
Section 4 Public Input and Planning Process

“It is important for the community be given an opportunity to provide input on what vision it wishes to create for the future of parks and recreation.”

The Parks and Recreation Department has a history of involving the community in its planning efforts. The community has participated in public meetings that have been held for such planning processes as: 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan, Recreational Facility Needs Study, Community Center Feasibility Study, Public Facilities Study, park master plans for individual parks, and Community Visioning for the 2030 Park and Recreation Master Plan. The City also completes a community survey every five years that measures satisfaction with City services. Utilizing input from the public provides for good government.

4.1 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan

As part of creating a 2030 Park and Recreation Master Plan the goals/issues identified in the previous 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan that it created needs to be revisited. By looking back first and acknowledging its achievements, the City can use these accomplishments as a springboard forward as it develops a 2030 Park and Recreation Master Plan. Through public input, the City created and approved the 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan in 1998. Ten years ago, the 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan identified 10 goals. A status report of whether or not the ten goals were achieved is being provided in order to help define future direction for the 2030 Park and Recreation Master Plan.

Goal #1: Explore a Centrally Located Community/Regional Park Facility and/or Recreational Public Lake

Status: *A central park location has been identified to be created in a 950+ acre development site in the northeast area of the City. Acquisition of the park land is planned to occur through the park dedication process meaning that the City will not have to pay for the land. Conceptually it has been discussed that the park will contain youth ball fields and soccer fields. A community center being built on this site has also been explored. It also will contain other park amenities such as walking trails, picnic shelters and playground equipment. The community park identified site is adjacent to approximately a 90+ acre wooded and open space area. While a new Dakota County regional park is planned to be created in Empire Township, it will not be centrally located within the City of Farmington border. It will however only be approximately two miles to the east of the City of Farmington and Empire Township border. It should be readily and easily accessible either by walking/biking trails or with a vehicle. Since a centrally located community park has not yet occurred, it seems to make some sense that a centrally located community park or an increase in community parks in general, should be addressed somewhere in the 10 year Master Plan that is being created.*

Goal #2: Evaluate Existing Parks on a Yearly Basis to Ensure the Parks are Safe, Well Maintained and Accessible to All Residents; Identify Upgrade Needs to be Included in the 5 Year CIP; Evaluate Current Park and Trail Needs Based on Demographic Forecasts.

Status: *A five year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) has been created that identifies a rotation of when a Park Master Plan (PMP) will be developed for every park. This process was implemented in 2003. There have been nine parks that have had a PMP developed through the end of 2005. The PMP process has used public input to gather information regarding the amenities and programs that the community would like to see in the park. The identification of the amenities and program spaces by the public helped create an estimated budget for the park improvement costs. However due to budget constraints, City staff and Park, Recreation Advisory Commission (PRAC) and the City Council prioritized the improvements based on a smaller budget than what was estimated and approved for each park during the PMP process. In some situations though, all of the improvements were completed because the budget was small enough to accommodate the completion of all improvements. The PMPs that have been completed thus far for the nine parks will be reviewed on an approximate 8-year cycle. The review will be completed in order to see if the park improvements identified in the original PMP continue to be priorities for the community. If the improvements are still a community priority, then depending on the money available, either some or all of the remaining improvements not completed initially will be completed.*

The safety, maintenance and accessibility of the parks are now evaluated on an annual basis. This occurs several ways. One way it is accomplished is through the Park Maintenance Division staff holding one staff retreat in the spring and one staff retreat in the fall to discuss the condition of each park from a maintenance and safety point of view and then developing an annual work plan to address any issues related to safety, maintenance and/or accessibility. A second way this is being accomplished was through a training priority identified during the 2004 and 2005 budget process to send Park Maintenance Division staff to playground safety training school offered by the National Recreation and Park Association's (NRPA) National Playground Safety Institute. Staff had not previously been trained on how to identify safety issues when inspecting playground equipment. As a result of this training, staff members now regularly inspect and document the condition of playground equipment. Staff members have corrected a number of playground safety issues as a result of the training received. Accessibility seemed to be an issue to the City's parks. Since 2004 paved trails have been constructed in parks that provide excellent access to park structures. Pea gravel is being removed from playground sites and new engineered wood fiber is being installed in its place. The engineered wood fiber meets the Federal Access Board requirements for an accessible surface to playground equipment. The wood fiber also meets safety surfacing requirements for playground equipment. Accessibility issues to existing park structures along with corrective actions are being identified when PMP's are created.

