

Approved 08 January 2008

Ordinance No. 027-2007


LEWIS YOUNG
ROBERTSON & BURNINGHAM, INC.
INVESTMENT BANKERS
MEMBERS: NASD AND SIPC

*PARKS & RECREATION
CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN*

FOR

PROVIDENCE CITY

CACHE COUNTY, UTAH

NOVEMBER 27, 2007

Submitted by:

LEWIS YOUNG ROBERTSON & BURNINGHAM, INC.



PROVIDENCE CITY, CACHE COUNTY, UTAH

PARKS & RECREATION CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PARKLAND TARGET AND ACTUAL LEVELS OF SERVICE	3
PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH.....	4
EXISTING PARK INVENTORY (ACTUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE)	4
ACQUISITION PLAN.....	5
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS	5
CONCLUSION	6
CHAPTER 1 DEFINITIONS AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS	7
PURPOSE OF A CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN	7
PARKS & RECREATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.....	7
PURPOSE OF DEFINITIONS AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS	8
PROJECT AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.....	8
NATIONAL RECREATION & PARKS ASSOCIATION PARK DEFINITIONS	8
PARKLAND STANDARDS	8
IMPACT FEE CREDITS	9
CHAPTER 2 EXISTING PARK AND RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS	10
CITY POPULATION PROJECTIONS	10
EXISTING PARKS INVENTORY	10
ACTUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE.....	11
CHAPTER 3 PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS AND FUNDING ANALYSIS.....	12
PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF COSTS.....	12
FUNDING OPTIONS.....	13
CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION.....	15



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cities often overlook the importance of parklands. Culinary water, sewer, storm water and roads infrastructure are typically deemed more critical than improvements to parks, open spaces. However, culinary water, sewer, storm water and roadway infrastructure are commodities that do not differ or distinguish one community from another or add to a community's perceived value. Parks, on the other hand, provide recreational opportunities, revitalize neighborhoods, build healthy communities, and improve and enrich the lives of a community's residents. In order to provide these benefits to its residents, Providence City (the "City") has retained Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham, Inc. ("LYRB") to develop the Parks & Recreation Capital Facilities Plan ("CFP").

PARKLAND TARGET AND ACTUAL LEVELS OF SERVICE

The purpose of a CFP is to establish an adequate level of service standard for parks, and park improvements for the City as well as guidelines for planning for the future. The standards proposed herein are based upon standards, or guidelines, provided by the National Recreation & Park Association ("NRPA") balanced with the policies previously set by the Providence through the City's General Plan, and land use and planning ordinances. The standards, which are typically expressed in terms of need per 1,000 residents, define where the City should be in terms of park investment. This is not necessarily the case since actual inventories may be deficient or in excess of the ideal standard. **Throughout this analysis the level of park investment that the City should strive to meet is referred to as the Target Level of Service.**

The second focus of the CFP is to inventory existing recreation facilities and identify the future projects that the City is considering. Impact fees can only be based upon the level of investment that the City has made in their existing parks and not the target standards that define where the City should be in terms of park investment. **Throughout this analysis the actual amount of parks that the City owns or has contributed to is referred to as the Actual Level of Service.**

Figure 1 below shows the target and actual levels of service for parks and recreation areas. Figure 2 is an inventory of existing parks that currently exist within the City today and meet the standards of system improvements. System improvements are projects that serve the City as a whole rather than a local project area.



FIGURE 1: RECOMMENDED PARKS STANDARDS AND EXISTING FACILITIES

Level of Service Standards per 1,000 Residents		
Parks and Open Spaces	Target Level of Service	Actual Level of Service
Community Parks*	5.50	4.37
Neighborhood Parks*	1.50	1.25
Total Acreage:	7.00	5.62

*based upon NRPA standards

FIGURE 2: EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Existing Park Facilities	Acreage
Community Park	
Zollinger Park	12.71
Von's Park	13.7
Neighborhood Park	
Braegger Park	2.93
Meadow Ridge	0.28
Cattle Corral	0.67
Brookside	0.9
Hampshire (Olsen)	1.43
Alma Leonhardt	1.36
Total Acreage	33.98

PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH

The demand for park and recreation facilities are driven solely by residential land uses and population and therefore the standards for park infrastructure are expressed in terms of facilities per 1,000 residents. As population increases year by year the target level of service for facilities increases with population while the actual level of service only increases at the time the City acquires new land or construction of amenities.

