect public venues weekly when practical, with weekly safety checks to ensure maintenance and safety guidelines are being met as well as compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Continue to evaluate better park maintenance methods and best practices.

GOAL 7

Establish maintenance standards of recreation facilities and equipment.

- Plan for obsolescence of facility equipment and schedule repair or replacement.
- Ask for appropriate levels of staffing and equipment.
- Ensure staff commitment through training and staff participation in determining standards.
- Evaluate anticipated level of maintenance after each new park is added to ensure standards can be achieved.

GOAL 8

Encourage relationship building and coordination among government and nonprofit entities.

- Continue regular meetings with Tooele County, school districts, and State and Federal agencies.
- Provide appropriate promotional support to groups for recreation activities (Little League softball/baseball, American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO), and others).

GOAL 9

Provide sports and recreation programs which adequately meet community needs.

- Continually update need analysis through various methods including surveys, end-of-program questionnaires, and observing industry trends.
- Continue awareness of various groups of participants in non-traditional activities.

GOAL 10

Provide adequate recreation, wellness and fitness facilities to fulfill needed community programs.

- Evaluate facilities' needs of programs on a regular basis and estimate trends.
- Provide facilities for senior citizens, special needs individuals, and youth at risk.

GOAL 11

Adequately inform public of programs and activities available.

- Continue informing the public through social media and newsletters.

GOAL 12

Connect paths on the Agency trail system.

- Encourage use of non-motorized vehicles as modes of transportation.
- Promote bike trail system on existing streets with future developments.
- Encourage Agency-wide planning of commercial or work locations close to trails and residential areas.
- Establish a policy for Multi-Modal Transportation Studies (looking at pedestrians and biking in addition to vehicle traffic).
- Establish a subdivision policy for granting trail and bike right-of-ways to the Agency when subdivisions are platted.

GOAL 13


Implement innovative recruitment and marketing of major events.

- Generate relationships with relevant sports organizations and marketing groups.

GOAL 14

Find new revenue sources to achieve goals.

- Aggressively seek funding from state, federal and private foundations or sports organizations.
- Investigate bonding opportunities.
- Utilize local tax revenues such as impact fees, RAP, TRT Tax, grants, public-private partnerships.
- Look for opportunities to engage the private sector (public/private partnerships).





6. ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, MANAGEMENT & OPERATION NEEDS

The Agency Board would like to emphasize how important the accurate estimates for construction, on-going operation and maintenance and staffing are to identify. While the recommended timelines for proposed capital projects can be accelerated, or decelerated, depending on the influx or lack of funding availability or community desire, it is advised that no project be started until costs are adequately vetted. Part of that vetting process includes more than cost estimations, it may also include identifying community champions, area of concern, or any backlog of existing maintenance issues.

- Mitigating life safety issues
- Imminent structural failure
- Increasing efficiency (by decreasing reoccurring repairs).
- Increasing capacity to accommodate demand and generate revenue and community branding.

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR SPECIFIC NEEDS

The costs of building a parks and recreation system includes land and construction (capital costs) as well as maintenance. These costs, adjusted for average Stansbury prices, are shown in the following tables.

Whatever the source, whether it be fundraising or a portion of team fees set into a building account, or any of the other funding sources to be outlined in this Chapter, a Community Recreation Foundation or Sports/Recreation Commission could be established to identify community champions and extra funding for projects that are needed the most.

MAINTENANCE COSTS

In tandem, an annual budget must be allocated to provide quality maintenance of these places. In 2016, the maintenance budget for the Parks Division was \$X. As the Agency's inventory of parks grows, its maintenance and personnel budget should grow commensurately.

The recommended prioritization in determining funds is as listed below:

		UNIT COST															
		120,000	40,000	51,700	45,000	800	500	500,000	350	125,000	500	2,200	25,000	500	1,280		
EXISTING PUBLIC PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	MEDIUM PAVILION	SMALL PAVILION	COURTS (POST TENSION)	PLAYGROUND	PICNIC TABLE	BENCHES & FURNISHINGS	SKATE PARK/ SPLASH PAD	TREES	RESTROOM	PARK SIGN	DRINKING FOUNTAIN	REMOVABLE SHADE STRUCTURE	TRASH RECEPTACLES	PARKING	COST OF IMPROVEMENTS
MINI PARKS (approx. 0-2 acres)																	
STANSBURY PARK																	
Brent Rose Park	across from Stansbury Elementary at 485 Country Club Drive.	1.57		1			3	2		5		1			2		\$ 46,650
Brigham Park	Brigham Street, not of Benson Grist Mill and Stansbury Park Cemetery	1.36										1					\$ 500
Benson Mill Park	Intersection of Angell Way and Decker Lane	0.64	1	1			3			4		1			2		\$ 165,300
Captains Island Park	Turnabout at north end of Island	0.47										1			1		\$ 1,000
Delgada Park	North shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	0.28		1			2	3		5		1			2		\$ 46,350
Fairway Park	next to Golf Course at 629 Country Club Drive	0.93										1			1		\$ 1,000
Galley Park	Intersection of Galley Lane and Regatta Lane	0.92						2				1			1		\$ 2,000
Gateway Park	Intersection of Old Mill Road and Harvest Drive	0.83										1					\$ 500
Northport Park	West shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	1.02	1	1			3	3				1			2		\$ 165,400
Ponderosa Park	Intersection of Ponderosa Lane and Horseshoe Drive	0.82										1					\$ 500
Regatta Park	Intersection of Regatta Lane and Bayshore Drive	0.45										1					\$ 500
Rex Sutton Memorial Park		0.51	1			1	5					1			1		\$ 170,000
Woodland Park	Intersection of Country Club Drive & Miller Circle	1.27										1					\$ 500
Total		16.371	3	4	0	1	16	10	0	14	0	13	0	0	12	0	\$ 600,200

			UNIT COST														
			120,000	40,000	51,700	45,000	800	500	500,000	350	125,000	500	2,200	25,000	500	1,280	
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK			PROPOSED AMENITIES														
EXISTING PUBLIC PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	MEDIUM PAVILION	SMALL PAVILION	COURTS (POST TENSION)	PLAYGROUND	PICNIC TABLE	BENCHES & FURNISHINGS	SKATE PARK/ SPLASH PAD	TREES	RESTROOM	PARK SIGN	DRINKING FOUNTAIN	REMOVABLE SHADE STRUCTURE	TRASH RECEPTACLES	PARKING	COST OF IMPROVEMENTS
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK (approx. 2-15 acres)																	
STANSBURY PARK																	
Millpond Park		7.12										1					\$ 500
Oscarson Park	Bayshore Drive & Schooner Ln	5.3		5	1	1	10	7		20	2	1	1	1	5	20	\$ 661,000
Park View Park	Intersection of Parkview and Regatta Lane	5.62		1				3				1		1	2		\$ 68,000
Sagers Memorial Park	Next to Mill Pond at #10 Plaza	9.94										1			5		\$ 3,000
Sandhill Park	Intersection of Sandhill Way and Calais Lane	2.4										1					\$ 500
Village Park	Intersection of Village Blvd. and Stallion Way	6.76	1									1			4	50	\$ 186,500
Total		37.14	1	6		1	10	10	0	20	2	6	1	2	16		\$ 919,500

			UNIT COST														
			120,000	40,000	51,700	45,000	800	5,000	500,000	350	125,000	500	2,200	25,000	500	1,280	
COMMUNITY PARK			PROPOSED AMENITIES														
EXISTING PUBLIC PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	MEDIUM PAVILION	SMALL PAVILION	COURTS (POST TENSION)	PLAYGROUND	PICNIC TABLE	BENCHES & FURNISHINGS	SKATE PARK/ SPLASH PAD	TREES	RESTROOM	PARK SIGN	DRINKING FOUNTAIN	REMOVABLE SHADE STRUCTURE	TRASH RECEPTALES	PARKING	COST OF IMPROVEMENTS
COMMUNITY PARK (approx. 5-25 acres)																	
STANSBURY PARK																	
Porter Way Park	Intersection of Porter Way and Star Discovery Way	28.66			1				1			1	2		4		\$ 558,600
Clubhouse Complex	Across street from the Golf Course Pro Shop at #1 Country Club Drive	6.95		1				3			1		2		5		\$ 186,900
Total		35.61	0	1		0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2				\$ 745,500

		UNIT COST															
		120,000	40,000	51,700	45,000	800	5,000	500,000	850	125,000	500	2,200	25,000	500	1,280		
SUMMARY PARKS	EXISTING AMENITIES	PROPOSED AMENITIES															
EXISTING PUBLIC PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	TOTAL ACRES	MEDIUM PAVILION	SMALL PAVILION	COURTS (POST TENSION)	PLAYGROUND	PICNIC TABLE	BENCHES & FURNISHINGS	SKATE PARK/ SPLASH PAD	TREES	RESTROOM	PARK SIGN	DRINKING FOUNTAIN	REMOVABLE SHADE STRUCTURE	TRASH RECEPTACLES	PARKING (PER STALL)	COST OF IMPROVEMENTS
SUMMARY PARKS																	
STANSBURY PARK																	
Brent Rose Park	across from Stansbury Elementary at 485 Country Club Drive.	1.57		1			3	2		5		1			2		\$ 46,650
Brigham Park	Brigham Street, not of Benson Grist Mill and Stansbury Park Cemetery	1.36										1					\$ 500
Benson Mill Park	Intersection of Angell Way and Decker Lane	0.64	1	1			3			4		1			2		\$ 165,300
Captains Island Park	Turnabout at north end of Island	0.47										1			1		\$ 1,000
Clubhouse Complex	Across street from the Golf Course Pro Shop at #1 Country Club Drive	6.95		1				3			1		2		5		\$ 186,900
Delgada Park	North shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	0.28		1			2	3		5		1			2		\$ 46,350
Fairway Park	next to Golf Course at 629 Country Club Drive	0.93										1			1		\$ 1,000
Galley Park	Intersection of Galley Lane and Regatta Lane	0.92						2				1			1		\$ 2,000
Gateway Park	Intersection of Old Mill Road and Harvest Drive	0.83										1					\$ 500
Northport Park	West shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	1.02	1	1			3	3				1			2		\$ 165,400
Ponderosa Park	Intersection of Ponderosa Lane and Horseshoe Drive	0.82										1					\$ 500
Regatta Park	Intersection of Regatta Lane and Bayshore Drive	0.45										1					\$ 500
Rex Sutton Memorial Park	Bayshore Drive & Schooner Ln	0.51	1			1	5					1			1		\$ 170,000
Oscarson Park	Bayshore Drive & Schooner Ln	5.3		5	1	1	10	7		20	2	1	1	1	5	20	\$ 661,000
Woodland Park	Intersection of Country Club Drive & Miller Circle	1.27										1					\$ 500
Millpond Park		7.12										1					\$ 500
Park View Park	Intersection of Parkview and Regatta Lane	5.62		1				3				1		1	2		\$ 68,000
Sagers Memorial Park	Next to Mill Pond at #10 Plaza	9.94										1			5		\$ 3,000
Sandhill Park	Intersection of Sandhill Way and Calais Lane	2.4										1					\$ 500
Village Park	Intersection of Village Blvd. and Stallion Way	6.76	1									1			4	50	\$ 186,500
Porter Way Park	Intersection of Porter Way and Star Discovery Way	28.66			1				1			2			5		\$ 558,600
Total		83.81	4			2	26	23	1	34	3	20	5	5			\$ 2,265,200

