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Introduction
1. INTRODUCTION

“Norfolk is dedicated to fulfilling the potential of the 21st century city: a place alive with people, enticing resources, and purposeful activity.” (City of Norfolk General Plan LC-1)

1.1 Parks Planning: A Sustainable Approach

The City of Norfolk has a wealth of assets including a rich history, incredible natural resources, an interconnected roadway network, great parks and strong neighborhoods. Like many older cities across the United States however, Norfolk is also facing a variety of urban challenges such as declining budgets for both capital improvements and maintenance; traffic congestion; an older housing stock; aging infrastructure; changing demographics and more stringent state and federal regulations. The City’s public realm – its parks, streets, natural areas, civic spaces, water access and trails – can at least partly address some of these issues to make the city more livable and sustainable. Thus, the purpose of the City of Norfolk Recreation System Master Plan is two-fold:

1) To identify improvements needed to meet residents’ top priority recreation, parks and open space needs; and,
2) To help solve some of the city’s most pressing urban problems and improve quality of life.

A community’s public realm can comprise as much as 40 percent of its land mass, including parks, conservation areas, civic spaces, streets, trails and greenways. Norfolk’s public realm amounts to closer to 50% of the city’s area because of its extensive waterways, parks, cemeteries, beach, and transportation network. Typically the public realm also includes a variety of recreation, education and social programs. When managed as a system and not as individual elements, the public realm provides an unparalleled platform from which to affect improvements in a community’s economic, social and environmental sustainability.

Despite the challenging economic times, the City of Norfolk Recreation System Master Plan has the potential to make both an immediate and long-term impact on improving residents’ quality of life. The key is to integrate the planning and design of the public realm with other city systems such as streets, utilities, stormwater, schools and libraries. Through strategic, incremental improvements that leverage available resources and generate multiple benefits, the Recreation Master Plan provides a framework for capitalizing on the city’s public realm for the quality of life of both today’s residents and future generations.

Top: The tidal river at Poplar Halls Park.
Bottom: Youth sports provide an opportunity for building community.
1.2 Relationship to Other Plans

A major component of sustainability is ensuring that different planning initiatives are in sync and support one another rather than duplicate or even contradict each other. The City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan relates to several planning efforts previously completed by the City, or are currently underway.

**Norfolk Recreation, Parks and General Services Comprehensive Master Recreation Plan**

In 1998, the City contracted with PROS consultants to create the Norfolk Recreation, Parks and General Services Comprehensive Master Plan. The plan identified seven “Key Issues”, including the need to: expand leisure services to underserved populations; improve existing facilities and build new facilities; develop effective partnerships; expand the operating hours of the recreation centers; expand and improve marketing; and provide safe access to recreation opportunities by public transportation. The 1998 plan addresses these key issues through a number of recommended partnerships and redistribution of services. Some of the challenges discussed in the plan—such as transitioning a system based on a 1950s model of recreation services to a 21st-century model—continue to be relevant. Although the plan was never adopted, the Department of Recreation, Parks and Open Space (RPOS) has made strides in addressing the key issues, such as building new recreation facilities like the Norview and Lamberts Point Community Centers; improving and expanding existing facilities such as Lake Taylor soccer fields and the Northside Park softball field; and improving marketing opportunities through the *Good Times* publication.

**City of Norfolk General Plan**

The General Plan for the City was approved in 1992. Elements include Economic Development, Housing, Transportation, Environmental Quality, Community Design, Caring Community, Living Community and Neighborhood Planning.

In the General Plan, the vision for Norfolk’s future is based on six themes:

- “A City representing historic American values, with a sense of history and the leadership to make history.
- “A City attuned to the world, acting as a gateway for commerce, people, investment, and ideas between the United States and the world, especially Asia and a united Europe.
- “A City of the sea with great importance as a naval harbor; an international, intracoastal, and pleasure port; an oceanographic research center; and a primary distribution point for the bounty of the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Ocean.
- “A City where people are neighborly and outgoing, where government is accessible and responsive to the needs of its citizens, and where citizens participate willingly, generously, and responsibly in meeting the needs of the community.
- “A City enlivened by diversity; enriched by cultural and educational institutions and activities; enhanced by attractive and soothing green spaces and private landscapes, inspiring architecture, and livable neighborhoods; and generously endowed with opportunities for memorable experiences and scenes.
• “A City which offers opportunities to all of its citizens to share fully in life’s experiences, including educational, cultural, and economic, with special attention to the needs of the underprivileged.” (VN-1)

The General Plan also notes “recurring development themes” such as the role of water in shaping the city; the importance of history; the sense of identity in the neighborhoods; and the importance of the parks system in preserving a high quality of life. And though there is emphasis on the special character of Norfolk, an important message reiterated throughout the General Plan is the need for Norfolk to be the regional leader of Hampton Roads. The document notes the importance of working together with the other communities in the metro area—Suffolk, Chesapeake, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth, Hampton and Newport News—to create a regional synergy that will make the area a focal point of the Mid-Atlantic.

The Living Community Element of the General Plan directly addresses quality of life in Norfolk through four key policy areas: recreation and open space; culture and entertainment, education, and libraries. Specific recreation and open space policies are stated as follows:

Goal: Maintain and expand recreation opportunities on both the community and neighborhood level.

Policies for 2000
• Improve current recreation and open space resources.
• Create and develop new open space and recreational areas.
• Protect existing recreation inventory.
• Continue to use public school sites as recreation resources.
• Ensure that recreation programs and facilities meet the changing needs of Norfolk’s citizens.
• Develop beneficial partnerships for the creation and use of more recreational space.
• Require usable open space in new development.
• Develop pedestrian walkways in strategic areas.
• Promote active and passive access to water resources.
• Give priority to underserved areas in Norfolk.
• Explore expanded use of bicycle/pedestrian routes as part of the recreation network.

Policies for 2020
• Concentrate on needs of neighborhoods and individual citizens.
• Explore a regional approach for the provision of major recreation spaces.
• Expand partnerships in the provision of recreation space.

This Recreation Master Plan will support the General Plan’s recreation and open space goal and policies, and will serve as a tool to update the Living Community Element. The plan will also support the visions, goals and policies of the General Plan’s other elements, particularly in the following:

• Economic Development. The Economic Development Element maps a number of major employment centers scattered through the community, illustrating that Norfolk is not a concentric city with a single core, but one with multiple “hubs.” The Recreation Master Plan can help support those hubs through providing alternative transportation options to, from, and between these employment centers and the neighborhoods. Other pertinent aspects of the
Element include a commitment to improving the quality of development throughout the city; improving workers’ education; reinforcing downtown as the focal point of the region; maximizing the use of the waterfront; and enhancing tourism and culture.

- **Housing.** The Housing Element focuses on neighborhood identity, diversity, and stability. The Recreation Master Plan can support neighborhood vitality through bicycle and pedestrian access to open space and recreation at the neighborhood level, and through stewardship of the public realm.

- **Transportation.** The Transportation Element is heavily based on automobile travel and enhancing the highways and roadways for greater mobility. The Recreation Master Plan is an opportunity to update this Element to reflect the idea of “Complete Streets”, which are streets that are designed and operated to enable safe access for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and drivers. It is also an opportunity to support the development of the light rail line through providing linkages to the stations and quality public spaces at train stops.

- **Environmental Quality.** The Environmental Quality Element contains goals on air and water quality, energy consumption and the conservation of natural resources. Goals of particular relevance to the Recreation Master Plan include:

  - “Protect, enhance, restore, and manage wetlands, beaches, sand dunes, forests and other ecosystems including remaining waterfowl and wildlife habitats”;
  - “Improve and maintain public access to city waterways including public beaches, parks, and natural areas”; and,
  - “Develop, promote, and manage a greenway and open space preservation program throughout the city which provides protection to open space and environmentally sensitive areas.” (EQ-14 – 15)

- **Community Design.** The Community Design Element reflects the interest and investment Norfolk has already placed in creating a well-designed, beautiful city. The Element concentrates on 13 aspects of community design: design awareness; architectural harmony; quality public buildings; unifying accessible streetscapes and attractive urban landscaping; the importance of water; the expansion of historic preservation efforts; improved site plan/design review; wayfinding; the elevation of urban heritage and public art; the enhancement of neighborhood identity; and the improvement of property maintenance. All 13 community design foci are essential components in cultivating the long-term vision for the parks and open space system of Norfolk.

- **Neighborhood Planning.** The city has a long history of neighborhood planning. For every neighborhood with its own plan, the Recreation Master Plan will support their visions and goals through the provision of accessible open space.

**Five-Year Proposed Capital Improvements Program (CIP)**
The City provided a list of proposed park improvements for 2010 through 2014. In addition to improvements to existing neighborhood parks, community parks, and community centers, projects included in the CIP are:
FY 2010: Construction of a new skate park; construction of a new park for Westside neighborhoods; construction of a gymnasium at Ingleside; renovation of Lake Taylor soccer fields; and construction of an indoor aquatic facility in Southside.

FY 2011: Plan and construct Therapeutic Recreation Center; additional renovations to Lake Taylor soccer fields.

These projects have been incorporated into the Recreation Master Plan in Section 4, Vision.

Trust for Public Land (TPL) Study: “The Parks System of Norfolk, VA”

One particular study of note was the Trust for Public Land’s report, “The Parks System of Norfolk, VA” from February, 2005. This study was commissioned by the Bay Oaks Parks Committee with the purpose of comparing Norfolk’s parks system to that of other communities. It found that Norfolk lacks the park acreage of comparable cities and that RPOS is under-funded and stretched too thin to cover its responsibilities. As part of its recommendations, the study strongly urged the City to acquire the Bay Oaks maritime forest property to help meet open space demands in the community.

Other Documents

Other materials reviewed prior to the Recreation Master Plan process included the annexation map of Norfolk; elementary, middle, and high school attendance zone maps; a map of the Elizabeth River Trail; the General Plan Land Use Update map; the Downtown Norfolk Pattern Book; the Greater Wards Corner Comprehensive Plan; a demographic profile of Norfolk and Hampton Roads; the approved species list for trees on new and existing streets; the Wards/Superwards map; the Norfolk Zoning Ordinance; the Five Points Corridor concept; a list of RPOS partnerships; the recreation centers’ hours of operation; a parks and forest atlas, including maintenance responsibilities; an inventory of park and school amenities; RPOS organizational charts; and various neighborhood plans. Census Tract Data from the 2000 United States Census was also evaluated.