EXISTING PARK INVENTORY (ACTUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE)

Figure 3 below shows that the City has acquired 33.98 acres of parks and recreation facilities within the City. According to the standards used in this analysis, the City is somewhat deficient in park facilities in relation to the needs for the current population of 6,050.



FIGURE 3: COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND TARGET LEVELS OF SERVICE

Parkland	City Standard	Existing Acres	Current Needs	Excess/ (Deficiency)	Buildout Needs	Future Purchases
Acres						
Community	5.50	26.41	30.80	(4.39)	55.00	28.59
Neighborhood	1.50	7.57	8.40	(0.83)	15.00	7.43
Total	7.00	33.98	39.20	(5.22)	70.00	36.02

ACQUISITION PLAN

The City has to fund 5.22 acres in parklands beyond the 33.98 acres currently owned to reach the 2007 target standards. Impact fees can only fund the future capital projects that perpetuate the standards that already exist within the City and cannot be used to fund the deficiency. The City will have to fund the projects required to cure the deficiency with non-impact fee revenues to bring the level of service to the target level of service. The faster the deficits are remedied the faster the City can assess an impact fee for a higher level of service. At buildout the two standards should converge.

FIGURE 4: SUMMARY OF ACTUAL AND TARGET PARK INVESTMENT

Future Land and Improvements Cost Summary			
	Actual Investment (2007)	Target Investment (build-out)	Future Investment
Parkland	\$ 3,398,000	\$ 6,067,857	\$ 2,669,857
Ammenities	\$ 977,749	\$ 1,745,981	\$ 768,232
Total	\$ 4,375,749	\$ 7,813,838	\$ 3,438,089

Because the total acquisition of park space can not be accurately predicted, the actual standard is set to increase gradually each year. Figure 4 above shows the City's future investment if the current deficiency is not resolved. If the City were to construct sufficient parkland or other amenities in a single year to cure the deficiency, then impact fees should be reassessed at a higher standard. Therefore the impact fees should be reevaluated with the acquisition of major parklands.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

PROPOSED PARKS & RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECTS

The City needs to purchase a minimum of 36.02 acres of parkland by build-out to maintain the current level of service standards. If the City opts to purchase the additional 5.22 acres with non impact fee revenues necessary to meet the NRPA standards then it would be able to set impact fees to purchase a maximum of 30.8 acres. The intent of this analysis is to establish the standards and parameters that the City will use in evaluating future park purchases so that as future park development opportunities arise, the City can decide if the proposed project meets the standards that would allow for the use of impact fee revenues towards the project.



Impact fees are a very acceptable funding source for certain park improvements but cannot be used for all improvements, particularly those that are intended to be project improvements or projects needed to cure deficiencies between the actual and target levels of service.

CONCLUSION

Providence values the lower densities that it has enjoyed and seeks to continue the development of parks, open spaces, and other recreational opportunities for its residents. Although at the moment the actual level of service is below the target level of service, the City is committed to providing adequate parkland for its residents. As stated earlier, an impact fee cannot be used to cure any existing deficiencies and as the City develops future parkland with non-impact fee revenues to narrow the disparity between the actual and the target level of service standard.



CHAPTER 1

DEFINITIONS AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

PURPOSE OF A CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

This CFP will provide the City with park and recreation planning standards that will help guide the City in the process of acquiring parkland and recreation facilities and deciding how these standards should be funded. This substantive planning will address the City's actual level of service standards, future parks & recreation needs, proposed parks & recreation capital projects and associated costs, and the funding sources available to the City. Additionally, this CFP will fulfill all financial requirements as promulgated under Title 11 Chapter 36, Utah Code (the "Impact Fees Act").

PARKS & RECREATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The City is focused on the continued development of additional parkland and recreational amenities so that the City's residents may enjoy an ideal target level of service for parks & recreation facilities, which includes active parkland, and open space. The City's park and recreation core values and objectives that have guided the creation of this CFP are listed below.

- ▣ Preserve the integrity of Providence City as a rural community by enhancing the existing amenities and open space.
- ▣ Preserve open space and natural visual corridors.
- ▣ Beautify and enhance the appearance and environment in Providence City.
- ▣ Create an identity for the City through parks, and open space.
- ▣ Provide adequate facilities for needed recreation programs and activities.
- ▣ Encourage and provide increased public access to county, state and federal lands, parks, and open space.
- ▣ Support property values and community growth by providing recreational amenities.
- ▣ To design and construct park and recreation facilities that conserve natural resources such as water, and set an example for the community.
- ▣ To provide an integrated, connected and diverse system of parks, recreation programs, that are economical and accessible to community members.
- ▣ To maintain communications between administration, public officials, and residents to ensure that recreation facilities and programs continue to meet the needs of the community.