Goal #3: Present and Restore the Vermillion River Corridor and Acquire Properties Abutting the River When They Become Available.

Status: *Through the shore land protection ordinance and new park dedication requirements, the Vermillion River Corridor is being protected and preserved. This was seen in the Vermillion River Crossing commercial development review process that*

occurred in 2004 and 2005. Through careful scrutiny by City staff, consultants, and other governmental agencies such as the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and Dakota County Soil and Water Conservation District staff, land adjacent to Vermillion River Corridor was protected and preserved as open space. There will be additional development that will occur along the Vermillion River and within the City of Farmington border that will need to be acquired and preserved. Because the City has shoreland protection and park dedication ordinances in place, the acquisition and preservation of Vermillion River should continue to occur.

Goal #4: Assess Current Park Development Trends; Develop a Variety of Park Facilities.

Status: *This is being accomplished through the hiring of consultant who have worked with City staff and the public in developing PMPs. The PMPs created thus far are a reflection of the trends that are occurring in the area of park development including the amenities and facilities that are being planned for future construction.*

Goal #5: Assess Current Recreational Trends; Develop a Variety of Recreational Activities.

Status: *Recreation Division staff members have developed a variety of new recreational activities. They have formed a partnership with other municipal Park and Recreation Departments to provide an adult soccer league and special events. A new skate park was created to allow youth the opportunity to skateboard, which has become a popular alternative activity for youth. There have been new programs created at the Rambling River Center for older adults. These new programs include weight training, cardiovascular equipment training, aerobics, tai chi and a model railroad club.*

Goal #6: Explore the Construction of a Recreational Water Park and/or Community Center.

Status: *City staff worked with the community to gather information and feedback from the community regarding the construction of a community center. Several committees were assembled and had representation from various interests from the community. One committee assembled in 2004 completed a community center feasibility study that looked at the size and spaces that should be included in a community center. The committee also conducted a survey of the community that showed there was support for a new community center. A second committee, assembled in mid-2005, further studied a community center by analyzing sites, partnerships and the phasing of a community center that would include certain spaces within the first phase of construction. This second committee also conceptually planned what a community center could look like based on the spaces identified to be included in the first phase of construction. The Committee brought forwarded this information and made a recommendation to the City Council in early 2006. The City Council subsequently determined that it was not the appropriate time to construct a community center. While an outdoor pool has not been discussed in great detail, it nonetheless should be discussed and addressed as part of the first phase of a community center and whether or not the first phase should include an indoor pool or an attached outdoor pool. A facility master plan study was also completed on several city*

facilities including the outdoor pool. The study showed that the existing outdoor pool facility is in poor condition and needs significant improvements including a new bathhouse, pool shell and pool deck. A PMP created for Evergreen Knoll Park identifies the existing outdoor pool being replaced with a spray ground or splash pad in the park should an indoor or outdoor pool be built as part of a community center. It seems to make some sense that a potential community center and/or water park should be addressed somewhere in the 2030 Master Plan that is being created.

Goal #7: Evaluate Future Expansion or Relocation of the Farmington Senior Center.

Status: *The City has evaluated the existing Farmington Senior Center (now known as the Rambling River Center) through two studies. The first study that was completed late in 2005 was a facility master plan study that reviewed the present condition of the existing facility. The recommendation based on the facility study stated that the City should continue to defer maintenance on the building but should identify the replacement of the mechanical equipment in the Capital Improvement Plan. It further stated that creating senior space in a community center would be a viable alternative to using the existing building given its age. The community center committee that is currently analyzing spaces seems to favor the inclusion of senior space in a new community center.*

There have been several improvements completed in the past several years that have in the short term addressed space issues. New staff offices were constructed that provided more and separate space for full and part-time staff. Another improvement that was completed was constructing a fitness room by dividing a large meeting room space into separate space for fitness equipment and reducing the meeting room space. As a result of new offices being constructed, the opportunity presented itself to move computer equipment into a new computer lab that was created from the former staff office space. New computer hardware (including a laser printer) and software were purchased from fundraising efforts and from other donations.

The ordinance that pertains to the creation of a Senior Advisory Board was amended in 2004-2005 to change the name from the Senior Center Advisory Board to the Rambling River Center Advisory Board. The ordinance was also amended to identify that the Rambling River Center Advisory Board forwards recommendations to the PRAC concerning the Rambling River Center. Previously the Advisory Board forwarded recommendations directly to the City Council.