1.3 Planning Process and Approach

In May 2008 the City of Norfolk issued a Request for Proposals to create a Recreation Master Plan. The intent of the project was to serve as “a planning and development guideline to assist the City in meeting its cumulative park and recreation needs and trends over the next ten (10+) years.”

The Recreation Master Plan was created between June 2009 and September 2010. Following are the steps and deliverables of the planning process, and the section of this document in which each is discussed:

Section 1: Introduction
- Review of existing data – the first step was a review of existing City of Norfolk documents and plans that formed the groundwork of the Recreation Master Plan.
- Kick-off meeting – City of Norfolk staff and AECOM staff met to kick off the project in June 2009 and refine the project schedule and deliverables.

Section 2: Community Context
- Creation of a basemap – Using data provided by the City, AECOM produced a multi-layered basemap that served as the graphic foundation of the Recreation Master Plan.
• **Population/demographic analysis** – Using data from the 2000 Census and additional research conducted by the City, AECOM reviewed Norfolk’s demographic information and analyzed its implications for parks and recreation planning.

**Section 3: Needs Assessment**

• **Existing system analysis** – In September 2009, AECOM and City staff members visited over 40 park sites and evaluated each for access, comfort and image, and sociability.

• **Qualitative needs assessment techniques** – Also in September 2009, AECOM facilitated two public workshops to gather public comment on recreation needs; one focus group workshop; and three days of stakeholder interviews.

• **Quantitative needs assessment techniques** – In addition to qualitative techniques, AECOM conducted a service area analysis for eight major facility types to determine gaps in access. Additionally, LeisureVision/ETC led a survey of residents conducted by mail and telephone.

• **City-wide boat ramp assessment** – Local engineers Moffat & Nichol conducted a boat ramp assessment in August, 2009 of five City-operated boat ramps: Willoughby, Haven Creek, 45th Street, Harbor Park, and Lafayette City Park.

• **Needs assessment presentation** – AECOM presented the findings of the needs assessment to the City Managers’ Office in January 2010.

**Section 4: Vision**

• **Visioning workshop** – AECOM facilitated a visioning workshop from January 12th to 14th, 2010, that focused on seven sub-systems: athletic facilities, water access, community centers, therapeutic recreation, bikeways and trails, community character, programs, and operations & maintenance. The workshop was led by key staff members and the AECOM planning team.

• **Creation of a conceptual parks system vision map** – Based on input from the visioning workshop, AECOM created a conceptual parks system vision map and reviewed it with City staff.

**Section 5: Implementation Strategy**

• **Order of magnitude estimate of probable construction cost** – Based on the improvements shown in the parks system vision map, AECOM prepared an order of magnitude estimate of probable construction cost.
• **Presentation to Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee** – In May 2010, AECOM presented the draft plan to the Norfolk Planning Commission and Recreation Advisory Committee for input.

• **Implementation workshop** – In July 2010, AECOM facilitated a half-day workshop to establish funding priorities, identify funding sources and discuss changes to the CIP and other documents.

• **Implementation strategy** – Based on results from the Implementation workshop, AECOM drafted an implementation strategy.

At the completion of the implementation strategy, AECOM submitted a draft report to City staff in July, 2010 for review. Once staff comments were addressed and the document revised, the plan was posted on the City of Norfolk website for a three-week public comment period. AECOM then incorporated public comments and final staff comments into the final report, which was submitted to the City in March, 2011.
Community Context
2 COMMUNITY CONTEXT

To successfully plan for the future parks and recreation system, it is important to understand Norfolk’s community context. This section is an overview of the following:

2.1 Community History and Historic Resources
2.2 Population and Social Resources
2.3 Economic Resources
2.4 Transportation Systems
2.5 Environmental Resources

2.1 Community History and Historic Resources

The beauty and natural resources of Hampton Roads have long attracted people to the area—in fact, there is evidence that humans have lived in Norfolk since as early as 9500 B.C. Around the time of European arrival, the Chesapeake tribe dominated the area and had established a town called Scicoak at the present site of Norfolk.

In the early 1600s, small settlements began to emerge in Virginia. The first records of European settlement in Norfolk are from this time, with 500 acres (present-day Ocean View) granted to Thomas Willoughby in 1624. By 1636, present-day downtown Norfolk was granted to William Willoughby, and ferry service began along the Elizabeth River. In the following decades, Lower Norfolk County constructed its first courthouse on Broad Creek, which was later replaced by one on the Elizabeth River and then another on the Lynnhaven River at the southern end of Great Neck. At present-day Town Point Park, Half Moon Fort was built in 1673. By 1736, Norfolk officially incorporated into its own borough.

Because of its strategic location on the Chesapeake Bay, Norfolk was the site of numerous conflicts during the Revolutionary War. In 1776, English ships open fired on the city and burnt many of the buildings to the ground; Colonial troops completed the destruction of the city so that the British could not occupy the site. Norfolk was the only American town completely destroyed in the Revolution and rebuilt—a cannonball in the wall at St. Paul’s Church is a testament to this period. Despite the destruction, the population of the city was nearly 3,000 by 1790.

The 19th century was significant in the growth of Norfolk. In 1801, the first Continental Navy Yard was established in the city. Military presence increased when Fort Norfolk was constructed along the Elizabeth River in 1810, on a site used as a fortification during the Revolutionary War. Additional trade routes were established when the Dismal Swamp Canal opened in 1814, providing easy access between Norfolk and the coastal towns of North Carolina. It was also in this period that the city began to modernize, and street lamps were installed for the first time.

By the 1820s, the city was forging new links with nearby cities, including slow-moving steam boats serving as ferries to Portsmouth, and eventually steam ferries in the 1830s. As Norfolk grew in population, the landscape of the city began to change, and waterways were filled in to provide more room for development. In 1845 Norfolk incorporated as a city, and two years later the cornerstone was...
laid for City Hall, which is now the MacArthur Memorial. In the following decade, an 80-mile railroad connecting Norfolk to Petersburg was completed, literally laying the tracks for today's Norfolk Southern Railroad.

Despite prosperity, the mid-19th century also brought disasters upon Norfolk. In 1855 the steamship Ben Franklin arrived in Hampton Roads with the yellow fever virus onboard. Though half of the city fled, the disease spurred an epidemic that took the lives of about 2,000 people—over one third of Norfolk’s population. The start of the Civil War six years later also brought destruction to the area, when vessels in Portsmouth’s Navy Yard were burned and scuttled. One of the most famous naval battles of the Civil War—the Monitor versus the Merrimac—was fought in Hampton Roads, and represented the first battle between ironclad ships. By 1862 Norfolk fell to Union troops, who occupied the city until 1865.

Reconstruction following the Civil War happened quickly for Norfolk. The recovery was speeded by the area’s waterways and rich farmland, and the railroads were once again opened for the transport of coal to the port. In 1870 the Norfolk and Petersburg Railroad consolidated with other companies to become Norfolk and Western. Horse-drawn trolleys were introduced as a way to get around the city, and in 1879 a narrow gauge railroad connected Ocean View to the railroad terminus at Church and Henry Streets. A few years later, a 19-mile railroad was constructed between Norfolk and Virginia Beach. These improved transportation connections allowed the city to grow outward; in 1887, Brambleton was annexed, followed by Atlantic City (now the Sixth Ward) in 1890. In the same year, the Ghent Company laid out its residential area and renamed Smith’s Creek “The Hague.” By 1894, an electric trolley began operation in the city, and eventually linked the heart of the city to Sewell’s Point, Ocean View, South Norfolk, Berkley, Portsmouth and Pinner’s Point. By 1902, Park Place was annexed, followed by Berkley in 1906 and Huntersville and Lambert’s Point in 1911.

The early 1900s in Norfolk were host to interesting events, such as the 1907 Jamestown Exposition at Sewell’s Point that celebrated the 300th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown. The Exposition fair grounds were later redeveloped into the U.S. Naval Operating Base and Training Station in 1917. Norfolk reportedly led the nation in per-capita recruiting for the U.S. Navy during World War I.
Following the War, the City continued to grow. In 1921, Virginia Beach Boulevard was completed, which connected Norfolk to the City of Virginia Beach. Norfolk underwent another annexation to include Ocean View, Larchmont and Lafayette, which added another 27 square miles to the city. In the 1930s, the Norfolk campus of Virginia Union University—the predecessor to Norfolk State University—opened. Just three years later, the city’s municipal airport opened on the Truxton Manor Golf Course tract.
With the coming of World War II, increased defense activities caused Norfolk’s population to burgeon until it nearly doubled. Interestingly, this was also the time that the United States Housing Administration (USHA) earmarked $2 million for slum clearance in Norfolk. In 1949 Norfolk became one of the first cities in the country to be assigned an allocation of public housing units. This marked a significant turn in the city’s development, along with the replacement of the city’s streetcars with buses.

The evolution of Norfolk continued with a number of bridge programs, including the 1952 opening of the Downtown-Portsmouth Bridge Tunnel, followed by additional tunnels in the 1960s. The historic Berkley Bridge was demolished in the process. The tunnels also marked the end of the ferry era; ferry service from Norfolk to Portsmouth that had been established as far back as 1636 was discontinued.

The 1950s in Norfolk were a time of great civil unrest, in a movement now referred to as Massive Resistance. In 1955 African-American parents petitioned the Norfolk School Board to organize the schools without regard to race. In 1958, the governor closed six schools to stop their integration, but the following year Norfolk’s schools completely desegregated.

Since the 1960s, Norfolk’s major changes have involved its continued growth as a port and center for the region. In 1966 the Norfolk International Terminals were built, which are some of the most complex operations in the nation for steamship, rail, and track carriers with international cargo. In 1972, the City completed its convention center (COPE) and the cultural center of Chrysler Hall. The following decade, Norfolk and Western and Southern railways consolidated and moved headquarters to Norfolk. A year later Waterside opened as a festival marketplace. Two major downtown investments occurred in the 1990s: the construction of the National Marine Center (Nauticus) and the opening of the MacArthur Center Mall.