PARKS, TRAILS & RECREATION FACILITY NEEDS

PARKS IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN (IFFP)

Background

The Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area of Tooele County (“Service Area”), working with MGB+A, completed a Community Master Plan in 2019. The Master Plan, along with additional input from the Service Area, forms the basis for this Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) for Parks, Trails and Recreation.

The Service Area has determined that there is one service area district-wide and that there is no excess capacity in any existing park facilities. Only residential development is considered to create demand for park facilities and therefore only residential growth has been considered in the determination of impact fees.

Projections for population growth in the Service Area are as follows, with projected growth of 4,336 persons between 2019 and 2029.




TABLE 1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH, 2019-2029

Year	Population
2019	10,210
2020	10,644
2021	11,077
2022	11,511
2023	11,944
2024	12,378
2025	12,812
2026	13,245
2027	13,679
2028	14,112
2029	14,546

Source: Tooele County Building Permits, American Community Survey

Identify the Existing and Proposed Levels of Service and Excess Capacity

Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(i)(ii)(iii)

The IFFP considers only system facilities in the calculation of impact fees. For the Service Area, this has been determined to mean neighborhood, community and regional parks. Local parks are considered project improvements and have not been included in the calculation of impact fees.

Existing service levels are based on the (2019) levels of service in the Service Area for parks. Existing and proposed service levels are shown in the table below.

TABLE 2: EXISTING AND PROPOSED SERVICE LEVELS

	UNITS		
	Existing	Proposed (Minimum)	Excess Capacity
Land (acres, with improvements, per 1,000 population)	6.16	6.16	0.00

The Service Area intends to at least maintain, and likely increase, service levels for parks. No facilities currently have excess capacity. The park development in the Service Area is one overall recreation system designed to meet the needs and desires of its residents for physical and leisure activities.

Identify Demands Placed Upon Existing Public Facilities by New Development Activity at the Proposed Level of Service

Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(iv)

The table below shows the declining service levels that will occur in the Stansbury Park Improvement District, due to population growth, if no new facilities are added.

TABLE 3: IMPACTS TO SERVICE LEVELS DUE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT IF NO IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE

	Units (Acres per 1,000 Population) in 2019	Units (Acres per 1,000 Population) in 2029
Park Land and Improvements (acres per 1,000 population)	6.16	4.32

Identify How the Growth Demands Will Be Met

Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(v)

In order to maintain the existing level of service, the projected new development over the next ten years will require the construction or acquisition of new facilities in the amount of \$4,588,265, as stated in 2019 dollars.

Consideration of Revenue Sources to Finance Impacts on System Improvements

Utah Code 11-36a-302(2)

This Impact Fee Facilities Plan includes a thorough discussion of all potential revenues sources for park improvements. These revenue sources include grants, bonds, interfund loans, transfers from the General Fund, impact fees and anticipated or accepted dedications of system improvements.

Utah Code Legal Requirements

Utah law requires that communities prepare an Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) before preparing an Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and enacting an impact fee. Utah law also requires that communities give notice of their intent to prepare and adopt an IFFP. This IFFP follows all legal requirements as outlined below.

Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Facilities Plan

A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFFP before preparing the Plan (Utah Code §11-36a-501). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website. The Service Area has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFFP by posting notice.

Utah Code requires that each local political subdivision, before imposing an impact fee, prepare an impact fee facilities plan. (Utah Code 11-36a-301).

Section 11-36a-302(a) of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee facilities plan which is required to identify the following:

- (i) identify the existing level of service
- (ii) establish a proposed level of service
- (iii) identify any excess capacity to accommodate future growth at the proposed level of service
- (iv) identify demands placed upon existing facilities by new development activity at the proposed level of service; and
- (v) identify the means by which the political subdivision or private entity will meet those growth demands.

Further, the proposed level of service may:

(i) exceed the existing level of service if, independent of the use of impact fees, the political subdivision or private entity provides, implements, and maintains the means to increase the existing level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service; or

(ii) establish a new public facility if, independent of the use of impact fees, the political subdivision or private entity provides, implements, and maintains the means to increase the existing level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service.

In preparing an impact fee facilities plan, each local political subdivision shall generally consider all revenue sources to finance the impacts on system improvements, including:

- (a) grants
- (b) bonds
- (c) interfund loans
- (d) transfers from the General Fund
- (e) impact fees; and
- (f) anticipated or accepted dedications of system improvements.

Certification of Impact Fee Facilities Plan

Utah Code states that an impact fee facilities plan shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the impact fee facilities plan. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

Existing Service Levels, Proposed Service Levels and Excess Capacity

Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(i)(ii)(iii)

Growth in Demand

Impacts on recreation-related facilities will come from residential development only. Residential growth is projected as follows:

TABLE 4: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH, 2019-2029

Year	Population	Population Growth
2019	10,210	
2020	10,644	434
2021	11,077	434
2022	11,511	434
2023	11,944	434
2024	12,378	434
2025	12,812	434
2026	13,245	434
2027	13,679	434
2028	14,112	434
2029	14,546	434
TOTAL		4,336

Source: Tazols County Building Permits, American Community Survey

Population projections are for 4,336 new residents between 2019 and 2029.

Existing Service Levels

Park Land Area

Existing system parks are shown in the Table below. Local parks are considered project improvements and have not been included in the level of service for impact fees.

TABLE 5: SYSTEM PARKS

PARKS	Address	Acres
Park View Park	Intersection of Parkview and Regatta Lane	5.62
Sagers Memorial Park	Next to Mill Pond at #10 Plaza	9.94
Village Park	Intersection of Village Blvd. and Stallion Way	6.76
Porter Way Park	Intersection of Porter Way and Star Discovery Way	28.66
Clubhouse Complex	Across street from the Golf Course Pro Shop at #1 Country Club Drive	6.95
Oscarson Park		4.93
Total		62.86

Source: Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area

The existing level of service for parks then, for the purpose of calculating impact fees, is 6.16 acres per 1,000 residents, calculated by dividing the 62.86 eligible park acres by the estimated 2019 population of 10,210 (which has been divided by 1,000).

Park Land and Improvements

The table below summarizes the improvements, along with the costs, to determine an existing standard for park land and improvements. Cost estimates have been provided in consultation with the Service Area.

TABLE 6: SYSTEM PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS

Improvement	Cost Per Unit	Units	Total Cost
Sod & Irrigation Acres	\$87,120	47.3	\$4,120,776
Parking Stalls	\$1,050	486	\$511,300
Basketball	\$20,000	5	\$100,000
Volleyball	\$10,000	1	\$10,000
Tennis	\$60,000	4	\$240,000
Baseball/Softball	\$10,000	8	\$80,000
Soccer	\$3,000	2	\$6,000
Football	\$1,000	7	\$7,000
Restrooms	\$80,000	18	\$1,440,000
Picnic Table	\$500	30	\$15,000
Playground Equipment	\$80,000	4	\$320,000
Pavilion	\$100,000	3	\$300,000
TOTAL			\$7,149,076

Source: Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area

With 62.86 existing park acres, the average cost is \$113,730.13 per acre, not including land costs. Land costs are estimated to be \$58,143.06 per acre based on the weighted average of the listing price for the following properties located in the Stansbury/Tooele area.

TABLE 7: ESTIMATE OF FUTURE LAND COSTS PER ACRE

Property Number	Address	Acreage	Listing Price	Price/Acre
1	1652 Pine Canyon Rd	1.84	\$169,900	\$92,336.96
2	1413 Arrowhead Ln	2.49	\$225,000	\$90,361.45
3	1451 E Arrowhead Ln	2.5	\$199,900	\$79,960.00
4	3594 N Arrowhead Ln	5.13	\$230,000	\$44,834.31
5	2520 N 400 E	17.22	\$861,000	\$50,000.00
6	2400 N 424 E	8.34	\$599,000	\$71,822.54
7	1228 E Meadowbrook Dr., Pine Canyon	4.7	\$170,000	\$36,170.21
Total		42.22	\$2,454,800	\$58,143.06*

Source: ataforesalestate.com recorded 1/16/2023

*Weighted average of the price-per-acre price for the listed properties $(\$2,454,800/42.22 = \$58,143.06)$

PROPOSED SERVICE LEVELS

The Service Area has determined that parks have no excess capacity and that it desires to maintain existing service levels in the future, as new development occurs.

Identify Excess Capacity

The Service Area has not identified any excess capacity in any of its facilities.

Identify Demands Placed on Existing Public Facilities by New Development Activity at Proposed Level of Service and How Those Demands Will Be Met
Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(iv)(v)

Demand Placed on Facilities by New Development Activity

Park Land and Park Improvements

Existing park service levels will decline, due to new development activity, from the existing service level of 6.16 acres per 1,000 persons to 4.32 acres per 1,000 residents, over the next 10 years, if no improvements are made.