Goal #8: Work with Dakota County, Independent School District 192, Surrounding Communities, the City's Boards and Commissions and Private and/or Non-Profit Organizations on Developing Joint Ventures for Recreational Parks, Open Spaces, Facilities and Trails Systems.

Status: *In 2005 the PRAC met with the City of Rosemount Park and Recreation Commission, the Empire Township Park and Recreation Commission and the Lakeville Parks, Recreation and Natural Resources Committee to discuss common issues and to look at possible partnerships that could be formed. The meetings with Empire Township*

and Lakeville appeared to be especially beneficial as trail alignments were discussed so that trails could be constructed in such a manner that a trail leading from one community to the next would be seamless. It was determined that these initial meetings were very beneficial from the standpoint that neighboring communities were no longer planning in a vacuum but rather were sharing information that should help neighboring communities better plan together for a comprehensive and regional trail system.

Dakota County staff members attended several PRAC meetings informing them about the regional park that was identified in Empire Township and asked for their support for the regional park. PRAC and City Council members from Farmington both endorsed the location of a new regional park in Empire Township. The regional park location was approved by the County Commissioners and acquisition of the property is underway.

Goal #9: Explore Alternative Revenue Sources to Generate Additional Funds for Park Improvements

Status: *Traditional and alternative funding sources have become more difficult to come by. The Park Dedication Ordinance was amended and as part of the amendments, a new park development fee was created that requires a developer to contribute funds that are to be used in the new development that will help pay for half of the cost to construct a new park or trails.*

The PRAC has looked at alternative funding sources and is weighing whether or not to propose a dedicated funding amount from the general levy that would go into the Park Improvement Fund.

One of the alternative funding sources that emerged in the past years is the annual transfer of 50% of the profits from the liquor store operations after the Arena subsidy has been made. Annually \$40,000-\$50,000 has been transferred from the liquor store operations to the Park Improvement Fund. It is hoped that this amount will continue to increase as the Farmington liquor stores have positioned themselves well for growth by leasing larger store space along Pilot Knob and in the City Center development. It seems to make some sense that alternative funding sources should be addressed somewhere in the 2030 Master Plan that is being created.

Goal #10: Evaluate Future Expansion of the Farmington Civic Arena.

Status: *The City initiated a feasibility study to analyze whether or not the arena could be expanded on vacant City property to the east of the existing arena. Phase I of the study showed that the site was not big enough to accommodate the parking as required by City Code and also that a significant portion of the property was in the 100 year flood plain and would need to be filled in order to allow the construction of a second sheet of ice. While it is possible to fill the flood plain, it is also very expensive because of the cost to haul material in as well as to mitigate the loss of flood plain by creating flood plain elsewhere along the Vermillion River. Additionally the site was not large enough to accommodate the storage of storm water runoff due to its immediate adjacency to the*

Vermillion River, which has been classified by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources as a protected trout stream.

4.2 Recreational Facility Needs Study

In 2003-2004 a Recreational Facility Needs Study was completed with the assistance of Ingraham and Associates, a professional planning firm. A 19 member Recreational Facility Study Task Force was created that consisted of community representation from various youth sports organizations, senior citizen, Farmington School District staff, Farmington School Board member, a member of the clergy, Dakota County Fair Board, daycare provider, Farmington Chamber of Commerce City staff members, Farmington City Council members and other at-large members from the community not affiliated with any organization. The Task Force's primary role was to prepare and submit a final report back to the City Council that would provide key recommendations concerning the future direction of recreational facilities. As a result of this almost one year study, five key recreational facility priorities were identified:

Priority #1: Prepare a community center feasibility study including space needs, location, partnerships and cost estimates.

Priority #2: Identify sites for separate youth and adult sports complexes with approximately 40-60 acres for each site.

Priority #3: Prepare a park system plan that identifies sites for major facilities.

Priority #4: Build community gyms in a community center in partnership with the school district or through public/private partnerships.

Priority #5: Expand trail network and connections.

4.3 Community Center Feasibility Study

In 2004, and as a result of the Recreational Facility Needs Study, the City Council authorized addressing the recommendation of completing a Community Center Feasibility Study (Feasibility Study). Ballard King and Associates, a consulting firm experienced with community center maintenance and operations, was hired to complete the Feasibility Study. A Community Center Feasibility Study Steering Committee (Steering Committee) was created that consisted of various community members that were similar in makeup to the Recreational Facility Needs Study Task Force. The Steering Committee spent time addressing various types of recreational spaces that could be contained within a community center that would best fit the current and long-term needs of the community. The Feasibility Study also completed a community survey, a market analysis of the primary and secondary markets and developed a proforma for the operation and maintenance of a community center.