Today, Norfolk is recognized as the cultural and transportation hub of the Hampton Roads Region, and continues its identity as a major port and military city.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

With more than 400 years of history, Norfolk’s historic resources are primarily located close to the original city center near the water. Settlement began in the Norfolk area in the early 17th century, and the subsequent layers of history have created a varied and vibrant built environment. Some of the oldest remaining structures in Norfolk are clustered in the East and West Freemason districts or are early farmhouses scattered throughout what is now Norfolk, but was at the time rural land. Many significant antebellum structures remaining are around downtown, now markers of Norfolk’s prominence as a seaport during this time. Following the Civil War fine commercial buildings were constructed in downtown, along Granby Street in particular. These structures are in today’s Downtown District.

By the end of the 18th century, a growing population and increasing wealth in the city necessitated more housing, and developers began buying land on which to build. Around this time, with the expansion of streetcar lines, an explosion of suburban growth occurred. Many of the communities now listed on the National Register were built during this time, c. 1900 – 1930. These neighborhoods include Ballentine Place, Colonial Place, Park Place, Riverview, Lafayette Residence Park and Winona.

Outside of the central business district and these inner-ring neighborhoods, Norfolk contains historic resources that are not currently included in a district or listed on the National Register. A survey
completed in 1997 is the most recent assessment of the city’s historic resources. The survey, however, was not comprehensive; it was meant to be representative and organized around the 18 historical themes determined by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR). As a result, the survey covered 800 buildings at a reconnaissance level and 55 at a more intensive level. The total number of buildings in Norfolk at the time numbered about 61,000. The survey report recommended additional work to identify historic industrial buildings, 1950s commercial and institutional buildings, war-time housing, and historic bridges in particular. In addition to the neighborhoods of East Freemason, West Freemason and Ghent that were already on the Register, the survey identified nine additional historic districts in Norfolk:

- Ballentine Place
- Berkley North
- Chesterfield Heights
- Colonial Place
- Lafayette Residence Park
- North Ghent
- Park Place
- Riverview
- Winona

In addition to these neighborhoods, the city currently has 32 individual historic sites listed on the National Register.

Other Historic Resources of Note
Three other historic sites or resources that are important to note are Fort Norfolk, the Cannonball Trail, and the Norfolk Botanical Garden.

Fort Norfolk is the last of 19 harbor ports that George Washington authorized to protect the nation’s coastline. The Fort consists of a four-acre site overlooking the Elizabeth River, and has earthwork embankments, ramparts, a dungeon, officers’ quarters, a powder magazine, barracks, and a guardhouse. Most of the surviving elements of the fort date to 1810. The site has witnessed a number of historic events, such as the War of 1812; seizure by the Confederacy to supply the CSS Virginia (Merrimack) in the famous battle with the USS Monitor; and its recapture by the Union for use as a prison. Since 1923, the fort has been occupied and managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The Norfolk Historical Society began restoration of the site in 1991, and is currently working with ACOE to provide more public access and interpretation of the site to be included on the Cannonball and Elizabeth River Trails.

The Cannonball Trail is a downtown self-guided walking tour developed by the Norfolk Convention & Visitors Bureau. The approximately three-mile trail encompasses 40 attractions, including heritage sites and narrative plaques. Currently the brochure detailing the route is not available online. Although the trail route is developed, it has yet to be marketed widely. Once the light rail construction is completed, the trail will be marked more consistently and will be easier to follow.
A third place of interest is the Norfolk Botanical Garden. Located in the northern section of the city near the Norfolk International Airport, the site began life as a Works Progress Administration (WPA) project called Azalea Gardens. The major objective of all WPA projects was to create jobs; because many of the city’s labor force was already involved in other WPA projects, about 200 African-American women and 20 African-American men built the gardens in 1938. The work to turn 155 overgrown, swampy acres into a pristine garden was back-breaking, but by March 1939 the work force had planted 4,000 azaleas, 2,000 rhododendrons, and several thousand camellias in a garden that expressed the design trends of the 1930s. Today the site has over 30 thematic gardens and is a repository for a large number of art pieces.

CULTURAL RESOURCES
In 2006, the City of Norfolk established a Department of Cultural Affairs. The agency is housed in the historic Selden Arcade, built in 1930. The Arcade serves as the city’s cultural arts center, and includes the community arts initiative the d’Art Center, a number of galleries, eateries, and shops. In addition to the Selden Arcade, the city has a number of important cultural resources of note.

Museums
For a city of its size, Norfolk is richly endowed with museums. The most prominent museum in Norfolk is the Chrysler Museum of Art. Founded in 1939 as the Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences, the Museum grew immensely in 1971 when Walter P. Chrysler Jr. donated his art collection. Today the museum houses more than 40,000 objects spanning over 5,000 years of history. In addition, the Chrysler Museum also oversees two historic house museums, the Moses-Myers House and the Norfolk History Museum at the Willoughby-Baylor House. Two other historic museums of note include the Hermitage Foundation, a 1908 summer house that contains a substantial art collection and a number of other history and art programs; and the Hunter House Victorian Museum.

The city also has museums that relate to Norfolk’s military heritage. Of particular note are Nauticus and the National Maritime Center. Nauticus is a contemporary museum that celebrates global maritime commerce within the setting of Norfolk’s waters. In addition to a number of permanent and special collections, it includes the battleship USS Wisconsin, one of the largest ships ever built by the U.S. Navy. Smaller museums throughout the city also celebrate Norfolk’s military or maritime history, such as the General Douglas MacArthur Memorial and the Tugboat Museum.
Arts & Entertainment Facilities
The city has a number of arts and entertainment facilities, including galleries, theaters and several arts organizations including the Virginia Ballet Theater, the Virginia Opera, and the Virginia Stage Company. Major venues include the Attucks Cultural Center, Scope Chrysler Hall, and the Selden Arcade.

Libraries
The City of Norfolk has an extensive library system. In addition to the Main Library downtown, the City operates 11 branches throughout Norfolk and a bookmobile. The current Main Library location is an interim location as plans move forward to construct the 180,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art Slover Library complex near the Selden Arcade.

Special Events and Festivals
Most of Norfolk’s major festivals and special events are organized by Festevents, Ltd, a private, non-profit organization that produces celebrations for the City of Norfolk. It is also the official event marketing and production agency for the City. Major events include Harborfest; Bayou Boogaloo Ball & Cajun Food Festival; the Azalea Festival; and the Virginia Beer Festival. A complete listing of events can be found on the Festevents website. Most events are held at Town Point Park or Ocean View Park, but occasionally smaller events are held at churches throughout the community.

The Public Art Program
Norfolk’s Public Art Commission was established in 2006. It operates with the goal of providing Norfolk a blend of significant, timeless art that is appropriate to its context. Primary goals include interweaving art with the urban fabric; creating a unique image and sense of place; celebrating historic events and persons; and inspiring, educating and beautifying public places. The City Capital Improvement budget allocates one percent of all construction projects over $500,000 to be contributed for the purpose of public art.
From top: Harborfest; Armed Forces Memorial; parking garage public art installation.
Currently there are two major concentrations of public art in Norfolk: downtown and the Botanical Gardens. The Public Art Program has produced interactive, online maps for both of these areas to help those interested locate the works of art. In recent years the Public Art Program has pursued a number of community arts projects and installations in every-day spaces such as the City’s parking garages.

The Public Art Program currently has a number of projects under contract, including installations at the following locations:

- Town Point Park
- The Zoo
- Coleman Place Elementary School
- Norview Community Center
- Parking Garage 2009
- Armed Forces Memorial
- Lambert’s Point Community Center
- Selden Arcade

Public art in-progress includes coordination with the new light rail system in installing station art and larger pieces; art in commemoration of the end of Massive Resistance; and the Courthouse. Future work plan project sites include the following:

- MacArthur Square
- Crossroads Elementary School
- Police Precinct
- East Church Street Brewery
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center
- Northside Park
- Norview Community Center
- Broad Creek Linear Park
- Southside Aquatic Facility
- 2010 Parking Garage Program
- Slover Library

**IMPlications FOR Parks AND Recreation Planning**

Historic and cultural resources and parks and open spaces have a symbiotic relationship: parks can serve as venues for the arts, and are likewise enlivened by celebrating a community's arts, heritage, and culture.

- In Norfolk, some parks are already primary cultural arts venues, such as Town Point Park, Ocean View Park, and the Norfolk Botanical Garden. As the public art program expands, additional parks and recreation facilities will also serve as places to enjoy the city’s history and culture.
• There is a major opportunity in the future to make Fort Norfolk part of the city’s park system.
• The large stock of historic structures and neighborhoods in Norfolk is remarkable; there is an opportunity for walking tours and programs to be created that get people outside exploring their city while also exercising.
• Additional partnerships can be made with existing museums and cultural centers to coordinate programming and provide unique venues in the city’s public spaces, or incorporate additional arts and culture programming through the city’s recreation centers.

There may be opportunities in the future to preserve and adaptively re-use vulnerable historic structures to become part of the parks and recreation system.

2.2 Population and Social Resources

Parks systems are not “one size fits all”—what works well for one community may not serve the needs of another. In fact, different populations can have vastly different parks and recreation needs. Young children, for example, need smaller parks and playgrounds near their homes, whereas residents in their 20s and 30s tend to want dog parks, trails, and places for special events. There is also research showing how different ethnic groups have different parks preferences; one study of Chicago residents showed strong evidence that African-Americans tend to prefer parks that are more programmed, whereas Caucasians showed a greater preference for more natural areas. While it would be unwise to make conclusions based solely on these general trends, it is essential to understand the population that the parks and recreation system is meant to serve, and how that population is expected to shift over time.

Unless noted otherwise, this demographic analysis of the City of Norfolk is based on United States Census data from the year 2000 compiled by the market research company Nielsen Claritas®. A number of population characteristics of Norfolk were examined:

• Population and Growth
• Racial Diversity
• Age
• Education
• Households
• Employment and Commuting

As a point of reference, data for Norfolk is compared to the neighboring Hampton Roads cities of Newport News, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach and to state-wide numbers. A discussion of how Norfolk’s population characteristics affect planning for parks, recreation, and open space summarizes the findings of this analysis.