Table B: Park Land and Improvement Service Level Impacts from New Development Activity, 2019-2029

Year	Population	Population Growth	Land Acres per 1000 Persons if No New Facilities
2019	10,280		6.16
2020	10,644	434	5.91
2021	11,077	434	5.67
2022	11,511	434	5.46
2023	11,944	434	5.26
2024	12,378	434	5.08
2025	12,812	434	4.91
2026	13,245	434	4.75
2027	13,679	434	4.60
2028	14,112	434	4.45
2029	14,546	434	4.32

Identify the Means by Which the Political Subdivision Will Meet the Growth Demands

The Service Area will need to acquire additional park lands and improvements to maintain its existing and proposed service levels. Service levels will decline, due to population growth, unless new facilities are constructed or acquired. Impact fees will be used to maintain the existing service levels for parks.

The figures in the following table were calculated by multiplying the existing service levels by the cost for each line item by the projected growth in demand over the next ten years.

Table 9: Cost of New Construction Due to New Growth, 2019-2029

	Proposed Service Level (Park Acres per 1000 Population)	Facilities Needed in 10 Years (Park Acres)	Cost per Park Acre	Total Improvement Cost Needed Over 10 Years
Land & Park Improvements	6.16	26.70	\$171,873*	\$4,588,265

* Comprised of land costs per acre of \$58,143 and park improvement costs per acre of \$113,730. Land costs were determined based on the average cost of the listed price for the properties in Table 7

Consideration of All Revenue Sources
Utah Code 11-36a-302(2)

Grants

The Service Area is unaware of any potential grant sources for future parks, recreation and trails development. However, should it be the recipient of any such grants, it will then look at the potential to reduce impact fees.

While the Service Area has been gifted some park property in the past, it has no future indication of any gifts that will be received by the Service Area. Further, the Service Area has conservatively excluded any gifted properties, or properties acquired through grant funds, from establishing its level of service used in the calculation of impact fees.

Bonds

The Service Area has no outstanding bonds for its existing parks and trails facilities that have been included in this Impact Fee Facilities Plan. While the Service Area, through Tooele County, could issue bonds in the future in order to fund parks, recreation or trail facilities, no bonds are currently being contemplated and therefore no costs associated with bond issuance have been included in the calculation of impact fees.

Impact Fees

Because of the growth anticipated to occur in the Service Area, impact fees are a viable means of allowing new development to pay for the impacts that it places on the existing system. This IFFP is developed in accordance with legal guidelines so that an Impact Fee Analysis for Parks, Recreation, and Trails may be prepared, and the Service Area may charge impact fees for Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Anticipated or Accepted Dedications of System Improvements

Any item that a developer funds must be included in the

IFFP if a credit against impact fees is to be issued and must be agreed upon with the Service Area before construction of the improvements.

Certification

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies that the attached impact fee facilities plan:

1. Includes only the costs of public facilities that are:
 - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
 - b. actually incurred; or
 - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
2. Does not include:
 - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
 - b. costs for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
 - c. an expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and the methodological standards set forth by the federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement;
3. Complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

The Service Area intends to at least maintain existing service levels for both parks and trails. Park development in the Service Area is one overall recreation system designed to meet the needs and desires of its residents for physical and leisure activities.

Impact on System Improvements by Anticipated Development Activity - Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)

The table below shows the declining service levels that would occur in the Service Area, due to population

Summary of Impact Fee Analysis (IFA)

The Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area of Tooele County (“Service area”) has completed a Parks Impact Fee Facilities Plan which, along with input from the Service Area, forms the basis for this impact fee analysis. The Service Area has determined that there is one service area agency wide and that there is no excess capacity in any of its parks or trails facilities. Only residential development is considered to create demand for parks, trails and recreation facilities and therefore only residential growth has been considered in the determination of impact fees.

Projections for population growth in the Service Area are as follows:

TABLE 1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH, 2019-2029

Year	Population
2019	10,210
2020	10,644
2021	11,077
2022	11,511
2023	11,944
2024	12,378
2025	12,812
2026	13,245
2027	13,679
2028	14,112
2029	14,546

Source: Tooele County Building Permits, American Community Survey

This IFA is organized based on the legal requirements of Utah Code 11-36a-304.

Impact on Consumption of Existing Capacity - Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a)

The IFFP considers only system facilities in the calculation of impact fees. For the Service Area, this has been determined to mean community and regional parks. Local parks are considered project im-provements and have not been included in the calculation of impact fees.

Existing service levels are based on the (2019) levels of service in the Service Area for both parks and trails. Existing and proposed service levels are shown in the table below.

TABLE 2: EXISTING AND PROPOSED SERVICE LEVELS

	UNITS		
	Existing	Proposed (Minimum)	Excess Capacity
Land (acres, with improvements, per 1,000 population)	6.16	6.16	0.00

growth, if no new facilities are added.

TABLE 3: IMPACTS TO SERVICE LEVELS DUE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT IF NO IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE

	Units (Acres per 1,000 Population) in 2019	Units (Acres per 1,000 Population) in 2029
Park Land and Improvements (acres per 1,000 population)	6.16	4.32

Relationship of Anticipated Impacts to Anticipated Development Activity - Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(c)

The demand placed on existing public park facilities by new development activity is attributable to population growth. According to projections calculated from Tooele County’s Building Permit records and the American Community Survey (ACS), The Service Area has an estimated 2019 population of 10,210 persons and as a result of anticipated development activity will grow to a projected 14,546 persons by 2029 – an increase of 4,336 persons. As growth occurs as a result of increased development activity, more parks will be needed to maintain existing service levels and to reach proposed service levels.

In order to maintain the existing level of service, the projected new development over the next ten years will require the construction or acquisition of new facilities in the amount of \$4,588,265, as stated in 2019 dollars.

Proportionate Share Analysis - Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(d)(i)(ii)

Costs Reasonably Related to New Development Activity
 The cost of new system improvements required to maintain the service levels related to new development activity is based on the costs of system-wide park facilities, and the consultant fees for the preparation of the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and the Impact Fee Analysis.

The total gross fee is \$677.82 per capita. However, the

actual fee charged will be based on the average household size of a residential unit.

TABLE 5: CALCULATION OF GROSS IMPACT FEE

Summary of Gross Fee	
Park Land and Improvements	\$1,058.18
Consultant Costs	\$2.31
Impact Fee Fund Balance	(\$382.67)
TOTAL GROSS IMPACT FEE PER CAPITA	\$677.82

The Service Area may choose to either charge one fee for every type of residential unit, or it can charge different fees for single-family and multi-family units. The average household size for residential units in the Service Area is as follows:

TABLE 6: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Single-Family Units	3.66
Multi-Family Units	3.23

Source: American Community Survey 2017

The maximum impact fees for single-family and multi-family residential are shown in the table below:

TABLE 7: MAXIMUM IMPACT FEES

MAXIMUM GROSS FEE	Amount
Single-Family Residential	\$2,480.81
Multi-Family Residential	\$2,189.35

Manner of Financing - Utah Code 11-36a-304(2)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)(h)

An impact fee is a one-time fee that is implemented by a local government on new development to help fund and pay for all or a portion of the costs of public facilities that are needed to serve new development. Additionally, impact fees allow new growth to share in the cost of existing facilities that have excess capacity.

Impact Fee Credits

The Impact Fees Act requires credits to be paid back to development for future fees that may be paid to fund system improvements found in the IFFP so that new development is not charged twice.

Extraordinary Costs and Time Price Differential

It is not anticipated that there will be any extraordinary costs in servicing newly-developed park properties.

Utah Code 11-36a

Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis. Utah Code requires that “each local political subdivision... intending to impose an impact fee shall prepare a written analysis (Impact Fee Analysis or IFA) of each impact fee” (Utah Code 11-36a-303). This IFA follows all legal requirements as outlined below.

Section 11-36a-304 of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee analysis which is required to identify the following:

anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;

anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;

how anticipated impacts are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity

the proportionate share of:

costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and

costs of impacts on system improvement that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and

how the impact fee was calculated

Further, in analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, shall identify, if applicable:

the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;

the cost of system improvements for each public facility;

other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;

the relative extent to which development activity will con-

tribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by means such as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;

the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;

the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;

extraordinary costs, if any in servicing the newly developed properties; and

the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

Calculating Impact Fees. Utah Code 11-36a-305 states that for purposes of calculating an impact fee, a local political subdivision or private entity may include the following:

construction contract price;

cost of acquiring land, improvements, materials, and fixtures;

cost for planning, surveying, and engineering fees for services provided for and directly related to the construction of the system improvements; and

for a political subdivision, debt service charges if the political subdivision might use impact fees as a revenue stream to pay the principal and interest on bonds, notes or other obligations issued to finance the costs of the system improvements.

Additionally, the Code states that each political subdivision or private entity shall base impact fee amounts on realistic estimates and the assumptions underlying those estimates shall be disclosed in the impact fee analysis.

Certification of Impact Fee Analysis. Utah Code 11-36a-306 states that an impact fee analysis shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the impact fee analysis. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

Impact Fee Enactment. Utah Code 11-36a-202 states that a local political subdivision or private entity wishing to

impose impact fees shall pass an impact fee enactment in accordance with Section 11-36a-402. Additionally, an impact fee imposed by an impact fee enactment may not exceed the highest fee justified by the impact fee analysts. An impact fee enactment may not take effect until 90 days after the day on which the impact fee enactment is approved.

Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis. A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFA before preparing the Analysis (Utah Code 11-36a-503(1)). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website. The Service Area has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFA by posting notice.

Impact Fee Analysis

Utah Code allows cities to include only system-wide parks for the purpose of calculating impact fees. Project-wide parks cannot be used to establish levels of service eligible to be maintained through impact fees. Based on input from the Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area and the consultants, a system-wide park is defined as a

park that serves more than one local development area. System-wide parks in the Service Area include neighborhood, community and regional parks.

This IFA is organized based on the legal requirements of *Utah Code 11-36a-304*.

Impact on Consumption of Existing Capacity
Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a): an impact fee analysis shall identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity

Demand Placed on Facilities by New Development Activity

Park Land and Park Improvements
Existing park service levels would decline, due to new development activity, from the existing service level of 6.16 acres per 1,000 persons to 4.32 acres per 1,000 residents by 2029 if no improvements are made.