A Community Attitude and Citizen Interest Survey was conducted by Leisure Vision in November and December 2004 as part of a Community Center Feasibility Study that was initiated in 2004 and completed in 2005. Leisure Vision was subcontracted by Ballard King and Associates to administer the survey. As a result of this survey, feedback and input was obtained from the community regarding indoor and outdoor recreational facilities. 1,523 surveys were first distributed by mail to randomly selected households. In order to have a high return rate on the survey, Leisure Vision was to make a follow up phone call to encourage respondents to return a completed survey. The goal was to have at least 300 surveys completed and returned to Leisure

Vision. This goal was far exceeded with 594 surveys being completed and returned. This resulted in a return rate of 39%. The results of the random sample of 594 households had a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/- 4.0%. While the survey questions focused primarily on indoor facilities and specifically on a community center, there were several questions related to parks and outdoor recreational facilities. The complete survey results have been included in the Appendix. The following summarizes the feedback received from the community survey:

Survey respondents indicated that 84% of households use City of Farmington parks, significantly higher than the national benchmark of 72%. 45% of the survey respondents indicated their households are currently using indoor recreation facilities. However, only 32% of the households using recreation facilities feel the existing facilities meet their needs. Household use of a new community center that had an indoor pool was very high with 71% of the survey respondents indicating their household would use the facility at least a few times per month. The survey results also indicated there was a strong community need and support for developing more natural areas and paved trails. It should be noted that many of the stakeholder interviewed also identified a need for more sports fields (soccer, baseball, softball and football). Overall, 37% of the survey respondents felt the development of a community center was either a very high priority or high priority compared to other issues facing the City of Farmington.

Based on the discussion by the Steering Committee and the results of a statistically valid community attitudes and interests survey that was completed by ETC Leisure Vision from Olathe, Kansas, the following components were recommended to the City Council to be included in the construction of a community center:

- Aquatics Area
- Gymnasium
- Indoor Turf Area
- Walking/Jogging Track
- Indoor Playground
- Weight and Cardiovascular Area
- Aerobics and Dance Studio
- Auxiliary Fitness Area
- Multipurpose Room
- Youth Fitness Area
- Birthday Party Rooms
- Rock Climbing
- Game Room
- Senior Center Area
- Babysitting Area,
- Lobby
- Park and Recreation Department Offices,
- Storage

The City Council accepted the final report of the Feasibility Study and then approved a request to complete a Conceptual Planning Study of a community center that would include completing the following items:

- Develop a building footprint
- Identify a preferred site
- Estimate construction costs
- Develop a conceptual site plan (including indoor and outdoor recreational facilities)

Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik and Associates consulting firm was subsequently hired to complete the Conceptual Planning Study of a community center. A Community Center Conceptual Planning Study Task Force (Task Force) was formed to complete the conceptual planning and forward a recommendation to the City Council. The Task Force consisted of two members from the following groups:

- City Council
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission,
- Rambling River Center Advisory Board (City’s advisory board for senior citizens),
- Farmington School District (one staff member and one school board member)
- City staff (City Administrator and Parks and Recreation Director)

The Task Force completed the study of the four identified items and forwarded a recommendation to the Park and Recreation Advisory Commission approving the conceptual development plan for a community center. The Park and Recreation Advisory Commission forwarded a recommendation to the City Council to accept the community center conceptual development plan and to move forward with a referendum for a community center. The City Council determined that due to other projects having a higher priority and because of the cost to construct a community center it was not the right time to go to referendum. The community center project was postponed until a later date.

4.4 Public Facilities Study

A public facilities study was completed by Wold Architects and Engineers in 2005. Recreational facilities reviewed during the study included the Rambling River Center, outdoor pool and the Schmitz-Maki Arena. The content of this study will be covered more in detail in Section 7 – Recreational Facilities.

4.5 Citizen’s Satisfaction Survey

A survey was completed in 2006 that accomplished three objectives:

1. Gather feedback and identify issues and concerns faced by City residents.
2. Determine what residents like most about living in the City of Farmington.
3. Gather opinions about public safety and parks and recreation.