**POPULATION AND GROWTH**

According to Chart 2.1a, Norfolk’s population appears to have been fairly stable between 2000 and 2009 and is making modest gains—the 2009 population is estimated at 235,638, and 2014 projections show a population of 237,031. Compared with the rest of the Hampton Roads region, this gain is slightly larger than that expected in Newport News and Portsmouth, but is substantially smaller than the growth anticipated in Suffolk and Virginia Beach.
From 1990 to 2000, the population of Norfolk decreased by 10.27 percent, from 261,229 residents to 234,403. This is somewhat comparable to Portsmouth but contrasts with the positive growth seen in Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and statewide. The decline in population did not affect all areas of Norfolk equally. Map 2.1a shows that the decline was not universal, and that many neighborhoods achieved significant growth between 1990 and 2000; numbers on the map correspond to areas mentioned in this narrative. The area of the highest population gain was near the Norfolk International Airport at Lake Taylor (9). Other strong areas of growth included the Industrial Park (10) and Middletown Arch (11); Downtown and Ghent (17); Lambert’s Point (24); Lakewood (25); and Talbot Hall/Suburban Acres (26 and 27). Areas that experienced a decline in population include the Naval Base (1); West Ocean View (2, 3, and 4); Roosevelt Gardens (5); East Ocean View (6, 7, and 8); Oakmont (28); Campostella Heights (13); Campostella (12); Berkley (14); Brambleton (14, 15); ODU/Park Place (21, 22, 23); and Huntersville (19).
Racial Diversity
Of the five cities' data examined, Norfolk has the closest to an even split in race: 48.36 percent of the population is White/Caucasian, whereas 44.11 percent is Black/African-American. Norfolk’s Asian, Hispanic, and other racial groups’ percentages are comparable to the rest of Virginia.

Figure 2.2b Race in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>45.84</td>
<td>53.82</td>
<td>71.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black, African-Am.</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>39.07</td>
<td>50.61</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>18.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian Alone</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age
The age profile of Norfolk’s population does not substantially deviate from the statewide averages. The exception is that Norfolk has a noticeably large percentage of residents aged 21 to 34 (26.04 percent) compared to the state and other Hampton Roads cities, Portsmouth excluded. This is likely because the Naval Base attracts a large population of young adults. Likewise, Norfolk’s percentage of residents between 35 to 49, and 50 to 64, is comparatively lower than other communities in the area that are less influenced by a military presence.

Figure 2.2c Age in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Age 0 - 4</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 5 - 9</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 10 - 14</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 15 - 20</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 21 - 34</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>22.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 35 - 49</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>24.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 50 - 64</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>12.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 - 84</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Over Age 84</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education
The education levels attained by Norfolk residents are comparable to those in Newport News, Portsmouth, and Suffolk. Almost 30 percent of Norfolk’s population’s educational level is a high school diploma, and 11.9 percent have a bachelor's degree. Generally, the education levels attained by Norfolk residents are lower than residents of Virginia Beach and the state.
Households
Norfolk has a lower percentage of family households than other Hampton Roads communities and the statewide average. This is likely because of the high percentage housed in group quarters: according to the 2000 Census, there were 23,289 Norfolk residents in group housing, which amounts to over one-tenth of Virginia’s total group quarters population. This unusual household composition is likely due to large number of people residing in barracks at the Naval Base. The presence of the Naval Base—and its large number of young, single people—is also reflected in a comparatively lower percentage of households with children.

Figure 2.2e Households in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Est. Households</td>
<td>86,010</td>
<td>73,601</td>
<td>38,344</td>
<td>31,232</td>
<td>162,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>86,210</td>
<td>69,686</td>
<td>38,170</td>
<td>23,283</td>
<td>154,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>89,478</td>
<td>64,102</td>
<td>38,741</td>
<td>18,516</td>
<td>135,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Growth 1990-2000</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>+ 8.71</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>+ 25.75</td>
<td>+ 13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Family Households</td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td>66.52</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>71.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Family Households</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>33.48</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Households with Children</td>
<td>34.90</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters Pop.</td>
<td>23,289</td>
<td>5833</td>
<td>4814</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>7683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Size</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Income</td>
<td>$43,025</td>
<td>$44,926</td>
<td>$41,556</td>
<td>$50,844</td>
<td>$60,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$32,214</td>
<td>$37,034</td>
<td>$33,983</td>
<td>$41,392</td>
<td>$48,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$17,372</td>
<td>$17,843</td>
<td>$16,507</td>
<td>$18,836</td>
<td>$22,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Families below Poverty Level</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 2.1e also illustrates the disparity in income between Norfolk/Portsmouth and the rest of the region and the state. Norfolk’s median income is $32,214, compared to $37,034 in Newport News; $41,392 in Suffolk; and $48,871 in Virginia Beach. The combination of a smaller percentage of family households and lower income levels leads to a comparatively larger total percentage of families at or below the poverty line—about 14.67 percent of Norfolk’s families in 2000 were below the poverty line, compared to 11.31 in Newport News, 10.78 in Suffolk, 5.09 in Virginia Beach, and 6.99 statewide.

**Employment & Commuting**

Unsurprisingly, Norfolk has a high percentage of residents employed in the armed forces: 14.81 percent compared to 9.68 in Virginia Beach, 7.23 in Newport News, 5.57 in Portsmouth, and as low as 2.96 in Suffolk. Overall, the Hampton Roads region has a dramatically larger percentage of residents in the armed forces compared to the statewide percentage of 2.37 percent. In 2000, Norfolk had a slightly higher rate of unemployment (4.69 percent) compared to Newport News at 3.40; Suffolk at 2.96, Virginia Beach at 2.57, and the statewide average at 2.73.

**Figure 2.2f Employment Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% In Armed Forces</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Civilian - Employed</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>57.65</td>
<td>60.67</td>
<td>61.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Civilian - Unemployed</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also of interest is the transportation mode that residents use to travel to work, and their typical travel times. Generally the more urbanized a community is, the smaller the percentage of people who drive alone. Of those Norfolk residents who worked in 2000, two-thirds drove alone to work, 14.2 percent carpooled, 4.59 percent took public transportation, and 6.78 percent walked. The percentage of people who did not travel by personal vehicle is significantly larger in Norfolk than the other Hampton Roads communities and the statewide averages, indicating a more urban, dense city infrastructure.
Figure 2.2g Commuting Modes and Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>66.77</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>72.85</td>
<td>80.41</td>
<td>82.03</td>
<td>77.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-Pooled</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Means</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Less than 15 Minutes</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 15 - 29 Minutes</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 30 - 44 Minutes</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 45 - 59 Minutes</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 60 or more Minutes</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Average Travel Time (Minutes)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing
The data on housing in Norfolk is consistent with a young, mobile population: 45.51 percent of housing is owner-occupied, compared to 52.4 percent in Newport News, 58.57 in Portsmouth, and 72.22 in Suffolk. This is also significantly lower than the statewide average of 68.09 percent. However, the Norfolk residents’ average length of housing tenure (10 years) is the same as the state’s average and could indicate that a large percentage of the population settles in Norfolk for extensive periods, and offsets the percentage of those stationed at the Naval Base and others who stay for shorter periods.

Figure 2.2h Housing Occupancy, Tenure, and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>65.59</td>
<td>68.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>31.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Length of Residence (Years)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Owner Occupied Housing Value</td>
<td>$89,669</td>
<td>$94,286</td>
<td>$81,243</td>
<td>$104,746</td>
<td>$124,635</td>
<td>$120,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2.2h illustrates differences in property values. The median value of owner-occupied housing in Norfolk in 2000 was $89,669, and is greater than that of Portsmouth ($81,243) but falls short of Suffolk ($104,746) and Virginia Beach ($124,635). The larger percentage of renter-occupied units and lower housing values is reflected in the type of residential structures in Norfolk; Chart 2.2i shows the City has a comparatively smaller percentage of single-unit, detached homes, which are typically the most expensive housing type. Another potential reason for Norfolk’s comparatively lower housing value is that its structures are older, with a median built year of 1959. Although older homes do not always have lower values than newer homes, their relative age does mean they have had more time to deteriorate and develop maintenance issues.
Figure 2.2i Building Type and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORFOLK</th>
<th>NEWPORT NEWS</th>
<th>PORTSMOUTH</th>
<th>SUFFOLK</th>
<th>VA BEACH</th>
<th>STATE-WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% 1 Unit Attached</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 1 Unit Detached</td>
<td>47.94</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>78.34</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 2 Units</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 3 - 19 Units</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 20 - 49 Units</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 50 or more Units</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Mobile Homes</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built after 1999</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built 1990 - 1999</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built 1960 - 1969</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built 1950 - 1959</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built 1940 - 1949</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Built 1939 or Earlier</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOCIAL RESOURCES: A CITY OF NEIGHBORHOODS

“The waterways of the region have helped to create identifiable communities and neighborhoods throughout the metropolitan area. In a sense, the area is a federation of many small communities. The challenge is to recognize the common problems and deal with them effectively while not losing the advantages of the smaller communities.”

- City of Norfolk General Plan, VN-7

Demographics only tell part of the story of Norfolk’s social resources. One of the most distinguishing features of Norfolk is its collection of neighborhoods, and the social capital they create. Presently there are over 120 neighborhoods and 150 civic leagues spread throughout Norfolk. To foster community at the local level, the City of Norfolk runs five neighborhood centers: Berkley Neighborhood Center, Campostella Heights Resource Center, Huntersville Neighborhood Center, Park Place Neighborhood Center, and Work Force Development Center. The City also supports neighborhoods through the Neighborhood University, which is a free community enrichment program to train community leaders.