PURPOSE OF DEFINITIONS AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Establishing target parks and recreation standards is essential to benchmark the community's efforts to develop and maintain parks and recreation facilities. Moreover, the standards serve as a basis for the calculation and assessment of parks and recreation impact fees. The decision to accept or reject parkland dedications offered by developers as a credit against impact fees is also directly dependent upon the target standards and criteria which determine whether an improvement relates to the project or to the system as a whole.

PROJECT AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS

Project improvements include facilities that benefit a small area and are generally of little benefit to the community as a whole. In this analysis, mini-parks are considered project improvements as are parks that are dedicated to the City in return for increased density. Project improvements cannot be funded through impact fees, receive credit for their cost against impact fees, or be considered in the impact fee level of service.

SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

System improvements are intended to benefit the community as a whole and are allowed to be funded through impact fees. Generally these improvements are located outside of specific developments unless the improvement is provided in addition to the parks needed for the developer to receive the full density.

NATIONAL RECREATION & PARKS ASSOCIATION PARK DEFINITIONS

Many of the target standards are based upon guidelines from the National Recreation & Parks Association (NRPA). The NRPA's mission is "to advance parks, recreation, and environmental conservation efforts that enhance the quality of life for all people". To accomplish this mission, the NRPA has established parks standards which are accepted and followed by communities across the country. The City will use the following definitions and descriptions, provided by the NRPA, as benchmarks in determining how the City will define its parks system.

PARKLAND STANDARDS

Parkland is space that is set aside, dedicated, designated, or reserved for recreational facilities, and is typically improved to include some form of equipment, buildings, lakes and water features, built play areas, special use areas and performing arts facilities to accommodate recreational activities including baseball, basketball, soccer, golf, boating, volleyball, skateboarding, horseshoes, etc. Subject to approval of final development plans, active open space may be utilized for the secondary purpose of satisfying stormwater retention requirements. Parkland is designated for the following park types:



NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS (SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS)

Neighborhood parks are playground and park combinations designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized recreation activities. These parks typically include children's playgrounds, picnic facilities, open spaces, natural areas, outdoor basketball courts and multi-use play fields. The size and amenities contained in each neighborhood park shall be based on the existing or planned population to be served, consistent with NRPA location and site selection guidelines. These parks are included in the City's level of service and are considered system improvements.

COMMUNITY PARKS (SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS)

Community parks are planned to primarily provide active and structured recreation opportunities for young people and adults. They often include sports fields, water bodies, gardens, nature trails, and other similar features. Community parks may include active and programmed recreation, sport fields and courts, playgrounds, golf courses, picnicking, sport complexes and swimming pools, recreational lakes and passive recreation activities. Community parks typically require support facilities such as off-street parking and restrooms. The size and amenities contained within each community park shall be based on the existing or planned population to be served, consistent with NRPA location and site selection guidelines. These parks are included in the City's level of service and are considered system improvements.

IMPACT FEE CREDITS

Impact fee credits are handled between the City and developers. The City may "allow a credit against impact fees for any dedication of land for, improvement to, or new construction of, any system improvements provided by the developer if the facilities: a) are identified in the Capital Facilities Plan and b) are required by the local political subdivision as a condition of approving the development activity."¹ Credits are handled on a case-by-case basis and will not be included in this analysis, although the Proportionate Share Analysis will identify the extent to which specific developers are entitled to a credit.

Developers who have received greater density for the development of parkland may not receive credit for the parks against the impact fees owed as the improvements are intended to function as a benefit to the development area and not to the City as a whole. These parks will be considered project improvements and will not be credited against the impact fees.

¹ 11-36-202(3)(c)



CHAPTER 2 EXISTING PARK AND RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS

CITY POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Located just outside of Logan and 82 miles northeast of Salt Lake City, Providence is a small community that is experiencing substantial growth from new developments attracted to the City. The City is largely residential, and the City's residents would like the City to maintain its rural atmosphere.

The City has estimated its existing and build-out populations, but it is impossible to predict the exact rates at which growth will occur. The City expects to increase its current population by approximately 4,700 by build-out.