A total of 500 phone interviews in the community were completed. The methodology used to conduct the survey produced a statistically reliable survey. The Citizen’s Satisfaction Survey

contained 25 questions, which of this total, 4 questions were related solely to the Parks and Recreation Department. In addition to these four questions dedicated to the Parks and Recreation Department, there were several other questions that included the Parks and Recreation Department as one of the responses to the question. The following is a summary of the questions that were asked related to the satisfaction with the Parks and Recreation Department and the results:

Question #8 Which City department have you had the most contact with during the past year? The Parks and Recreation Department had the most frequent contact with survey participants. Twenty three percent (23%) of participants surveyed said they had the most contact with the Parks and Recreation Department. The responses showed that females had more contact with the Parks and Recreation Department than males did. 60% of the respondents that identified that they had the most contact with the Parks and Recreation Department were under the age of 45 years. Households with incomes between \$70,000-\$89,999 had the most contact.

Question #17 What information on the web site did you find most useful? The Parks and Recreation Department area of the website was mentioned as one of the two areas mentioned most often as useful. Twenty two percent (22%) of the respondents identified the Parks and Recreation Department's area of the web site as most useful. Only City News/Information was higher at twenty four percent (24%).

Question #22 If you or any members of your household have used City parks within the past 12 months, how would you rate the quality of the parks? A four point scale was used with a rating of 1 meaning poor, a rating of 2 meaning fair, a rating of 3 meaning good and a rating of 4 meaning excellent. 77% of the respondents said that the quality of parks was either good or excellent. 14% of the respondents said that they had not used the parks in the past year.

Question #23 Which type of park should be the top priority for development in Farmington during the next five years? Thirty one percent (31%) of the respondents felt that large community parks with athletic fields should be the top priority. Twenty seven percent (27%) of respondents said that natural or open space should be the top priority. Twenty seven percent (27%) of respondents said that neighborhood parks should be the top priority. Only nine percent (9%) of respondents said that small mini parks should be the top priority.

Question #24 In the past 12 months, if you or any of your household have participated in recreational programs offered by the City, how would you rate the experience? Again using a four point scale of 1 being poor and 4 being excellent, forty three percent (43%) of respondents felt that the experience was either good or excellent. Only six percent (6%) of respondents felt that the experience was either fair or poor. Surprisingly fifty one percent (51%) of the respondents had not participated in any recreational program offered by the City in the past year.

Question #25 If you or any members of your household have used any City trails in the last 12 months, how would you rate the quality of the trails?

Sixty six percent (61%) of respondents indicated that they would rate the quality of trails as either good or excellent. Only seven percent (7%) rated the quality of trails as either fair or poor. Twenty seven percent (27%) of respondents indicated that they had not used City trails in the past year.

Overall it appears that the community is satisfied with the types of services that the Parks and Recreation Department provides to the community. The survey seems to indicate a direction that should be taken including:

- 1. Increased marketing of recreational programs should be made to the community making the community more aware of what is offered in order to encourage more residents to participate.**
- 2. More diverse programs should be offered to the community in order to meet what appears to be a broad base of recreational interests in the community.**
- 3. Trails should be marketed more to the community, which should include educating the community about the City's trail system through the use of an updated trails map.**
- 4. When acquiring land for new City parks, larger parks should be the focus.**
- 5. The City should continue to focus on maintaining its existing parks in order to create safe and attractive parks that encourages the community to use them.**

4.6 Community Visioning

It is important that the community be given an opportunity to provide comments and input on creating a future vision of parks and recreation. Two primary methods were used to gather public input during the updating of the 2030 Master Plan. The first was by holding public meetings in the spring of 2007 that resulted in the community providing input on the vision that it wished to create for the 2030 Park and Recreation Master Plan. The second was through a questionnaire that was provided to youth sports groups through the Farmington Youth Athletic Association in order to gain information about their perceived recreational facility, parks, trails and recreation program needs. A summary of these two primary public input processes follows.

1. Public Open House Meetings

Public open houses were held in January and February 2007. During these visioning sessions, community members reviewed the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and were asked to evaluate the 2020 Comprehensive Plan policies. There were 10 primary goals that were identified in the 2020 Park and Recreation Master Plan that were reviewed above in this section. In addition to the these 10 goals, there were also strategies that addressed parks, trails, open space and recreation program under the over-arching 34 goals for the entire 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Participants were asked to select one of the three following choices: yes if the goal should be carried over into the 2030 Comprehensive Plan; no if the goal should not be carried over into the 2030 Comprehensive Plan; or no answer if they did not want to select either yes or no.