TABLE 5: PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENT SERVICE LEVEL IMPACTS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY, 2019-2029

Year	Population	Population Growth	Land Acres per 1000 Persons if No New Facilities
2019	10,210		6.16
2020	10,644	434	5.91
2021	11,077	434	5.67
2022	11,511	434	5.46
2023	11,944	434	5.26
2024	12,378	434	5.08
2025	12,812	434	4.91
2026	13,245	434	4.75
2027	13,679	434	4.60
2028	14,112	434	4.45
2029	14,546	434	4.32

2 Impact on System Improvements by Anticipated Development Activity

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b): an impact fee analysis shall identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;

The Service Area will need to acquire additional park lands and make park improvements to maintain its existing service levels of improved parks. Impact fees will be used to maintain the existing service levels for parks and trails.

The figures in the following table were calculated by multiplying the existing service levels by the cost for each line item by the projected growth in demand over the next ten years.

TABLE 9: COST OF NEW CONSTRUCTION DUE TO NEW GROWTH, 2019-2029

	Proposed Service Level (Park Acres per 1000 Population)	Facilities Needed in 10 Years (Park Acres)	Cost per Park Acre	Total Improvement Cost Needed Over 10 Years
Land & Park Improvements	6.16	26.70	\$171,673*	\$4,588,265

* Comprised of land costs per acre of \$58,143 and park improvement costs per acre of \$113,738.

3 Relationship of Anticipated Impacts to Anticipated Development Activity

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(c): an impact fee analysis shall subject to Subsection (2), demonstrate how the anticipated impacts described in Subsections (1)(a) and (b) are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;

The demand placed on existing public park facilities by new development activity is attributable to population growth. The Stansbury Park Recreation Service Area has a 2019 population of 10,210 persons and as a result of anticipated development activity will grow to a projected 14,546 persons by 2029 – an increase of 4,336 persons. As growth occurs as a result of increased development activity, more parks needed to maintain existing service levels and to reach proposed service levels.

Proportionate Share Analysis

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(d)(i)(ii): an impact fee analysis shall estimate the proportionate share of costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity;

existing level of service for improvements is a cost of \$113,730 per acre, or a total cost of \$3,036,099. Total land and improvement costs necessary over the next ten years are calculated at \$4,588,265.

Costs Reasonably Related to New Development Activity

The cost of new system improvements required to maintain the existing level of parks, recreation and trail services related to new development activity is based on the cost of system-wide park and trail facilities, as well as consultant fees for the preparation of the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and the Impact Fee Analysis.

The Service Area will need to acquire an additional 26.70 acres of land over the next 10 years in order to maintain its existing service level of 6.16 acres per 1,000 persons. At a cost of \$58,143 per acre, the cost to the Service Area will be \$1,552,418.

In addition, all 26.70 acres will need improvements. The

TABLE 12: PER CAPITA COST TO MAINTAIN LEVS FOR PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS

Park Land and Improvements	
Improvements Needed, 2019-2029	\$4,588,265
Population Growth, 2019-2029	4,336
Cost per Capita	\$1,058.18

The Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis consultant cost is \$2.31 per capita.

TABLE 13: PER CAPITA CONSULTANT COSTS

Description	Amount
Consultant Cost	\$10,000
Projected Population Growth (2018 - 2028)	4,336
Cost per Capita – Consultant Costs	\$2.31

The total gross Parks, Recreation, Trails and Open Space Impact Fee is \$677.82 per capita.

TABLE 14: MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE IMPACT FEE

Description	Amount
Park Land and Improvements	\$1,058.18
Consultant Costs	\$2.31
Impact Fee Fund Balance Credit	(\$382.67)
TOTAL GROSS IMPACT FEE PER CAPITA	\$677.82

The total cost per capita is then multiplied by the household size in order to arrive at the maximum impact fee that may be charged.

TABLE 17: HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Household Type	Household Size
Single-Family	3.66
Multi-Family	3.23

Source: American Community Survey 2017

TABLE 18: MAXIMUM IMPACT FEE

Development Type	Amount
Single-Family Residential	\$2,480.81
Multi-Family Residential	\$2,189.35

5 Impact Fee Credits

Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(e): an impact fee analysis shall, based on the requirements of this chapter, identify how the impact fee was calculated;

There are no bonds outstanding on parks or trails facilities and therefore no credits need to be made against the gross impact fee.

6 Manner of Financing

Utah Code 11-36a-304(2)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)(h): an impact fee analysis shall identify, if applicable: other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, federal taxes, or federal grants;

An impact fee is a one-time fee that is implemented by a local government entity on new development to help fund and pay for all or a portion of the costs of public facilities that are needed to serve new development. These fees are usually implemented to help reduce the economic burden on local jurisdictions that are trying to deal with population and commercial growth within the area. As a matter of policy and legislative discretion, the Service Area, in conjunction with Tooele County, may choose to have new development pay the full cost of its share of new public facilities if the facilities would not be needed except to service new development. However, local governmental entities may use other sources of revenue to pay for the new facilities required to service new development and use impact fees to recover the cost difference between the total cost and the other sources of revenue. Additionally, impact fees allow new growth to share in the cost of existing facilities that have excess capacity.

At the current time, no other sources of funding other than impact fees have been identified, but to the extent that any are identified and received in the future, then impact fees will be reduced accordingly.

Additional system-wide park land and recreation facility improvements beyond those funded through impact fees that are desired to maintain a higher proposed level of service will be paid for by the Service Area through other revenue sources such as user charges, special assessments, general taxes, etc.

Impact Fee Credits

The Impact Fees Act requires credits to be paid back to development for future fees that may be paid to fund system improvements found in the IFFP so that new development is not charged twice. Credits may also be paid back to developers who have constructed or directly funded items that are included in the IFFP or donated to the Service Area in lieu of impact fees, including the dedication of land for system improvements. This situation does not apply to developer exactions or improvements required to offset density or as a condition for development. Any item for which a developer receives credit should be included in the IFFP and must be agreed upon with the Service Area before construction begins.

In the situation that a developer chooses to construct facilities found in the IFFP in lieu of impact fees, the arrangement must be made through the developer and the Service Area.

At the discretion of the Service Area, impact fees may be

modified for memory care units or other forms of housing that do not place demand on parks and recreation facilities.

Extraordinary Costs and Time Price Differential

It is not anticipated that there will be any extraordinary costs in servicing newly developed park properties. To account for the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times, actual costs have been used to compute buy-in costs to public facilities with excess capacity and current costs have been used to compute impacts on system improvements required by anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility.

Certification

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies that the attached impact fee analysis:

1. includes only the costs of public facilities that are:
 - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
 - b. actually incurred; or
 - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;

2. does not include:
 - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
 - b. costs for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
 - c. an expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and the methodological standards set forth by the federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement;

3. offsets costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and

4. complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.



7. ACTION PLAN

STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The following chapter outlines a course of action for the Agency and the County to achieve the goals of the Master Plan recommended here. This timeline assumes a build-out population of approximately 11,551 by 2038 for the proposed Stansbury area (Source: TAZ). The actual rate of population growth may result in an earlier or later buildout. This timeline should be adjusted to match the rate of growth and pressing needs.

At the completion and adoption of this plan:

- Publish it widely and make it available on the Internet, in Agency and County offices, etc.
- Create a realistic budget for capital improvements and operation and maintenance for the next 20 years.
- Create a plan for fundraising/finding funds for the next 20 years to meet this budget.
- Begin fundraising efforts: call for changes in fees, donations and/or taxes (if possible), pinning down matching funds, and getting funding commitments from partners, or holding a bond election.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS & PRIORITIES

Mini Park Conclusions and Recommendations:

The development of Mini Parks is not encouraged. On a per acre basis, Mini Parks are very expensive to construct and maintain and generally serve a very limited population. However, it may be the last option for open space in some cases such as the more developed central portion of Stansbury Park. Mini Parks may be implemented after careful evaluation by the Board of Trustees.

Mini Parks may also be implemented in new housing developments if negotiations for a neighborhood park are unsuccessful. These Mini Parks need to be developed in conjunction with the trail system to make them an effective part of the park system.

When Mini Parks are necessary, incorporate as many diverse activities as the space will allow. For example, the addition of a basketball court or volleyball court would not occupy much more space. However, it would increase the ages of potential users and, therefore, the longevity of the park.

Neighborhood Park Conclusions and Recommendations: Neighborhood Parks serve the broader neighborhood with large amenities or local amenities that reflect the

specific demographics and interests of the neighborhood. Neighborhood Parks are within walking, biking, or skating distance of most of the neighborhood which it serves. The close proximity and diversity offered by Neighborhood Parks make them the core unit in a city park system and a part of a neighborhood's daily routines. Because they are the core unit in any city park system, it is recommended that Neighborhood Parks are first to be developed of all the park types, in new residential areas and where current service gaps exist.

Recommended Agency Policy: To accomplish the goal of providing opportunities for park space for all residents, the Agency should work with land owners and developers to create private parks which will serve these new neighborhoods, where identified on the proposed park map. The Agency should also seek non-traditional sources of funding for parks including public-private partnerships.

Community Park Conclusions and Recommendations:

Community Parks are diverse in nature, serving a broader purpose than the Neighborhood or Mini Parks. While Community Parks may include Neighborhood Park amenities, and do act as Neighborhood Parks as well, the focus of a Community Park is on meeting community-based recreation, athletics and open space needs. In some cases, a park with only a single athletic field that provides a venue for community athletic organizations may fall into this category regardless of its small size. It is recommended to focus on adding Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks through the 20-year planning period, as appropriate to the specific needs of communities.

Recommended Agency Policy: There are areas in the southern and western portions of the Agency where potential park land is available. We recommend that Stansbury continue to identify land for Community Parks. Some of these parks can be privately owned and Agency-run, if funding options are limited. Suggestions include; conservation easements, transfer of development rights, zoning, etc. to assist in making this property available for Neighborhood Parks.

Special Use Park Conclusions and Recommendations:

- Maintain existing.
- Add additional special-use items as needed.
- Look for opportunities to develop historical, cultural and social special-use areas.

Open Space Conclusions and Recommendations:

The Agency will need to identify potential connectors to open parcels in currently developing neighborhoods that are strategically located with applicable service area radii and connect them to the larger trail system (bike and

walking/hiking trails).

Determination of the Open Space Standard: Preserving open space serves many different purposes. It is essential in maintaining a sense of place and in identifying a community. Available open space that has qualities such as visual, habitat, water shed, etc. should receive first priority.