In addition to the Neighborhood University, the City runs the Neighborhood Design and Resource Center (NDRC). Services include neighborhood planning and design guidance, providing expertise in strategic planning, commercial district revitalization, and design guidelines. The NDRC also assists homeowners with planning for renovations, conducts education and outreach programs, and provides financial assistance to qualified homeowners. Neighborhoods are also supported through a neighborhood planning process. Plans that are underway or complete include Broad Creek Renaissance; Church Street; East Ocean View; Fairmount Park; Southside; Wards Corner; Downtown 2020; and Five Points.
Map 2.2b Civic Leagues and Neighborhood Centers
IMPLICATIONS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION PLANNING

Demographic data is informative in its own right, but it is most useful in how it is applied. The demographic profile of a city—and its mosaic of neighborhoods—can help plan for a parks, recreation, and open space system that will best fit a community’s needs now and in the future. In Norfolk, a number of themes emerge:

- Overall the city is projected to grow only modestly over the next five years. This gives Norfolk “breathing room” to address parks and recreation needs that may be long-standing, and start laying the groundwork for the future of the city.
- Some neighborhoods have experienced an increased population in recent years, which will likely translate into a need to “catch up” in neighborhood parks, recreation, and open spaces.
- Other neighborhoods have experienced a population decline. Parks are an opportunity to plan for neighborhood stabilization, and to look at vacant land as potentially useful open space rather than a magnet for vandalism or other unwanted activity.
- Norfolk has a diverse population, and the parks system must be able to provide spaces and programming for a variety of groups. A comparatively large number of young adults live in Norfolk, most likely due to the presence of the Naval Base. City leaders need to work with the military to ensure that this population’s needs are being served and to identify gaps in services that are not—or cannot be—provided on base.
- Educational attainment levels are lower than statewide averages. The parks and recreation system is an opportunity to engage the community into more diverse educational programming, and to provide additional services that not only help keep children and teenagers in school, but also support adult continuing education.
- Norfolk has a comparatively large population that lives in non-family households and has a lower percentage of households with children. This may indicate a need for more adult-centered programming and facilities.
- The percentage of families under the poverty level is significant at 14.67 percent. The parks, open space, and recreation system is an opportunity to help address the needs of these families, particularly those who need after-school programming, affordable access to facilities and programs, and transportation alternatives such as bicycle paths.
- Commuting modes and travel times to work indicate that Norfolk is an urbanized community that already utilizes methods of transportation other than personal vehicles. As construction for the light rail goes forward, parks and open spaces should play a positive role in creating quality public spaces near stations. Sidewalks and bikeways would probably also be utilized if improved and expanded.
- Norfolk’s comparatively high percentage of renter-occupied housing indicates a mobile population. Because renters do not tend to stay in the same unit for as long as homeowners do, it can be challenging for this population to create strong ties to their neighborhood. Additional outreach may be needed to attract the population to the parks and recreation system. Also, because the population changes frequently, park spaces should be designed to maximize flexibility and use for different groups and households over time.
- In a community like Norfolk that has a strong history of neighborhoods, a citywide parks and recreation master plan will provide a framework and guiding principles that each neighborhood can apply as appropriate to their circumstances in a neighborhood planning process. The plan will help ensure that each neighborhood has access to City facilities, and is well-connected to the system as a whole.
2.3 Economic Resources

Norfolk’s diverse economic base is enhanced by its strategic location: six of the ten largest population centers in the United States are within a 750-mile radius. This translates into two-thirds of the U.S. population being within a day’s drive of the city. Within the Hampton Roads region, Norfolk’s downtown is widely considered the hub.

Norfolk’s economy has long benefitted from its location on the water. Combined with Newport News, the port—with its 50-foot-deep, year-round harbor—is one of the busiest cargo ports on the eastern seaboard. Currently, over 95 percent of all shipping lines worldwide call on the Port of Hampton Roads, connecting Norfolk to over 380 ports globally. A planned $450-million expansion will double the port’s capacity over the next 15 years. In addition to cargo, Norfolk’s waterways are busy with cruise ships. The Half Moone Cruise and Celebration Center manages more than 230,000 passengers per year bound for ports like Bermuda, the Caribbean, and to New England and Nova Scotia. Two of the world’s largest cruise lines—Carnival and Royal Caribbean—call Norfolk home.

The impact of the military cannot be understated. Currently, the U.S. Department of Defense is the largest employer in Norfolk. Federal and other military employment in Norfolk also includes the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM); a Joint Forces Staff College; the Naval Network Warfare Command; and a number of other federal agencies, including Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Homeland Security, and Justice. The city is also home to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Allied Command Transformation, which provides a strong international presence to the city. Other major employers include the Norfolk City School Board, Sentara Healthcare, the City of Norfolk, Old Dominion University, and Norfolk State University. Currently the city has over 98,000 students engaged in higher learning.

Norfolk’s downtown is also a source of economic life. In a report conducted by the City’s Department of Development, a study showed that about 64 percent of the region’s residents made a trip to Norfolk’s downtown in the past year for non-work purposes. Further, 8 out of every 10 Hampton Roads households with an income of over $80,000 per year visited downtown, representing a substantial base for the city’s retail, entertainment, and restaurant establishments. Despite the economic downturn the city had over $1.1 billion of active construction in 2009, including projects like the Wells Fargo Center, Fort Norfolk Plaza, and the River House Apartments. Norfolk was ranked one of the Top 20 “Strongest Performing Metropolitan Areas” in the U.S. in the Brookings Institute 2009 MetroMonitor Report. There are also plans for a new convention center to be located at Granby Street and Main Street.
IMPLICATIONS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION PLANNING

- Parks and open spaces are critical to continuing to attract businesses that further diversify the city’s economic base and make it a desirable place for relocation. It is especially important to continue to support downtown with quality public spaces for passive recreation and hosting special events that can draw attendees region-wide.

- Parks and recreation in Norfolk can capitalize on the high level of federal investment already present in the city. Although the military provides recreation facilities at the Naval Station, City leaders will need to work with the Navy to ensure that military personnel have access to the same level of recreation that others in the city enjoy off-base.

- Engaging parks and recreation spaces and programming can draw tourists—and their dollars—further into downtown. With the large number of cruise ship passengers coming through the Half Moon Cruise Terminal, this could be a significant economic boost to downtown.

- The international element of Norfolk as a port city connected to cities worldwide can be celebrated throughout the city’s parks through public art and programming.

- On a smaller scale, planning for parks and open space can have great impact on individual households. The City’s Department of Development conducted a study in 2008 that evaluated consumer spending by Norfolk households. On average, each household spent about $47,253 over the course of the year. Of that amount, about 20 percent was spent on transportation, not including public transportation. Although distances throughout the city are not great, there is currently little infrastructure to support non-motorized transportation. Through parks planning, a system of bikeways and trails could be developed as viable transportation alternatives that over time can serve as a solution to automobile dependence. Even if just a fraction of households could significantly reduce their transportation costs by bicycling, walking or taking transit to work—and saving on gasoline, parking, and vehicle maintenance—more household spending can be used towards entertainment, recreation, and other sectors that have greater impacts on the local economy.
2.4 Transportation and Infrastructure

Norfolk is a major hub of the Hampton Roads region. The primary interstate in the city is I-64, along with its spurs, 264 in the south, and 564 that lead to the Naval Base. These interstates in turn lead to points throughout the region, and connect to I-464 and I-664. Aside from the interstates, major arterials that generally travel east-west include Brambleton Avenue, Norview Avenue, Little Creek Road, Bayview Boulevard, and Ocean View Avenue. Major north-south thoroughfares are Hampton Boulevard, Granby Street, Tidewater Drive, Sewell’s Point Road, Chesapeake Boulevard, Military Highway, and Azalea Garden Road. Because the city largely developed prior to the mid-20th century—and the shift to automobile reliance—the roadway system exhibits a high degree of connectivity, with many smaller roads that create a dense network.

In addition to the roadway network, Norfolk is also a regional railway hub. The Hampton Roads region is home to the Fortune 500 company Norfolk Southern, and is a primary center in handling cargo, particularly coal. The combined rail system of Norfolk Southern and CSX adds up to 43,300 miles of tracks that connect 23 states including the entire Eastern Seaboard and parts of Canada. Amtrak passenger service is available between Newport News, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York and Boston.

A major transportation initiative in Norfolk is the TIDE light transit line, slated to be operational in 2011. In the City’s Downtown 2020 Plan, there is an emphasis on TIDE and transit-oriented development around its stations at Government Center, Monticello, Plume Street, and the Chrysler Museum. This first phase of the light rail will span 7.4 miles, and already the city has experienced over $600 million of investment along the corridor. Two other transit-oriented developments of note include those at Ballentine and Newtown.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

Despite the dense transportation network and traditional roadway pattern, there are few bicycle facilities in Norfolk. An exception to this is the development of the Elizabeth River Trail. Called the “Atlantic City spur,” the trail follows a section of Norfolk’s waterfront and passes by a mixture of marine-related businesses, new residences, and a medical complex. The trail has only been partially constructed, and follows an old railroad right-of-way. Walkers and joggers can enjoy views of the ships and barges on the river, and also pass by important landmarks like Fort Norfolk. In addition to the Elizabeth River Trail, there are existing bike lanes along West Ocean View Avenue between 4th View Street and 15th View Street; East Bay Avenue between Granby Street and Tidewater Drive; Pleasant Avenue between 6th Bay Street and 21st Bay Street; the Shore Drive Bridge; Heutte Drive between Azalea Garden Drive and Camellia Road; Church Street from Broadway Street to Goff Street; the Hampton Boulevard Bridge; and Northampton Boulevard from Kempsville Road to Interstate 64.

Although the city currently lacks a strong bicycle network, it does have an extensive sidewalk network in place (though many lack curb ramps and do not meet the guidelines set forth by the Americans with Disabilities Act). The map below shows the most current data on sidewalks throughout the city.
Map 2.4b  Bicycle and Pedestrian Network
IMPLICATIONS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION PLANNING

- The City of Norfolk’s recent investment in the light rail line is also an opportunity for parks, especially in creating public spaces at transit-oriented developments that are comfortable and help to create a sense of place and arrival.
- The dense street network in Norfolk is conducive to developing a strong, interconnected system of bike lanes and routes. Because distances are not great between major nodes of activity, it is feasible that over time residents and visitors could travel safely around the city by bicycle.
- The Elizabeth River Trail project is an important start to the bicycle and trails system. Its success can spur the success of additional trails, and show Norfolk the numerous benefits of trails.
- Although Norfolk’s system of sidewalks is already extensive, there is an opportunity with every infrastructure improvement to ensure “safe routes to parks,” sidewalks that are complete and neighborhood parks that are accessible to all residents.
2.5 Environmental Resources

Norfolk is located at the southern end of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, where the Bay empties into the Atlantic Ocean. As such, Norfolk’s environment is deeply influenced by its waterways. According to the General Plan, about one-fourth (15 square miles) of the city’s area is water or wetlands. (LC-7) Its ecology is based on tidal tributaries like the Lafayette and Elizabeth Rivers that flow into the Chesapeake Bay and to the Atlantic Ocean. The wetlands along these tidal rivers are critical in serving as pollutant filters, wildlife habitat and natural buffers. In addition to the water, the city has over seven miles of beaches and dunes and an urban forest with substantial numbers of live oaks. This unique ecological region supports several habitats that are home to blue crab, oysters, and numerous waterfowl.