Participants who attended the public open house meetings overwhelmingly supported goals and strategies identifying the preservation of open space, natural areas and environmentally sensitive areas. In almost all situations more than 80% were in support of continuing to identify the

preservation of open space, natural areas and environmentally sensitive areas in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Most important elements cited that should be preserved were areas that contained steep slopes, streams, wooded areas, and wetlands.

Goals and strategies that contained reference to trail and sidewalk connections that are pedestrian friendly received a favorable response more than 80% of the time that participants approved carrying the goals and strategies related to trail and sidewalk connections over into the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Interestingly trails, sidewalks and pedestrian connections received the highest response on a strategy related to pedestrian friendly new neighborhoods where 97% of the participants felt that this should be carried over as a strategy for the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. More than 80% of participants responded favorably to having goals and strategies related to the preservation and protection of stream corridors as a greenway that would serve as a trail connection between parks, residential areas, schools and businesses.

Arts and culture did not seem to rank as high as a goal and strategy to carry over into the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. In almost all situations related to goals and strategies that dealt with arts and culture, typically 56% or less of participants felt that arts and culture goals and strategies should be carried over to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Participants felt that the goal of having 20 acres of parks per 1,000 residents should be carried over to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Regarding how many acres of park land should be attained by 2020, 66% of participants felt that the Goal of having 542 acres of park land by 2020 should be carried forward into the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

The community green idea for the Central District that was created in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan received very little support to be carried over as a goal or strategy. In most cases where the community green idea was identified in a goals or strategies, 30% or less of the participants favored it being part of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

A centrally located community or regional park seemed to be a goal that the participants favored as a future goal. In the four strategies developed for locating a community or regional park, the responses ranged from 78-85% in favor of carrying forward the idea of finding a location for a community or regional park as a goal in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding park and trail improvements, participants felt strongly about carrying over goals and objectives related to funding and making improvements to parks and trails. 78% favored addressing the continued evaluation of park improvements including identifying the improvements in a 5 year Capital Improvement Program. Strategies related to developing a variety of park facilities favorably scored between 83-85% to be continued as a goal in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Recreational facility improvements were also favored to be continued to be addressed in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The Rambling River Center expansion strategies that were identified scored between 80-83% to be carried forward. The future expansion of the Farmington Civic Arena goal received between a 66-77% favorable response to include in the 2030

Comprehensive Plan. Exploring construction of a water park or community center continues to be favored as a goal to include.

2. Input Questionnaire

Solicitation of input at the public open houses and from youth sports groups occurred through a four question survey that was provided at the first public visioning session and to the Farmington Youth Athletic Association (FYAA) member organizations. Youth sports organized under the FYAA umbrella include the following:

Traveling Baseball	In-House Baseball
Traveling Basketball	Hockey Association
Football	Volleyball Club
Tigersharks Swim Club	Traveling Soccer
Recreational Soccer	Tri-County Figure Skating Club
Girls Fastpitch Association	Track and Field/Cross Country
Wrestling Club	

There were nineteen surveys that were returned. The following four questions were asked on the survey:

1. Identify the three biggest issues facing parks, trails, recreational facilities and/or programs.

The most common responses to this question were the following:

- Shortage of outdoor recreational facilities
- Shortage of indoor recreational facilities
- Outdated recreational facilities

2. Identify three things that you like best about the City's parks, trails, recreational facilities and/or programs.

The most common responses to this question were as follows:

- Trails that connect the City of Farmington
- Adequate parks and locations
- Wide variety of good programs
- Well maintained natural areas & trails
- Facilities that are old but are kept clean and in good order

3. Identify three new things that should be added to the City's parks, trails, recreational facilities and/or programs either that we don't have or that we need more of.

The most common responses to this question were the following items:

- More Recreation Facilities/parks (for all seasons with full amenities, fields, outdoor rinks, warming houses, tennis courts etc.)
- More trails or sidewalks and parks

4. If you were to leave the City and come back in 25 years what changes in the parks, trails, recreational facilities and recreational programs would you expect to see.

The most common responses to this question were as follows:

- A community center
- Well maintained recreational facilities, parks & trails
- Preserved natural areas and the environment

As a result of this survey, the responses seem to indicate the following:

- there is interest in more indoor and outdoor recreational facilities being built in the City
- trails and parks are important to the community
- the City should acquire more parks that feature natural areas/open space so that they can be preserved for future use
- well maintained recreational facilities, parks and trails is important