Recommended Agency Policy: The Agency needs to develop an open space designation plan that supports the goal of connecting the trail system to park land and distributes open space within a 1/4 to 1/2-mile walking distance radius.

Park Development Priorities

Stansbury Park should create a Parks Committee to further identify park priorities and to aid in their implementation.

- All **existing parks** should be upgraded as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for amenities and features in parks.
- **Future parks** should be designed and developed from the outset with amenities and features that meet these standards.

The Agency is currently addressing the park priorities identified by the public in the online survey. Plans are to update existing parks (see charts in Chapter 6).

Within the next five to 10 years, the tennis courts and swimming pool by the Clubhouse will be removed to accommodate a larger swimming pool.

LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN

To insure the long-term health and functionality of the lake, a Lake Management Plan should be developed within the next five years.

Add fountains to the lake in the next one to three years that will function as both decorative and maintenance features.

GAPS

In order to meet future park needs, existing gaps must be filled and proposed parks developed. This includes the development of approximately **10** additional park acres. If possible, some of the additional acreage should be located in areas where there are existing gaps in distribution.

In order to meet the need for future parks, existing gaps must be filled and proposed parks developed as envisioned. To summarize the findings from Chapter 4, this includes the development of ten (**10**) additional parks



and the siting/reservation of **212** additional park acres to meet the needs of people at build-out in 20 years if the new Agency boundary is adopted.

MINIMUM STANDARDS

In order to ensure that existing and future parks meet community needs, the establishment of minimum standards for park development are recommended for all three types of parks. These standards should reflect the needs and expectations of the public, as contained in the 2017-18 Park Survey and as provided during the Public Open House meeting conducted in February 2018, which are summarized below:

Mini Parks should include, space permitting, at least the following amenities:

- Trees and shade
- Picnic tables and benches
- Grassy play areas
- Playgrounds
- Benches
- Other small scale amenities such as small pavilions
- Local trail connections

Neighborhood Parks should include, space permitting, at least the following amenities:

- All of the elements found in Mini Parks above
- Drinking fountains
- Restrooms
- Sport courts (basketball, volleyball and tennis)
- Sports fields (baseball, soccer, football and similar sports)
- Walking paths that are connected to other trails and open space
- Pavilions and shade structures
- A regional draw, such as a skate park or splash pad
- Local and regional trail linkages
- Parking

Community Parks should include, space permitting, at least the following amenities:

- All of the amenities found in Mini and Neighborhood Parks above
- Additional restrooms sufficient for anticipated need
- Specialty complexes or features, such as a swimming pool, arboretum, nature center or sports complex

Trail Development Priorities

A new Trails Committee should follow what is proposed on the proposed trail map, focusing on opportunities to create trails in and around the community.





APPENDIX

DEFINITIONS

Open Space

Open Space is defined in this plan in terms of recreation and includes:

- Land that is permanently protected and allows for public access for recreational uses. Open space may be preserved for developed parks or for outdoor recreation. Land for outdoor recreation shall remain in its natural condition and be left undeveloped except for minor recreation improvements like trails, restrooms, and picnic tables.
- Areas that are protected to allow access to other protected public lands or open spaces.
- Recreation uses may also utilize land that is protected for open space for other purposes, including utility easements, rivers and stream corridors, detention basins, trails and scenic highway corridors.

The Agency may also preserve open space for other reasons, including resource conservation; agriculture and other working landscapes; protecting public health and safety; and enhancing scenery and the Agency's cultural values.

Stansbury 's standard for open space designation is to have a permanent, protective easement on the property and an agreement for maintenance to retain its natural qualities in an ecologically sound manner. Please refer to p. 60 of this document for recommendations for Stansbury Park open space.

Trails

The term 'trail' is used to describe shared use paths, multi-use trails, sidewalks, and hiking pedestrian paths designed for non-motorized usage.

Sidewalks

Sidewalks, or paths, are directly adjacent to roadways are included when they provide a link between trails or between a trail and a destination.

Trail users may include but are not limited to: bicyclists, non-motorized scooters, in-line skaters, users of other wheeled devices like Segways or electric assist-bicycles, roller skaters, wheelchair users (both non-motorized and motorized), walkers, runners, and, in some cases, equestrians and non-motorized water activities.

Stansbury 's standard for trails is an 10' paved asphalt trails, (3" asphalt over 6" roadbase) with a 1' gravel shoulder on each side, within a 12' wide easement. Permanent signs with a trail map shall be erected at each terminus of

the trail. Mileage and trail name signs shall be posted at 1/2 mile intervals facing both directions. Trails and signage should integrate with Tooele County trails standards. (See Stansbury Park Trails Plan.)

Bikeable Community

Stansbury 's standard for bike lanes is a 4' painted striped lane on both sides of a road designated as a bike route. The outside stripe shall be a minimum of 4' from any parking lane, and a minimum 2' from the road shoulder or gutter. Permanent bike route signs shall be posted at 1/4 mile intervals facing both directions. Bicycle warning signs for motorists shall be posted at 1/2 mile intervals.

Walkable Community

A walkable community is defined in this plan in terms of recreation to mean integrated Agency design standards that promote walking for recreation, as an alternative means of transportation, and as a way to orient buildings and uses toward the street to create a comfortable, attractive streetscape.

Stansbury 's standard for a walkable community is to include sidewalks (min. 5' wide) on both sides of the street through all new and existing development. Sidewalks and their intersections with driveways and roads shall be ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessible and continuous between intersections. Sidewalks shall not be allowed to dead end into an unpaved surface or undeveloped area. Buildings and parking shall be designed to welcome pedestrians and make access to buildings safe. City blocks shall be designed with numerous intersections and access points for more direct routes.

OPEN HOUSE MEETING - COMMENTS & NOTES

Existing Parks

- Community Parks - more popular (amenities and variety). Make some themed parks with parking.

Proposed Parks

- Parks on the South side of Stansbury
- Long, continuous trails
- Linking to neighboring community trails
- Short-term: 25+ miles of continuous trails

Existing Trails

- Wayfinding for trailheads

Proposed Trails

- Connect bike lanes
- More signs/kiosks to find trailheads
- Traffic-free bike path (outskirts of town)
- Big loop trails
- Safe commuter routes
- Connecting schools with trails
- Railroad path
- Highway crossings

Miscellaneous/Other

- Benches along trails for resting


EXISTING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK TYPES & AMENITIES	PARK ADDRESS	PARK CLASS	TOTAL ACRES	PARKING	PRIVATE VS. PUBLIC	BASKETBALL	VOLLEYBALL	TENNIS	BASEBALL / SOFTBALL	SOCCER	FOOTBALL	RESTROOMS	PICNIC TABLE	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	PAVLION	TRAIL ACCESS	OTHER AMENITIES
COMBINED PARKS																	
STANSBURY PARK																	
Brent Rose Park	across from Stansbury Elementary at 485 Country Club Drive	Mini	1.57	Yes	Public			2			1					Yes	
Brigham Park	Brigham Street, north of Benson Grist Mill and Stansbury Park Cemetery	Mini	1.36	No	Public							2	2 covered		2		2 Charcoal Barbeques
Benson Mill Park	Intersection of Angell Way and Decker Lane	Mini	0.64														
Captain's Island Park	Turnabout at north end of Island	Mini	0.47	No	Public									1		Yes	
Delgada Park	North shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	Mini	0.28	No	Public											Yes	Lake access, boat dock, nature trail, bird watching
Fairway Park	next to Gold Course at 629 Country Club Drive	Mini	0.93	No	Public									1		No	2 Benches
Galley Park	Intersection of Galley Lane and Regatta Lane	Mini	0.92	No	Public								2	1			4 Benches
Gateway Park	Intersection of Old Mill Road and Harvest Drive	Mini	0.83	No	Public	1				1			3	1		Yes	Large shade trees. 3 benches.
Northport Park	West shore of Stansbury Lake on Delgada Way	Mini	1.02	Yes	Public								2			Yes	Lake access, boat ramp
Ponderosa Park	Intersection of Ponderosa Lane and Horseshoe Drive	Mini	0.8	No	Public	1				1			2	1		Yes	3 Benches
Regatta Park	Intersection of Regatta Lane and Bayshore Drive	Mini	0.45	No	Public											No	Detention Basin
Rex Sutton Park		Mini	0.51		Public	3							1	1			3 Benches
Oscarson Park	Bayshore Dr & Schooner Ln	Mini	5.3		Public												
Woodland Park	Intersection of Country Club Drive and Miller Circle	Mini	1.27	No	Public	1							5			Yes	Large shade trees, fire pit, 3 benches, 2 charcoal grills
Millpond Park		Neighborhood	7.12		Public												
Park View Park	Intersection of Parkview and Regatta Lane	Neighborhood	5.62	Yes	Public	1			1		2	2	1	1		Yes	3 Horseshoe Pits, 1 bench, walking paths
Sagers Memorial Park	Next to Mill Pond at #10 Plaza	Neighborhood	9.94	Yes	Public				4			3	4	1	1	Yes	Large shade trees, skateboard and scooter course, batting cage
Sand Hill Park	Intersection of Sandhill Way and Calais Lane	Neighborhood	2.4	No	Private						1					Yes	
Village Park	Intersection of Village Blvd. and Stallion Way	Neighborhood	6.76	Yes	Public				2		2	3		1		Yes	2 Benches
Porter Way Park	Intersection of Porter Way and Star Discovery Way	Community	28.66	Yes	Public			2	1	2	2	2	19	1	1	Yes	Wading stream, 18-hole Disc Golf Course, plumbed for splash pad
Clubhouse Complex	Across street from the Golf Course Pro Shop at #1 Country Club Drive	Special Use	6.95	Yes	Public	4	1	2				8	6		1	Yes	Clubhouse Event Center, lake access, Boat Ramp, Boat Dock Sport Court, Public Pool, 6 Benches, Bridge
Stansbury Park Total			83.8			11	1	4	8	4	8	20	47	10	5		

RESULTS FROM INFORMAL INTERNET SURVEY

The following is a summary charts and verbatim written comments. The results are not statistically valid, but the information does outline general issues, preferences, and comments.

Q1: Where do you live?