The Chesapeake Bay area is such a critical ecosystem that in 1988 the Virginia General Assembly enacted the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. The Act’s intent is to have a cooperative partnership between state and local governments in reducing non-point source pollution into the Bay. Each locality within the Tidewater region must adopt a program based on a framework prepared by the Local Assistance Board. There is a major emphasis on helping localities to make smart land use planning decisions, especially in terms of protecting the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas delineated by the Act.

The local government in charge of the Tidewater Chesapeake Bay Program is the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission. One area of focus is planning for the Bay’s tributaries. There are major water quality problems with the Bay’s tributaries, particularly algae growth and excessive nutrients like phosphorous and nitrogen. Currently the Commission is developing a James River tributary strategy that will include small coastal basins like Little Creek and Lynnhaven rivers. The next step will be to complete implementation plans for each river basin through best management practices. Norfolk residents have also formed the Lafayette River Sustainable/Fishable Committee. The group’s goal is to work towards improved water quality in this important tributary of the Elizabeth River.

Another important study is the Hampton Roads Conservation Corridor Study that analyzed lands with the highest potential for water, habitat, and regional connectivity. The study primarily used four layers of data: the National Wetlands Inventory; the National Land Cover Dataset; the Virginia Land Conservation Needs Assessment (VCLNA); and the hydrology dataset from the Virginia Base Mapping Project (VBMP). Maps showing this data, and how Norfolk relates with the region ecologically, are on the following pages. The maps indicate that Norfolk has markedly fewer natural resources that meet the criteria for the Conservation Corridor than other Hampton Roads localities. Aside from its riparian corridors and their related wetlands, Norfolk’s land cover is predominantly already developed with low-density uses, and contains no ecological “core” areas identified by the VCLNA. Despite this, Norfolk has approximately 1,915 acres of natural lands, the majority of it wetlands along the tidal waterways. Although many of the city’s natural resources have been altered through development, every effort should be made to preserve those which remain. Further, many of these resources—especially the streams and tidal rivers—suffer from pollution and other environmental issues and remain vulnerable to further degradation.
Figure 2
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Map 2.5b  VCLNA: National Land Cover Dataset

Map 2.5c  VCLNA: Riparian Corridors
IMPLICATIONS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION PLANNING

- Norfolk’s environment is heavily influenced by water, particularly the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries such as the Elizabeth and Lafayette Rivers. Yet as the maps from the Hampton Roads Conservation Corridor Study show, Norfolk is very developed and has fewer extant natural resources than other Hampton Roads localities. This makes it especially critical to conserve remaining resources, and ensure their long-term sustainability and ecological health. The future development of the parks and recreation system can aid in this goal by including additional natural lands in the system, restoring wetlands, and providing opportunities for environmental education to create a conservation ethic amongst Norfolk residents.

- The city’s environmental resources are not just of ecological value, but also hold a social value. For example, the experiences of crossing the rivers, walking along boardwalks in wetlands, and enjoying the shade of live oaks not only make Norfolk a beautiful place, but contribute to quality of life. Recreation experiences can be further enhanced by the city’s waterways, by providing opportunities for paddling, fishing or picnics. As the region moves forward with its conservation plans, the Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department should play a role in helping to provide quality recreation experiences and balance appropriate public access to resources.
2.6 Summary of Findings

Over the next few decades, Norfolk is expected to grow modestly. Some neighborhoods that have been in decline may have opportunities to develop additional parks and open spaces to improve quality of life, whereas faster-growing neighborhoods may require creative provision of access to parks resources. Parks and recreation planners will need to consider the city’s racially and socio-economically diverse population when developing parks resources, and be especially attuned to the recreation needs of young, transitory adults and families below the poverty line. This detailed level of planning is best accomplished through individual neighborhood plans to address the particular needs of each area.

Despite today’s challenging economic climate, the Hampton Roads area has been remarkably resilient and continues to see construction and growth. The City’s park system is critical to continuing to attract businesses that further diversify the city’s economic base, and make it a desirable place for relocation. As projects go forward, it is critical that parks and recreation improvements are viewed as important community-building elements that aren’t eliminated in the name of budget cuts. It is especially important to continue to support downtown with quality public spaces, bicycle and pedestrian-friendly passive recreation and spaces for special events that can attract attendees region-wide, and take advantage of cruise ship passengers passing through the city.

A major stimulus for development is the TIDE, the city’s new light rail line. With the creation of the light rail—and its transit-oriented developments—there are major opportunities for parks and open spaces to create vibrant public spaces at rail stations and help provide a sense of place. Though most residents currently rely on personal vehicles or buses for transportation, the TIDE may help change the living patterns of residents. There is interest and opportunity to develop an extensive bicycle system throughout the city by capitalizing on Norfolk’s dense street network. The Elizabeth River Trail is a good start, but more connectivity is needed to create a truly interconnected, functional system that provides a real transportation alternative.

As the city continues to develop and urbanize, greater attention must be paid to Norfolk’s delicate ecology, particularly to its tidal rivers that flow into the Chesapeake Bay. The future parks and recreation system can support the area’s ecology by contributing to wetlands preservation efforts, and connecting people to nature—particularly the water—through parks, kayak and canoe launches and environmental education programming. Every improvement made to a park presents an opportunity to make a positive impact on the environment. This not only benefits Norfolk’s environment, but also has the potential to make more beautiful and interesting park experiences.

Another factor that contributes to park experiences is the integration of history and culture into public spaces. In Norfolk, some parks are already primary cultural arts venues, such as Town Point Park, Ocean View Park, and the Norfolk Botanical Garden. As the public art program expands, there are many additional opportunities to incorporate installations—particularly at neighborhood and recreation centers. Specific opportunities for incorporating more historic and culture resources into the parks system include providing better access to Fort Norfolk; creating self-guided walking trails through historic neighborhoods; and exploring partnerships with arts organizations that can benefit from parks as venues, thereby enlivening park spaces.
Ultimately, Norfolk’s resources—its people, infrastructure, environment, and heritage—provide a solid foundation for the city’s future, and many opportunities exist for the parks and recreation system to capitalize upon these assets to create one of the most livable cities on the East Coast.

---

3 http://norfolkdevelopment.com/fullpdf/NorfolkDevelopmentPoster.pdf
4 Ibid.
Needs and Priorities Assessment
3 NEEDS AND PRIORITIES ASSESSMENT

3.1 Approach

Observational, qualitative and quantitative analyses were utilized to determine the parks and recreation needs of the City of Norfolk. Comparing the results of these three analyses to one another provides a reliable understanding of the highest-priority needs of the community. The following section details the methodologies and findings:

3.2 Physical Analysis of the Parks System
3.3 Interviews with Elected Officials
3.4 Stakeholder Interviews
3.5 Public Workshops
3.6 Mail/Telephone Survey
3.7 Level of Service Analysis
3.8 National Trends

Section 3.9 provides a summary of all analyses, and identifies the City of Norfolk’s priority parks and recreation system needs.

3.2 Physical Analysis of the Parks System

To understand the existing conditions of the City of Norfolk parks system, the planning team evaluated it at two scales. First is an examination of how the entire system functions as a whole in providing a quality recreation and open space experience, and second is how well individual parks and facilities contribute to this whole.

SYSTEM-WIDE ANALYSIS

Based on AECOM’s experience nationwide, an ideal parks and recreation system has equitable access to facilities, promotes community sociability, demonstrates sense of place stewardship, protects the natural environment, and is responsibly planned and administered. Criteria for each of these characteristics are described below, including a brief analysis of how Norfolk’s existing system compares.

Equitable Access

- Meaningful open space easily accessible to every resident;
- An equitably distributed system of special use facilities; and,
- An interconnected network of boulevards, parkways, and streets that link to greenways and trails throughout the city.

Norfolk’s existing parks system developed in the context of being a city of neighborhoods. Because of this, the city’s parks are fairly well-distributed, particularly in terms of passive open spaces. The city’s parks system is also based on a traditional model of neighborhood parks and large community parks with a variety of facilities; as a result, there are few special use facilities run by the Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department (RPOS). The special use facilities that exist, such as the Botanical Garden,
the Zoo, and a handful of boat ramps—are well-distributed throughout the city. Despite the overall equitable distribution of facilities, Norfolk lacks a greenways and trails system that connects to its boulevards and streets.

**Community Sociability**
- Central gathering spaces and easily-identified civic buildings for public events;
- A broad range of social, cultural, recreation and wellness programs;
- Parks planned as catalysts for neighborhood stabilization and/or redevelopment; and,
- Involvement and grooming of civic leaders and champions.

Norfolk has two “festival parks” located at opposite ends of the city that provide a range of programming. Additionally, the city has a remarkable network of community and neighborhood centers that are easily identified and well-distributed. There are also some examples of parks that act as catalysts for neighborhood stabilization—such as the Kaboom! playground in Denby Park—but overall, redevelopment does not appear to be a driving factor in park locations. People get involved in their communities primarily through civic groups, some of which are strong advocates for their neighborhood parks spaces.

**Sense of Place Stewardship**
- A signature park;
- Public art and signage integrated throughout the system;
- Celebration and access to heritage resources;
- Use of local building styles, materials and native plants; and
- Parks that “tell the story” of the community.

Norfolk’s signature park is Town Point Park, which is the site of most of the city’s special events. It is well-designed and takes advantage of both its downtown and harbor-side location. Although the City has a public art program, it is just starting to incorporate art in park spaces beyond downtown; there are plans for art installations in schools and community centers throughout the city in the coming years, such as the project at Broad Creek Linear Park. Despite the fact that Norfolk has a long, rich history there are few parks within the existing system that “tell the story” of the city. Access to heritage resources is largely through other departments or private organizations. The use of local building styles and materials was not observed in the 40 parks visited in September 2009, but there are stands of native vegetation in many of the larger parks.

**Protection of the Natural Environment**
- About 50 percent of parks space preserved in natural or maintained open space;
- Safe, convenient access to rivers, lakes and streams;
- Natural areas protected as conservation lands with appropriate and equitable public access; and,
- Parks designed to reduce energy and water consumption.

In an era when parks have become increasingly over-programmed with facilities, the City of Norfolk has maintained a balance between its active and passive park space. As a result, over half of Norfolk’s parks are maintained open space, but little is protected as natural areas or conservation lands. Likewise, there are few safe, convenient access points to the city’s rivers. However, there are ample access points to the Chesapeake Bay, both through parks and unofficial points along the coastline. Newer park
facilities have been designed to reduce energy and be more “green,” but most of the city’s park facilities have not been upgraded to these standards yet.