EXISTING PARKS INVENTORY

The City's existing parks inventory is shown in Figure 2.1. The City does have several special-use areas located within its boundaries (i.e., cemeteries, church grounds, elementary school, etc.), but these areas are not included in the City's parks system since special-use areas do not contribute to a community's level of service standards. Additional discussion about special-use and limited-use areas is included in the following chapter.

FIGURE 2.1: EXISTING PARK INVENTORY

Existing Park Facilities	Acreage
Community Park	
Zollinger Park	12.71
Von's Park	13.7
Neighborhood Park	
Braegger Park	2.93
Meadow Ridge	0.28
Cattle Corral	0.67
Brookside	0.9
Hampshire (Olsen)	1.43
Alma Leonhardt	1.36
Total Acreage	33.98



FIGURE 2.2: SUMMARY OF PARK NEEDS

Existing Improvements	Current Acres	Current Need	Surplus/Deficiency	Build-out Need	Future Acquisition
Active Parkland					
Community Park	26.41	30.80	4.39	55.00	28.59
Neighborhood Park	7.57	8.40	0.83	15.00	7.43
Total:	33.98	39.20	5.22	70.00	36.02

FIGURE 2.3: SUMMARY OF PARK INVESTMENT

Future Land and Improvements Cost Summary			
	Investment (2007)	Investment (build)	Investment
Parkland	\$ 3,398,000	\$ 6,037,769	\$ 2,639,769
Ammenities	\$ 977,749	\$ 1,737,323	\$ 759,574
Total	\$ 4,375,749	\$ 7,775,092	\$ 3,399,342

ACTUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE

The City’s levels of service standards, as recommended in this master plan, have considered the level of service standards as recommended by NRPA. While the NRPA standards serve as a guide that may benefit the City in establishing its standards, the NRPA standards should be adjusted to adequately reflect the City’s unique geographic, climatic, and/or demographic attributes.

FIGURE 2.4: PARKS AND OPEN SPACES – EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Level of Service Standards per 1,000 Residents		
Parks and Open Spaces	Target Level of Service	Actual Level of Service
Community Parks*	5.50	4.37
Neighborhood Parks*	1.50	1.25
Total Acreage:	7.00	5.62

*based upon NRPA standards

As shown in Figures 2.4, the City is slightly deficient in acreage. The City must secure an additional 5.22 acres of parkland to meet the NRPA’s target level of service.



CHAPTER 3 PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS AND FUNDING ANALYSIS

A CFP must set forth the proportionate share that becomes the basis for the impact fee analysis. The intent of the Proportionate Share Analysis is to determine the proportion of existing and/or future facilities that is allocated to growth. The Proportionate Share Analysis must also ensure that impact fees are not used to fund facilities that exceed the current and reasonable level of service or cure existing deficiencies. The Proportionate Share Analysis included herein accurately considers these requirements and demonstrates that based upon the City's current parks & recreation level of service, growth will pay the share of costs that directly relate to the impacts created by future development.

The Proportionate Share Analysis is based upon the City's projected increase in population through build-out. The City's population is expected to increase by approximately 4,700 residents through build-out, so the City's total population will increase from approximately 6,050 to 10,750 through build-out. Based upon these projections, approximately 44% of the City's total population at build-out will consist of future residents that will move into the City's boundaries. Therefore, impact fees can be used to recover approximately 44% of the total costs of the City's existing and future parks & recreation facilities and any outstanding debt used to finance the acquisition or development of parks.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF COSTS

The Proportionate Share Analysis restricts the City from collecting impact fees that place an inequitable burden on new development relative to the impact that the development will place upon the system. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 below show the possible costs according to whether the City chooses to follow NRPA standards or continue with current standards.

FIGURE 3.1: FUTURE PARK LAND ACQUISITION COSTS (NRPA STANDARDS)

	Cost per acre	Current Needs	Current Value	Excess/ (Deficiency)	Excess/Deficiency Value	New Acreage	New Value
Community Parkland	100000	30.80	3,080,000	(4.39)	(439,000)	28.59	2,859,000
Neighborhood Parkland	100000	8.40	840,000	(0.83)	(83,000)	7.43	743,000
Total		39.20	3,920,000	(5.22)	(522,000)	36.02	3,602,000

FIGURE 3.2: FUTURE PARK LAND ACQUISITION COSTS (ACTUAL STANDARDS)

	Cost per acre	Current Needs	Current Value	New Acreage	New Value
Community Parkland	\$ 100,000	26.41	2,641,000	20.52	2,051,686
Neighborhood Parkland	\$ 100,000	7.57	757,000	5.88	588,083
Total		33.98	3,398,000	26.40	2,639,769



FUNDING OPTIONS

The following paragraphs discuss several funding options that are available to the City for the funding of the acquisition and development of future parklands.