Answered: 411 Skipped: 0



Q2: How many in your household are in the following age groups:

Answered: 411 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
5 or younger	54.99%	226
6-10	56.20%	231
11-18	53.04%	218
19-24	26.76%	110
25-39	62.53%	257
40-54	60.85%	250
55 plus	27.25%	112

Q3: How many are female?


Answered: 411 Skipped: 0

Q4: How many are male?

Answered: 411 Skipped: 0


Q5: What is your combined household income?

Answered: 405 Skipped: 6





Q6: Members of my household are getting an education at the following school systems:


Answered: 411 Skipped: 0




Q7: How often do you, or a member of your household, participate in the following activities in season: (no response for never)









	DAILY	WEEK 2X	WEEKLY	MONTHLY	ANNUALLY	TOTAL
Baseball	9.43% 10	17.92% 19	15.09% 16	12.26% 13	45.26% 48	106
Basketball	7.14% 10	14.29% 20	20.00% 28	25.00% 35	33.57% 47	140
Cycling	24.52% 51	22.60% 47	25.00% 52	19.23% 40	8.65% 18	208
Equestrian	2.00% 1	11.43% 4	11.43% 4	5.71% 2	66.57% 24	36
Football - flag	0.00% 0	10.94% 7	14.06% 9	9.38% 6	65.63% 42	64
Football - tackle	17.07% 7	2.44% 1	7.32% 3	9.76% 4	63.41% 26	41
Golf	7.61% 13	10.40% 18	13.87% 24	31.21% 54	36.00% 64	173
Martial arts	13.33% 4	26.67% 6	10.00% 3	10.00% 3	40.00% 12	30
Mountain biking	10.34% 12	11.21% 13	20.69% 24	28.45% 33	29.31% 34	116
Pickleball	5.00% 2	12.50% 5	10.00% 4	22.50% 9	60.00% 20	40
Skatepark sports	8.06% 5	9.68% 6	16.13% 10	32.26% 20	33.67% 21	62
Soccer	20.00% 30	26.67% 40	14.67% 22	16.67% 25	22.00% 33	150
Softball	7.58% 5	16.67% 11	24.24% 16	16.67% 11	34.85% 23	66
Swimming	14.19% 41	17.30% 50	26.03% 61	26.99% 70	13.49% 39	209
Tennis	5.06% 4	10.13% 8	24.05% 19	24.05% 19	36.71% 29	79
Volleyball	5.97% 4	16.42% 11	11.94% 8	23.88% 16	41.79% 28	67
Other	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0

- 1 Walking..daily
- 2 Walking/Running
- 3 Running
- 4 Running
- 5 "Ultimate Frisbee - annually
Alpine Skiing - annually"
- 6 Dance - daily
- 7 Dirt biking.
- 8 Would be nice if there was more organized activities for adults!
- 9 On the Lake, kayaking, canoeing, paddle boating and fishing.
- 10 Racquetball
- 11 "Running
Skiing"
- 12 Running and walking
- 13 running, walking
- 14 Walking
- 15 Running
- 16 "Dance
Yoga
Music
We need more studios for each of those!"
- 17 Camping
- 18 Walking and running the park
- 19 Dance- weekly 2x
- 20 Motorcycling
- 21 Skydiving weekly, sometimes daily
- 22 Hiking, walking, water sports
- 23 Walking around the park with our dog and kids
- 24 Stansbury Lake, weekly
- 25 "Lap swimming- weekly
Running- weekly "
- 26 Running 3x week
- 27 Rugby weekly 2x.
- 28 Walking around Stansbury Park
- 29 We need more tennis / pickleball courts! Change the horseshoe pit that no one uses at the park on Parkview / Regatta to pickleball.
- 30 Dance
- 31 Walking
- 32 Splash water park.
- 33 Splash pad. 4 times a week
- 34 Dancing twice weekly
- 35 Rock climbing, Frisbee, hiking (weekly)

- 36 Walking
- 37 CrossFit - Daily
- 38 Kayaking, running/walking
- 39 Running on the nice trail system around toole once a week
- 40 Power walking
- 41 Running! 3-4 times / week
- 42 Kayaking on the lake . 2-3 times a week during good weather.
- 43 Running 2+ times weekly
- 44 Kayak and water sports
- 45 Walking---daily
- 46 The sports are per season. Like tackle football is every day from July to nov.
- 47 Running
- 48 Running 5x
- 49 Walking for exercise. Often
- 50 Running-daily
- 51 Walking, running, racquetball, weights, on a daily basis.
- 52 Watch grandkids play soccer, baseball, basketball, flag football and swimming
- 53 We walk or run on a daily basis, we would love trails for this
- 54 Dance weekly
- 55 walking

Q8: How often do you, or a member of your household, participate in the following activities in season: (no response for never)


Answered: 366 Skipped: 45



	DAILY	WEEK 2X	WEEKLY	MONTHLY	ANNUALLY	TOTAL
Camping	0.32% 1	0.32% 1	7.35% 23	48.56% 152	43.45% 136	313
Hunting/fishing	1.83% 4	5.94% 13	14.16% 31	33.79% 74	44.29% 97	219
Hiking/backpacking	1.13% 3	2.64% 7	10.67% 50	40.60% 120	20.00% 76	266
Kayaking	6.13% 10	11.66% 19	26.38% 43	38.04% 62	17.79% 29	163
Rock climbing	1.89% 1	1.89% 1	13.21% 7	35.85% 19	47.17% 25	53
Sledding/tubing	0.40% 1	4.37% 11	12.70% 32	24.60% 62	57.04% 146	252
Standup paddleboard	3.68% 9	11.03% 15	16.18% 22	33.09% 45	36.03% 49	136
Trail use (walk, run, cycle)	24.91% 71	21.05% 60	23.86% 68	20.70% 59	9.47% 27	285
Water play/splash pad	12.22% 27	22.62% 50	25.34% 56	24.89% 55	14.93% 33	221
Playground	19.52% 49	21.91% 55	31.47% 79	23.11% 50	3.96% 10	251
Picnic	6.70% 14	13.40% 28	22.97% 48	43.06% 90	13.88% 29	209

Q9: Please rate the frequency members of your household use these different types of recreation venues: (no response for never)


Answered: 359 Skipped: 52



	DAILY	WEEK 2X	WEEKLY	MONTHLY	ANNUALLY	TOTAL
Stansbury Park Swimming Pool	5.93% 14	8.05% 19	27.54% 65	27.54% 65	30.93% 73	236
Bike lanes on roadway or trails	21.94% 43	18.37% 36	30.10% 59	20.92% 41	8.67% 17	196
Stansbury Park Golf Course	0.71% 11	10.37% 17	12.20% 20	34.15% 66	30.58% 60	164
Fitness center (weights, cardio, classes)	33.73% 57	35.50% 60	15.38% 26	9.47% 16	5.92% 10	169
Gymnasiums (basketball, volleyball, other)	6.35% 8	23.02% 29	30.16% 38	27.78% 35	12.70% 16	126
Organized outdoor sports fields	17.07% 28	28.66% 47	20.73% 34	16.46% 27	17.07% 28	164
Public park (playgrounds, pavilions)	16.45% 50	23.36% 71	31.25% 93	21.71% 66	7.24% 22	304
Trail system through natural area or open spaces	19.13% 44	23.48% 54	27.83% 64	23.04% 53	6.52% 15	230

Q10: When considering the quality of life in your community, please rank in order of importance to you: (1 being most important to 6 being least important)


Answered: 372 Skipped: 39



	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	SCORE
Creating areas where neighbors can get to know each other	10.57% 37	12.57% 44	14.29% 50	19.71% 69	20.57% 72	22.29% 78	350	3.06
Offering recreational facilities for adults	12.30% 44	16.34% 58	15.40% 55	18.87% 67	21.41% 76	15.49% 55	355	3.33
Preservation of open space	24.86% 90	15.90% 59	16.47% 57	13.87% 48	10.69% 37	18.21% 63	340	3.70
Making neighborhoods more attractive and safe	20.68% 73	23.51% 83	18.98% 67	19.26% 68	12.18% 43	5.38% 19	353	4.05
Providing play areas for youth	23.66% 84	23.38% 83	18.03% 64	12.96% 46	13.24% 47	8.73% 31	355	4.05
Provide programs that promote healthy lifestyles and sociability	11.20% 41	10.00% 39	10.00% 37	14.02% 53	19.10% 70	20.00% 75	365	3.02

Q11: On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate how important is proximity (walkability) of parks to your current residence? (1 being least important)


Answered: 352 Skipped: 59



☆	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
☆	4.55% 16	3.41% 12	18.47% 65	26.42% 93	47.16% 166	352	4.08

Q12: On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate how existing parks and park facilities are meeting the needs of your household: (1 being not at all)

Answered: 351 Skipped: 60



☆	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
☆	6.27% 22	20.51% 72	34.47% 121	27.07% 95	11.68% 41	351	3.17

Q13: On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate how easy it is to access the nearest park by walking or biking (1 being very difficult):


Answered: 352 Skipped: 59





☆	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
☆	5.68%	6.53%	12.78%	23.58%	51.42%	352	4.09
	20	23	45	83	181		


Q14: In the past 12 months, how frequently have you or a member of your household used the following parks:


Answered: 343 Skipped: 68





















Q15: What improvements and/or amenities would you like to see made in parks in the next five years?