**Responsible Planning and Administration**
- Co-location and joint use of schools, libraries and parks;
- Up-to-date, well-designed and well-maintained facilities;
- Municipal, county, state, federal, corporate, and non-profit partnerships; and,
- A community-building mindset.

With more than 40 park facilities co-located with schools, Norfolk’s parks system is integrated into other public spaces, and a community-building mindset is evident in the large number and distribution of community and neighborhood centers. RPOS does not appear to have many formal partnerships in place with other Hampton Roads municipalities, and its facilities—while generally well-maintained—are aging and in some cases outdated.

When all of the elements of an ideal parks system are considered, the City of Norfolk’s parks system is the strongest in the following criteria:
- Meaningful open space easily accessible to every resident;
- An equitably distributed system of special use facilities;
- Central gathering spaces and easily-identified civic buildings for public events;
- A broad range of social, cultural, recreation and wellness programs;
- A signature park;
- +/- 50% of parks space preserved in natural or maintained open space; and,
- Co-location and joint use of schools, libraries and parks;

The greatest opportunities for improvement are in the following:
- An interconnected network of boulevards, parkways, and streets that link to greenways and trails throughout the city;
- Celebration and access to heritage resources;
- Use of local building styles, materials and native plants;
- Parks that “tell the story” of the community;
- Safe, convenient access to rivers, lakes and streams;
- Natural areas protected as conservation lands with appropriate/equitable public access;
- Parks designed to reduce energy and water consumption; and,
- Up-to-date facilities.

**SITE EVALUATIONS**
In addition to looking at the whole system, it is important to evaluate how each park site is performing. The non-profit organization Project for Public Spaces (PPS) uses the following criteria to understand how well a park is serving the community:

**Proximity/Access/Linkages:**
- Is the park easy to reach?
- Can someone who lives nearby easily walk or bike to the park?
- Does the park have clear signage and information?
- Are there “eyes on the park”, meaning people can easily see in from adjacent residences or commercial areas?
**Comfort and Image**
- What is the first impression someone has of the park?
- Is the park clean and well-kept?
- Are there comfortable places to sit?
- Does the park provide protection from bad weather?

**Uses and Sociability**
- If the space is a general use park, is there a mix of things to do?
- If the space is a special-use park, how well does it fulfill its intended function?
- Is the park busy?
- How much of the space is used versus parts that are unused?

Time and budget constraints prohibited an evaluation of every City of Norfolk parks facility, but RPOS selected the following 40 parks for evaluation by AECOM as a representative sample of the entire system:

- Airport Gateway Park
- Barraud Park
- Bayview Elementary School
- Berkeley Park
- Campostella Center
- Captain’s Quarters
- Chesterfield Elementary School
- Community Beach
- Craig Street Playground
- Crossroads Elementary School
- East Ocean View Community Center
- Fairlawn Elementary School
- Glenwood Park
- Huntersville Community Center
- Hyde Park Playground
- Ingleside Elementary School
- James Monroe Elementary School
- Jeff Robertson Park
- Lafayette Park
- Lakewood Park
- Larchmont Elementary School
- Mona Avenue Park
- Monkey Bottom Park
- Monticello Village Park
- Norfolk Fitness and Wellness Center
- Northside Middle School/Norfolk Therapeutic Recreation Center
- Norview Elementary School
- Northside Park
- Oakmont North Playgrounds
- Ocean View Beach Park
- Ocean View Senior Center
- Olney Road Parks
- Pollard Street Playground
- Poplar Hall Park
- St Helena Elementary School/Berkeley Community Center
- Sherwood Forest Elementary School and Community Center
- Tanners Creek Park
- Tarrallton Park
- Tarrallton Elementary School and Community Center
- Titustown Visual Arts Center
AIRPORT GATEWAY PARK
Address: 1936 Norview Avenue
Park Type: Neighborhood Passive

Airport Gateway Park is currently an inaccessible open space. It is used as the “home” of the City of Norfolk gateway sign for people arriving in town from the airport, but there is no other development in the park. Although there are indications that it previously was used as some sort of designed green space, it currently offers no parking, no pedestrian access and no amenities. Because of the lack of access and amenities, park usage and sociability are very low. The site's size and features do present an opportunity to develop the site in the future, and it could serve some of the recreation needs of the adjoining Bromley neighborhood. Visibility from Norview Avenue is good, and there is an opportunity for improved connectivity by extending Ventura Court and Bridle Way into a more complete network.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The park is located on a major street and has some visibility, but access is very difficult due to a lack of sidewalks and vehicular entry points.

Comfort | Image: The gateway sign itself is a positive introduction to the city for those arriving from the airport, but the rest of the site could be upgraded to reinforce a welcoming image of the city. Presently there are no amenities or eyes on the park.

Uses | Sociability: The site is currently undeveloped and lacks park uses to draw people—and activity—into the park.

Opportunities: The City could develop the park to serve community passive recreation needs, and support the sense of arrival into the community through additional landscape design.
BARRAUD PARK
Address: 2640 Barraud Avenue
Park Type: Community Park

Barraud Park is an older community park with a mix of facilities, including a baseball field, tennis courts, a boxing center, a playground, a kayak launch, and an outdoor amphitheater. Although almost half of the site is surrounded by water, it is difficult to actually see the river and a single small kayak launch is the only physical connection. Some parts of the park, particularly the outdoor amphitheater, do not appear to be used frequently. There are numerous opportunities to upgrade the park and improve its site design and connectivity.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The presence of Barraud Avenue through the park breaks the continuity of the landscape, but does not actually provide a vehicular connection due to barriers; it should either be removed or opened up as a true connection for the neighborhood. Sidewalk connections from the neighborhood into the park appear to be functional, but are narrow and in poor condition. Access to the water—both physical and visual—could be improved.

Comfort | Image: Many of the park’s facilities need to be updated, especially the boxing center, but some facilities are new and well-maintained, such as the playgrounds. Overall site maintenance is adequate, but the landscaping and site design do not create a beautiful, comfortable space. The site has an excessive amount of trash barrels that detract from the beauty of the park.

Uses | Sociability: Barraud Park appears to be used for its sports field and boxing center, and the kayak launch is also well-utilized according to City employees. The outdoor amphitheater reportedly has not been used in years, though historically there were frequent neighborhood gatherings for gospel performances. At the time of the site visit, the only people observed were using the park as a pass-through.

Opportunities: There are multiple opportunities to upgrade the site through updated facilities, better access to the water, and for green design elements using the existing wetlands. Internal circulation could be improved by the removal of Barraud Avenue and the site could be re-designed to create a more comfortable, beautiful environment for the neighborhood. Currently RPOS has a master plan and a CIP request for Barraud Park, which can help to address some of the site’s issues. With key upgrades, there may be opportunities for revenue by charging for use of the ballfields and hosting special events.
**BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
Address: 1434 E Bayview Boulevard
Park Type: City/School Shared Active

Bayview Elementary School is an attractive, historic school with shared active recreation facilities. The site consists of the historic school, a modern addition to the building, a baseball field, an open space field, two playgrounds, and a sport court. Beyond school hours, there are few “eyes on the park,” and overall the site is plain and not inviting.

**Proximity | Access | Linkages:** The adjacency of the active facilities to the school is a positive feature, but physical linkages to the neighborhood are poor. There are few eyes on the park but once within the site there is good visibility.

**Comfort | Image:** The site maintenance is adequate, but at the time of the visit there was a problem with graffiti. The new playground equipment improves the park’s feel and quality, but older outdated play equipment at the site’s periphery appears abandoned. There are few shade trees or other amenities.

**Uses | Sociability:** During school hours the site is well-used for recess and physical education programming. Beyond school hours, however, there is little to draw anyone to the park and the lack of visual access from the neighborhood may make it feel unsafe at night.

**Opportunities:** The historic school building is a unique feature and could be capitalized upon more in the rest of the site’s design. The addition of shade trees and more neighborhood connections would improve the site, as would more things to do beyond school activities.
BERKLEY PARK
Address: 706 Walker Avenue
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Berkley Park is a neighborhood active park located in Southside Norfolk. It is well-integrated into the neighborhood with strong pedestrian connections and “eyes on the park”, but appears to mostly be used as a place to pass through. The City has made recent investments in the facility, such as a new playground and basketball court. Litter appears to be a problem and the overall aesthetic of the park is plain. The architecture of the adjoining community center looks institutional and is unwelcoming due to the lack of windows and signage.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The park has excellent pedestrian connections to the neighborhood and good visibility into the site. Pedestrian connections are so strong, in fact, that many people walk through the site on trips to other points in the neighborhood.

Comfort | Image: The site has litter problems, and although there is evidence of stewardship and maintenance by the City, the overall aesthetic is plain and the park feels unkempt. The community center’s architecture is stark and unwelcoming, and does not interact with the site.

Uses | Sociability: At the time of the site visit, the park had two different user groups: people who were passing through on foot and people who were relaxing in small groups in peripheral areas of the site. It should be noted that Berkley Park is the location of the annual Berkley Reunion that attracts hundreds of current and past residents of the neighborhood.

Opportunities: There is an opportunity to renovate the community center so that it can become better integrated into the site. The park could be serving as more of a community meeting place beyond the annual Reunion, and could be upgraded through more interesting landscaping and tighter controls on litter.
CAMPOSTELLA CENTER
Address: 1130 Leake St
Park Type: City Center with Active Recreation

The Campostella Center is a small neighborhood center tucked back into a residential area. Connectivity and linkages are weak, but informal pedestrian access has been created via a “cow path”. Maintenance is good overall but there is a problem with litter in the woods adjacent to the creek. There is a lack of eyes on the basketball court behind the center, and the park does not appear to be well-used.

**Proximity | Access | Linkages:** The Center is located at the dead end of a quiet residential street, and is difficult to find due to a lack of signage. Pedestrian connections are weak, though there are opportunities for improvement. Center hours appear to be limited, and parts of the park lack visibility and may feel dangerous, especially at night.