- ▣ **PROPERTY TAX REVENUES**– Property tax revenues are a stable source of revenue, but property tax revenues allocate new system costs to development based upon property valuation rather than true impact. The City currently uses property tax revenues to help fund operations and maintenance expenses rather than capital projects.
- ▣ **DEVELOPER EXACTIONS** - A significant amount of the future park and recreation facilities will be provided by developers as an exaction against their impact fee liability. This will only be the case for system improvements and not project improvements which include parks developed as a condition of density approval.
- ▣ **SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND PRIVATE DONATIONS** – The City is looking to receive funds from various service organizations, corporations and private donors who are willing to join with municipalities in developing and helping fund various equipment and facilities for parks & recreation.
- ▣ **GRANTS** – The City should contemplate the use of State and Federal Grants and low/no interest loans as another possible revenue source to fund the acquisition of future parks.
- ▣ **SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS**
The City has discussed the option of creating Special Improvement Districts within developments for the funding of development related improvements including parks and recreation. At the moment there are not SIDs considered for the parks and recreation facilities within the City.
- ▣ **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS (EDAS)** – The City has already identified an EDA so that the City can collect tax increment funds which can then be used to fund the acquisition and development of future parklands.
- ▣ **IMPACT FEE REVENUES** – Impact fees have become an ideal mechanism for funding growth-related infrastructure. Impact fees are charged to ensure that new growth pays its proportionate share of the costs for the development of public infrastructure. Impact fee revenues can be attributed to future expansion of the parks & recreation system if the revenues are used to maintain an existing level of service (increases to an existing level of service cannot be funded with impact fee revenues). Analysis is required to accurately assess the true impact of a particular user upon City infrastructure and to prevent existing users from subsidizing new growth. The following paragraphs discuss other issues pertaining to impact fees.



EQUITY OF IMPACT FEES

Impact fees are calculated based upon the proportionate share of the total facility costs determined by the portion of the total population related to growth. This method results in an equitable fee as future users will not be expected to fund any portion of the projects that will benefit existing residents and vice-versa. This method also addresses current deficiencies by assuming that facilities are sized optimally to cover the City without deficiencies or excess at build-out. Since there is a deficiency in the City's existing parks & recreation facilities, the portion that existing users should pay will include any payments that existing users have already made.

The impact fee calculations are structured so that impact fees will fund 100% of the growth-related facilities identified in the Proportionate Share Analysis. Even so, there may be years that impact fee revenues cannot cover the annual growth-related expenses, and other revenues, most likely general fund revenues, will be used to make up any annual deficits. Any borrowed funds are to be repaid in their entirety through impact fees.



CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION

The City's parks & recreation impact fees are based upon the City's projected increase in population through build-out. The City's population is expected to increase by approximately 4,700 residents through build-out, so the City's total population will increase from approximately 6,050 to 10,750. Based upon these projections, approximately 44% of the City's total population at build-out will consist of future residents that will move into the City's boundaries.

The City has identified approximately \$3.4 million of future capital project costs for parkland and park improvements. The total costs that the City may recover through park impact fees are summarized in Figure 4.1.

FIGURE 4.1: COSTS OF FUTURE PARKLAND AND PARK IMPROVEMENTS TO BE RECOVERED THROUGH IMPACT FEES IF NRPA STANDARDS ARE MET

	Cost per acre	Current Needs	Current Value	Excess/ (Deficiency)	Excess/Deficiency Value	New Acreage	New Value
Community Parkland	100000	30.80	3,080,000	(4.39)	(439,000)	28.59	2,859,000
Neighborhood Parkland	100000	8.40	840,000	(0.83)	(83,000)	7.43	743,000
Total		39.20	3,920,000	(5.22)	(522,000)	36.02	3,602,000

FIGURE 4.2: COSTS OF FUTURE PARKLAND AND PARK IMPROVEMENTS TO BE RECOVERED THROUGH IMPACT FEES IF CURRENT STANDARDS ARE CONTINUED

	Cost per acre	Current Needs	Current Value	New Acreage	New Value
Community Parkland	100000	26.41	2,641,000	20.75	2,075,071
Neighborhood Parkland	100000	7.57	757,000	5.95	594,786
Total		33.98	3,398,000	26.70	2,669,857