Answered: 341 Skipped: 70



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Sporting Fields or Complexes	26.39%	90
Shelters	17.60%	60
Jungle Gyms and/or Swings	31.38%	107
Benches	41.94%	143
Community Gardens	24.05%	82
More Trees	59.53%	203
Splash Pad	68.62%	234
Other (please specify)	29.00%	99
Total Respondents: 341		

- 1 Trails to run/bike on that aren't on the road. I don't know if this is possible at this point, though.
- 2 maintenance only
- 3 some jungle gyms have wood chips that could be piled higher so there is less of a gap between the equipment and the chips, namely the one by the observatory.
- 4 More shade
- 5 More shade!! Our parks are severely lacking in large shade trees, except Woodland, which has an old playground.
- 6 Rec center
- 7 Repair broken jungle gyms and keep the wood chip levels high. More shade. My family would LOVE an indoor recreation center.
- 8 Covered parks that are shaded for summer
- 9 Connected trails
- 10 running trails
- 11 Grass and trees on schoner lane greenspace, - maintained walking trails and sidewalks!
- 12 Softball fields
- 13 Keep the lake private for Stansbury Residents
- 14 Restrooms
- 15 Dog park
- 16 Swings merry go rounds teeter totter
- 17 Dog park
- 18 The dirt at the end of Bayshore needs to have a park
- 19 running trails
- 20 Park strips, fencing, etc on village repaired.
- 21 Trail system, creeks
- 22 Apparently I need a map showing the location of the parks.,
- 23 All of it we need better parks!
- 24 Golf course
- 25 The less the better because that means less taxes / fees
- 26 Pickle ball courts
- 27 Dog park
- 28 Walking paths without golf cart use
- 29 Indoor or covered play surfaces- like tennis courts, racquetball, soccer, track, hardwood
- 30 Rec Center next to "open space"
- 31 If I can get my project approved I would be willing to add a splash pad to it
- 32 Improve how the parks are watered so the grass stays alive
- 33 Porter way needs benches around playground. More trees for shade at all parks!
- 34 Adult softball fields
- 35 Golf
- 36 Fitness center and biking/walking trails
- 37 Recreation center
- 38 Dog park
- 39 Rec center
- 40 Competition length swimming pool
- 41 Updated play ground equipment at the older parks like Garrett. Indoor swimming pool for swimming lessons and for the HS swim team to practice.
- 42 Bathrooms at more parks
- 43 CLEAN/updated BATHROOMS (especially by the swimming pool)
- 44 Keep greenbelt by the sledding hill and millpond. More biking and walking trails connected.
- 45 Dog Park
- 46 Lake is our #1 priority
- 47 Rec Center
- 48 Drinking fountains and clean toilets
- 49 Basketball courts, and please please please some benches by the playground at porter way park.
- 50 I'd pay more taxes for a Rec Center!!
- 51 I think you do a wonderful job adding to the beauty of Stansbury. We are lucky to live here.
- 52 Shade over play structures
- 53 Walking gardens
- 54 Rec Center, Library
- 55 100% a splash pad. We have so many little ones!
- 56 Rec. Center like Lehi or 5600W
- 57 Bathrooms
- 58 Bathrooms open year round
- 59 They're all great parks. Nothing needed.
- 60 Walking/cycling trails
- 61 Not a splash pad!!!
- 62 Fix mosquito park off regatta and park view.
- 63 Walking paths
- 64 Regulation of lake use: everyone pays a fee if they don't live on the lake; Stansbury residents get a discounted fee, those living outside SP pay more; employee people to

monitor, regulate & enforce; fine those in violation; enforce rules about respecting lake residents property & privacy, littering, abusing lake & privileges; the lake will be more respected if they have to pay to use it. Also More trees, plants, & wildlife, less people! Add a walking bridge over highway

38

65 Indoor track and sport complex for winter

use

66 Covered picnic benches

67 Newcomer welcome/ActivitiesClubhouse activi-

ties

68 Trails and dog park

69 Trails

70 Bike / walking path

71 Pickelball

72 Trails, bike lanes,

73 Running and biking trails

74 New indoor swimming pool

75 Park bathrooms

76 Bike/walking trails

77 I would love to see a all inclusive park for those with disabilities and their friends.

78 Maintain current

79 shade canopies over play equipment

80 I would like to see an indoor community center

81 Dog park for exercising dogs, replacement Russian Olive Trees

82 dog park

83 Trail system

84 Fenced dog park

85 Bike and walking paths

86 Dog park

87 I am sure scout troops or youth groups would love to help plant trees.

88 the weed filled empty lot at the end of Starside dr and Porter Way park could be a great basket ball court or splash pad

89 Trails, trails, trails, restrooms

90 My kids love porter way park but there is no where for parents to sit while keeping kids in view

91 Dog Park

92 A bigger skate park to accommodate the number of kids here. Suggest looking at parks all over Herri-

man

93 Trails and/or paths to walk

94 Restrooms

95 Fitness center

96 Dog park, area where dogs can be off leash (although some people already allow their dogs off leash even though it is very clear on the posted signs that dogs must be on leash all the time)


97 Bike / running trails


98 Splash PAD!!!!

99 Paved biking and hiking trails

Q16: What facilities in a park do you or members of your household use?

Answered: 348 Skipped: 63






	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	VERY OFTEN	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Playing fields (soccer, football, etc.)	20.00% 65	17.54% 57	30.77% 100	19.69% 64	12.00% 39	325
Baseball/Softball	43.87% 130	18.71% 58	22.56% 70	10.65% 33	4.19% 13	310
Tennis/Pickle-ball	43.51% 134	21.10% 65	24.35% 75	8.44% 26	2.60% 8	308
Playground equipment (swings, jungle gyms, etc.)	8.90% 30	7.42% 25	26.71% 90	29.67% 100	27.30% 92	337
Benches	4.45% 15	10.09% 34	29.97% 101	32.05% 108	23.44% 79	337
Walking Paths	6.59% 22	5.99% 20	23.35% 78	37.13% 124	26.95% 90	334
Frisbee Golf	40.50% 152	19.01% 62	25.50% 80	4.47% 14	1.00% 5	313
Community Gardens	59.87% 185	15.86% 49	16.83% 52	4.21% 13	3.24% 10	309
Park Shelters	25.80% 81	18.15% 57	36.94% 116	14.01% 44	5.10% 16	314
Restrooms	8.38% 28	11.68% 39	36.23% 121	25.75% 86	17.96% 60	334

Q17: What is your opinion concerning where future funding for improvements in the next 5, 10, and 20 years should be spent?

Answered: 328 Skipped: 83



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Improve current parks	52.44%	172
Expand recreational trail connections	55.79%	183
Other (please specify)	27.74%	91
Total Respondents: 328		


- 1 Proper upkeep
- 2 avoid development, maintenance only,
- 3 Splash pads
- 4 Bigger swimming pool
- 5 Roadways/street improvements
- 6 Add some larger parts with more variety
- 7 Building a nice sports complex would bring money into the community with sponsoring tournaments.
- 8 larger community gathering space
- 9 I was shown the developers plans for the schooner lane greenspace and was very dissapointed that project was scraped!
- 10 Keeping the lake private for residents use. Not commercializing Stansbury.
- 11 Keep the lake in great condition
- 12 Splash pad, rec center
- 13 Pedestrian Bridge over Sr 138 with ramp so bikes can cross
- 14 Make a dog park, with access to the lake, and

- a grassy area!, IMPROVE THE LAKE! Maybe apply for a bond to dredge it deeper, that is our most important "park resource" improve that
- 15 End of Bayshore needs to be developed
- 16 Community recreation center with lap pool!
- 17 I would love to see a nice trail system for walkers and joggers.
- 18 Improve current park strips, fencing, etc.
- 19 Keep spending to a minimum to avoid increasing mandatory taxes / fees
- 20 Pickle ball courts
- 21 Dog park(s)
- 22 Senior services and activities
- 23 Stansbury Community Center (think Rec Center)
- 24 Dunno
- 25 Splash pad; dog park
- 26 Adult softball complex or Rec Center
- 27 Splash pad
- 28 Park on schooners road

- 29 Splash pad
- 30 Recreation Center
- 31 Would love a playground on Sandhill
- 32 Splash pad
- 33 Dog park
- 34 Splash pad!
- 35 I'd love to see a rec center option for adults and kids alike
- 36 Bike trails and competitive swimming pool are a MUST!
- 37 Covered pool for swim team
- 38 Rec center with pool
- 39 Create more sports facilities to support the growing population
- 40 Maintaining level of crime and clean clean streets
- 41 Library/rec center combination
- 42 Add a Dog Park
- 43 Lake health and functionality
- 44 Rec center
- 45 Lake
- 46 Additional parks
- 47 Splash pad
- 48 Figure out the freaking mosquito and gnat problem so people actually spend time outdoors in this swamp.
- 49 Indoor swimming pool
- 50 Would love to see the horse shoe pit on Regatta / Parkview converted to Pickleball. Honestly no one uses it.
- 51 Stansbury Lake
- 52 The lake weeds NEED to be fixed before anything new!
- 53 Splash pad
- 54 Splash pad
- 55 Rec. Center like Lehi or 5600W
- 56 More green space and better maintenance of current public area. Weed removal etc.
- 57 Rec center with indoor lap pool
- 58 Weed control in the lake
- 59 Clean lake
- 60 Rec center
- 61 Soccer field complex
- 62 Expand/improve soccer fields
- 63 The lake: make it healthy again, hire people's to enforce rules regarding lake use, create fees that can help fund these things
- 64 more trees by the parks to offer shade from the summer sun
- 65 Park on Schooner 13 years past due
- 66 Community Recreation Center
- 67 Splash pad
- 68 Dog park; social areas/activities for senior
- 69 Rec center with indoor pool
- 70 We really really need a trail system for biking and walking.
- 71 Splash pad
- 72 Splash pad and biking/walking trails
- 73 Take care of existing parks would be a start.
- 74 Splash pad and develop already purchased parks
- 75 Community exercise facility, larger pool, solar for pool facilities
- 76 splash pad and dog park
- 77 Add soccer specific complex
- 78 More tree lined streets
- 79 Community rec center
- 80 Splash pad
- 81 Recreation center
- 82 Add splash pads and a library
- 83 Indoor recreation center with indoor pool, racquet-ball
- 84 Dog Park
- 85 Improve Lake quality
- 86 Rec center
- 87 Specifically make the village park more appealing for young kids, which will discourage the pot smokers from hanging out there.
- 88 Would love a splash pad
- 89 we need a dog park and splash pad and maybe a rec center
- 90 Improve on what we have. Unfortunately you can satisfy everyone.
- 91 Preserve green space, no apartments or high density

Q18: Like most communities, major parks and recreation projects often have to be funded through a bond. Would you be willing to bond for major projects in the future?


Answered: 328 Skipped: 83



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	81.40%	267
No	18.60%	61
TOTAL		328

Q19: How much would you support an annual user fee or bond, for the purchase of park land and park improvements? In this example the fee would be per household.


Answered: 330 Skipped: 81



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
0	14.55%	48
\$50 (\$4.16 Monthly)	39.39%	130
\$100 (\$8.33 Monthly)	20.00%	66
\$150 (\$12.50 Monthly)	9.39%	31
\$200 (\$16.67 Monthly)	4.55%	15
\$200+ (\$16.67+ Monthly)	6.06%	20
TOTAL		330

Q20: Which of the following projects would you be willing to bond for? Rank in order of importance (6 being the lowest, 1 being the highest).

Answered: 322 Skipped: 89



	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	SCORE
Swimming Pool	13.59% 42	18.77% 58	24.92% 77	27.83% 86	11.97% 37	2.91% 9	309	3.65
Recreation Center	32.70% 103	26.67% 84	17.46% 55	12.38% 39	5.71% 18	5.08% 16	315	4.53
Upgraded Clubhouse	4.93% 15	7.57% 23	14.47% 44	23.03% 70	38.16% 116	11.84% 36	304	2.83
Major Golf Course Improvements	7.79% 24	5.84% 18	7.14% 22	7.79% 24	17.86% 55	53.57% 165	308	2.17
Splash Pad	26.37% 82	20.26% 63	17.36% 54	12.22% 38	11.90% 37	11.90% 37	311	4.01
Community Library	16.88% 53	21.97% 69	19.43% 61	14.97% 47	11.46% 36	15.29% 48	314	3.72

Q21: Are there any other projects you would be willing to bond for?

Answered: 106 Skipped: 305

1 keeping Stansbury Park quiet, enforcement of quiet hours (from barking dogs), disallowing dogs to be outside during quiet hours unless they can do so without barking

2 No. I think you nailed it with this list of six.

3 I think if the clubhouse was properly upgraded, it could become a rec center. I would be willing to bond for a long (like 20 miles) paved bike/running trail that would help to get foot traffic off of streets (especially Bates Canyon... it is unsafe).

4 A baseball complex...

5 arts center

6 Bike paths into SLC

7 More sidewalks

8 running trails

9 Incorporate to control our community independent of Tooele County.

10 Improving the schooner lane green space, oh thats right i already paying taxes for the improvements on that landfill! Would love to see an amphitheater!

11 Softball complex

12 No

13 Trailside biking, hiking, or walking.

14 Rec center racquetball court, bike paths

15 Lake improvement. We need to fix the inlets, make them deeper, with less light going to the weeds. That would cost money, we should petition the county to find grants for this improvement.

16 Dog Park

17 Park at the end of Bayshore

18 Safe way to cross the highway from Delgada lane (ie. stop sign, stop light, or pedestrian crossing light)

19 Trails

20 Trail system although it may be too late in some areas!

21 Dog park, community amphitheater, food truck night location, or preferably cleaner lake.

22 Trail system, more trees.

23 More trails

24 I don't want any bonding at all. If people really want

these things why not have a private company build them and then charge access and then only those interested have to pay for them instead of forcing the taxes / fees on everyone?

25 Pickle ball courts

26 Trail system

27 Lake improvements

28 Dog park

29 Jr high

30 Again I would fund a splash pad. That is determined from the project I have in mind as well as the amount of whining from the community.

31 Dog park

32 Government should not be in the business for entertainment.

33 "Rec center WITH a swimming pool
New multi-use fields for soccer, lacrosse, etc"

34 Nothing

35 Biking and walking trails

36 Improve the park by Stansbury Elementary, playground, covered picnic area

37 Clean the lake up, keep it up, for use to kayak.

38 Recreation Center

39 Horse racing track

40 Dog park

41 Covered swimming pool for swim team to use year around

42 Splash pad, recreation with pool

43 Gardens

44 Purchase of more open space.

45 Bike trails a paths

46 "Summer rec. programs.

"

47 Library/rec center combination like East Mill-creek

48 Park on Bayshore and Schooner

49 Dog Park

50 Lake health and function. The lake is what makes

Stansbury Park unique, otherwise it is just another neighborhood community with a golf course.


- 51 Keeping the lake clear of weeds.
- 52 Greenbelt maintenance!!
- 53 the lake
- 54 Increased / better upkeep and maintenance on the lake.
- 55 a well thought out and run community garden that included classes on gardening/healthy eating/healthy lifestyles.
- 56 Genocide against mosquitoes and gnats.
- 57 Rec Center!! Like West Valley or Magna. We really need one! Indoor swimming pool, running/ walking track, weight equipment. We should focus on the health of our community. Let's do it!!!
- 58 Underpass
- 59 Walking and Biking Trail
- 60 The lake! Please get those weeds figured out!
- 61 A gym area for adults
- 62 Hold a weight lifting center open only for residents of Stansbury Park
- 63 More events put on by the service agency. Movie nights, music in the parks, Food Truck
- 64 Walkable/bikeable trails systems
- 65 More parks and community green space.
- 66 No
- 67 I would bond as much as necessary to clean up the lake. It is used by so many Stansbury residents for recreation and it is turning into a marsh.
- 68 Walking paths. So we can bike or walk without feeling like we will be hit by a car. Like west bountiful has.
- 69 No, taxes are killing me now and if they keep moving up I'll have to move away from tooele.
- 70 Mountain biking trails
- 71 Trail system
- 72 Jogging trail
- 73 A real recreation facility with exercise equipment and courts
- 74 Junior High should be highest priority. We got several elementary and no junior high? Poor poor planning
- 75 LAKE FEES & EMPLOYMENT OF THOSE ENFORCING FEES & LAKE USE

- 76 Connecting trail system
- 77 Finish the park and retention on schooner it is an eye sore now that all empty lots are developed
- 78 Bike and running trail
- 79 Paved bike trail
- 80 Dog park; safe access to parks and rec areas; bike lanes
- 81 Bike trails, walking trails
- 82 Bike waking trail
- 83 Unless funding went back into the community, I would not support gold improvements. I would like to see trails and bike lanes(in the roadways and elsewhere) Mt. Biking paths. Don't we already have a swimming pool? or indoor? If it was part of a Rec Center - then yes. I would think we could combine the Rec Center and Library in the same building, even an expanded community center (the clubhouse does not feel like a community center, it feels more HOAish).
- 84 Pickle ball courts and pathways
- 85 The swimming pool on this list, is that for a new one or to update the existing one?
- 86 No
- 87 A bike/walking trail from Stansbury to Grantsville
- 88 An all inclusive park where people with disabilities can come and play as wel.
- 89 None
- 90 dog park and splash pad
- 91 Paved bike trails
- 92 None, zero, zip. Require builders to create the parks then we can maintain them after creation.
- 93 Fenced dog park
- 94 Trail system around park. Frontage road.
- 95 Open nature area with walking trails
- 96 Lake mower
- 97 Dog park
- 98 The lake
- 99 Recreation center
- 100 Lake aeration, biologic treatment, grass carp
- 101 Walking trails throughout community
- 102 Clean the lake
- 103 Trail System and Biking Path connections.
- 104 Dog Park. Walking Trails. Not everyone in the community has kids so they must to be a balance between what projects should be funded.

- 105 Improved or labeling walking trails and bike trails
- 106 Bike and walking trails

Q22: Please rank each improvement listed below based on when you believe each improvement should occur:

Answered: 329 Skipped: 82





	NEVER	WITHIN 5 YEARS	WITHIN 10 YEARS	WITHIN 20 YEARS	TOTAL
Improve current parks	3.73% 12	63.04% 203	20.57% 92	4.00% 15	322
Expand recreational trail connections	7.10% 23	62.35% 202	24.38% 79	6.17% 20	324
Improve sidewalk and trail connections within Stansbury Park	6.83% 22	68.32% 220	20.81% 67	4.04% 13	322


- 1 With the number of people moving in, these should all be done short term.
- 2 Create larger parks with pavilions and a variety of equipment within 10 years
- 3 Install some speed bumps
- 4 Golf course
- 5 Current parks are awesome! Stansbury needs a rec center.
- 6 Within the parameters of taxes. Not raise them.
- 7 I have no idea where the oft referenced trails are.
- 8 competition pool within 5 years (way past time)
- 9 Covered swimming pool
- 10 Rec center with pool.
- 11 Lake should be TOP priority!!!
- 12 Greenbelt maintenance!!
- 13 the lake immediately
- 14 Stansbury Lake, better water quality and get rid of weeds
- 15 Build a gym
- 16 The lake needs improvement immediately!
- 17 We need wider sidewalks or longer trails around the community away from roads
- 18 No fitness center, please!
- 19 Lake fees & regulation within...NOW
- 20 Dog park and library. Immediately
- 21 I really would like to see a sand area by the lake for kids to play in. I don't know if that is possible. I think the trail system is top priority and then a Rec center.
- 22 Schooner park with splash pad- huge area, promised to be a park over 13 years ago. Not by Stansbury park service agency, of course, but it's a perfect place for wanted items
- 23 Invest in more lake mowers. Take care of what we have first before spending more.

Q23: Which of the following recreation facilities would you or members of your household be likely to use, and how often would they use the facility if it was built in the near future? (no response for never)

Answered: 319 Skipped: 92








	DAILY	WFK 2X	WFK 1Y	MONTHLY	ANNUALLY	TOTAL
Amphitheater (outdoor music concerts, plays)	1.38% 4	2.76% 8	14.83% 43	46.21% 134	34.83% 101	290
Fieldhouse (spectator seating, soccer, football, basketball, conventions, large events, etc.)	3.95% 9	3.95% 9	17.11% 39	26.32% 60	48.68% 111	220
Gymnasiums for multi-use (basketball, volleyball, fitness classes, dance, events)	9.52% 24	15.08% 38	25.00% 63	32.14% 81	18.25% 46	252
Upgraded soccer fields	10.78% 18	14.97% 25	14.97% 25	19.76% 33	39.52% 66	167
Softball/baseball 4-plex complex	5.22% 7	10.46% 14	10.40% 26	10.40% 26	46.52% 61	134
Climbing wall	2.01% 4	8.54% 17	20.60% 41	40.20% 80	28.64% 57	199
Racquetball courts	2.65% 4	8.61% 13	25.17% 38	31.79% 48	31.79% 48	151
Indoor walking track	21.13% 45	21.13% 45	30.05% 64	15.40% 33	12.21% 26	213

Q24: Other Considerations

Answered: 29 Skipped: 382



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I do not want the Agency to build any new facilities	68.97%	20
I wouldn't use any of the facilities above	48.28%	14
Total Respondents: 29		