**Comfort | Image:** The building and equipment are well-maintained, but there is a problem with trash and litter in the woods. Play equipment is older here than at similar City facilities but overall the equipment is well-maintained. The center’s scale is appropriate for the neighborhood, but windows and a more open architectural style would help to make it more welcoming. The creek and the woods are the most interesting part of the site, but appear to be only informally accessible.

**Uses | Sociability:** At the time of the visit, there were no users at the park. For its small size, the site has a number of things to do despite limited hours at the center.

**Opportunities:** The creek presents an excellent opportunity for connecting the neighborhood to the water and providing an ecological program element. There are also opportunities to strengthen physical access to the site through additional sidewalks, and footbridges over the creek. Because of the center’s small size and limited function, the City may want to consider leasing the structure to another agency or non-profit for a more specialized neighborhood use.
CAPTAIN'S QUARTERS
Address: 8oo Little Bay Road
Park Type: City Center with Active Recreation

Captain's Quarters is a beautiful facility in northern Norfolk. The site includes a neighborhood center with interesting architectural character, beautiful water views, and opportunities to fish and interact with the water. There is also a small playground and a number of programs that are run from the site, including kayaking lessons.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The site is a block off of West Ocean View Avenue, and there is a lack of directional signage—it would be difficult to stumble upon Captain's Quarters if one did not already know its location. Linkages to the neighborhood in general could be improved through better signage, but it is not difficult to reach the park on foot.

Comfort I Image: Captain's Quarters is one of the City's most beautiful park facilities, and exhibits a true sense of Norfolk. The waterside setting, mature oak tree cover, and interesting architecture all contribute to the feeling that the park is a special place. The playground is very new, as are some of the benches, but other site amenities need to be upgraded.

Uses I Sociability: Programs are offered in the neighborhood center, but the site is also conducive to informal gatherings and single users fishing and enjoying the water.

Opportunities: Better directional signage to the facility would help others discover Captain's Quarters. There is also an opportunity to formalize the site as the center for kayak/canoe recreation in Norfolk.
CHESTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND POOL
Address: 2915 Westminster Avenue
Park Type: City/School Shared Active Recreation

Chesterfield Elementary is located directly south of I-264 and shares facilities with the Grandy Village housing project. The facility is not as well kept as others in Norfolk, and some parts of it feel abandoned and unsafe. Equipment is also outdated and there appears to be a need for more parking.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Because of its location south of I-264, the school and the park are disconnected from most of the city. There is a good pedestrian linkage with Grandy Village, but the linkages are not as strong with the Chesterfield Heights neighborhood to the west.

Comfort I Image: The school grounds and pool do not exhibit the same standard of maintenance as most other park sites in Norfolk. The play equipment is antiquated, there are few amenities, and the pool is also enclosed by two sets of chain link fence, which negatively affects the beauty of the park. At the time of the site visit, the grass was not mowed, which added to the impression of the park feeling abandoned.

Uses I Sociability: Despite the presence of the school, the park felt empty and unused even during school hours.

Opportunities: The site is centrally located between Grandy Village and Chesterfield Heights, and with upgrades could be a successful gathering place and focus of the neighborhood. The upgrades needed, however, are substantial, especially in terms of the comfort and image of the site. It should be noted that the neighborhood’s waterfront has the potential to be a beautiful park space, but the community does not currently want public access to the amenity.
COMMUNITY BEACH
Address: 700 E Ocean View Ave
Park Type: Neighborhood Passive

Community Beach is one of the City's major bayfront parks. Users at the park noted that the clientele is more local in character than at Ocean View Park. The connections to the surrounding land uses are not very strong, and the site is difficult to reach across the traffic of East Ocean View Avenue.

**Proximity I Access I Linkages:** Although the oceanfront location is excellent, Community Beach lacks pedestrian connections, particularly across East Ocean View Avenue.

**Comfort I Image:** The beach is attractive and overall the site appears to be well-maintained, but feels unsafe during some parts of the day due to homeless people and other users loitering in the pavilion. Landscaping is minimal, and there appear to be problems with the retaining wall.

**Uses I Sociability:** At the time of the site visit, there were a handful of users sunbathing on the beach; the other users were homeless people utilizing the pavilion. The pavilion does provide a place for special events and gatherings, but otherwise the site is passive and unprogrammed.

**Opportunities:** There are opportunities to provide better pedestrian connections across East Ocean View Avenue, and to improve the physical design and look of the park.

Otherwise, the site appears to be functioning well as a community access point to the Bay. The park could also be catalyst for improving the Ocean View Avenue corridor into a more exciting, visually appealing area that takes greater advantage of the presence of the beach.
CRAIG STREET PLAYGROUND
Address: 425 Craig Street
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Craig Street Playground is a small neighborhood park located mid-block in a residential neighborhood. The City has recently invested in new playground equipment, but the site lacks the sense of stewardship found at other Norfolk parks.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: There is a sidewalk connection to the park from Craig Street, but no official linkage to Magnolia Cemetery. There is no visual access to the basketball court area that is directly behind two residences.

Comfort | Image: The new playground equipment helps the image of the park, but at the time of the site visit the grass had not been mowed and the basketball facility was in a state of disrepair. The basketball area also feels unsafe due to a lack of visibility. There are attractive shade trees but otherwise park amenities are few.

Uses | Sociability: Because of the condition of the basketball court, the only activity currently available at Craig Street Playground is using the playground equipment. There were no people using the park at the time of the site visit.

Opportunities: There is a neighborhood-wide opportunity to better connect the green spaces in Berkley, and Craig Street Playground could provide a critical linkage between Magnolia and Mount Olive Cemeteries.
CROSSROADS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND RECREATION CENTER
Address: 7920 Tidewater Driver
Park Type: City/School Shared Active Recreation

Crossroads Recreation Center is one of the City’s oldest centers, and one of the most in need of remodeling. The school’s active recreation area includes a softball field, sports court, and old playground equipment, all of which need to be updated. There are some eyes on the park from surrounding residences, and the presence of the school activates the space during the daytime.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Although park program elements are excessively fenced, pedestrian access to the neighborhood is fair. Visibility into the park is good around the baseball field, but decreases near the playground area.

Comfort I Image: Both the recreation center and the outdoor facilities need to be updated. There are few amenities, no shade trees, and the site lacks a sense of stewardship present at other parks and schools. The Recreation Center in particular is small and difficult to identify due to a lack of visible signage.

Uses I Sociability: Because of the presence of the elementary school, the site is activated throughout the day by children. It is unclear how well the site is utilized outside of school hours.

Opportunities: There is an opportunity to improve neighborhood connections through better pedestrian linkages. When the recreation center is renovated, the City should consider siting the Center in a more visually prominent location, and making it larger and more inviting.
EAST OCEAN VIEW PARK AND COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 9520 E 20th Bay St
Park type: City Center with Active Recreation

East Ocean View Community Center is located in the far northeastern corner of the City of Norfolk. Facilities include a community center, a playground with substantial pine tree cover, a community garden, and a baseball/multi-purpose field. The City has recently invested in the site by building a large fishing pier.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Visual access to the park is good from the Shore Drive bridge, but the site is tucked into a neighborhood that lacks sidewalk connections. Roadway connections, especially to Pretty Lake Avenue, could be improved.

Comfort | Image: The pine trees and the new fishing pier are positive contributors to the site’s aesthetic, as is the visual access to the water. The community center’s architecture is block-like and windowless, and detracts from the site’s comfort and image. The site appears to have good maintenance but some of the equipment and amenities need to be updated. Some areas between the center and the water are difficult to see into, and may feel unsafe after dark.

Uses | Sociability: East Ocean View has a range of things to do, including fishing, playing baseball or pickup soccer, crabbing, playing on the playground, or participating in one of the programs offered at the center. At the time of the site visit there was a diverse group of people using the park, including young adults, elderly men fishing, and teenagers using the center.

Opportunities: The site already embraces its location on the water, and there appear to be few additional opportunities for green or ecological design. If the center is to be renovated, an architectural style with more windows and interaction with the site would greatly enhance the park.
FAIRLAWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND RECREATION CENTER
Address: 1132 Wade Street
Park Type: City/School Shared Active Recreation

Fairlawn Elementary School and Recreation Center is located in the eastern area of Norfolk. Outdoor recreation facilities include two playgrounds, basketball courts, a picnic area, and two baseball fields; inside, the center contains a large gymnasium, a game room, and an arts and crafts space. Overall the center is attractive, well-used, and well-kept, but the outdoor facilities exhibit a lower level of comfort and quality.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: There is a lack of physical connections to the adjacent residential land uses. The recreation center is also at the confluence of large, busy roadways, making it difficult to reach on foot and seem isolated.

Comfort I Image: The interior of the center is well-kept and attractive, but the exterior recreation facilities do not exhibit the same level of stewardship. Outside, there are few amenities, and a lack of shade and benches makes the site uncomfortable in hot weather. Additionally, many of the park facilities are sited behind the center, inhibiting visibility from the roadway and potentially making the park feel unsafe at night.

Uses I Sociability: According to staff, the center is activated not only during school, but has morning and after-school programming as well. The outdoor recreation facilities do not appear to be as well-used.

Opportunities: Staff noted that there is a need for more meeting room space and media rooms. The outdoor recreation facilities are in need of upgrades, and there is an opportunity to better link the site to the adjacent neighborhood with improved pedestrian connections.
GLENWOOD PARK
Address: 8100 Evergreen Avenue
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Glenwood Park is a well-located neighborhood park surrounded by residences that provide “eyes on the park.” The mature shade trees are an attractive feature and the playground equipment is in good condition. The high fences detract from the look and feel of the park, as do the lower internal fences that divide the park into segments. The condition of the basketball court needs to be improved.

**Proximity | Access | Linkages:** Although the park is centrally located within the neighborhood, the chain link fence surrounding the park prevents easy access to the site. There is, however, good visibility into the park from a distance; good “eyes on the park” from adjacent homes; and the surrounding sidewalk network provides good pedestrian connections to the site. Signage could be improved however, and the park lacks ADA accessibility.

**Comfort | Image:** Overall, Glenwood Park is attractive, but the high chain link fence detracts from one’s overall impression of the space. Most of the park equipment is in good condition and the park appeared to be well-maintained except for the presence of litter in some areas. Benches placed in the shade of the mature trees provide comfortable places to sit. With the exception of the basketball court needing repairs, the park demonstrates strong evidence of management and stewardship.

**Uses | Sociability:** For a small neighborhood park, there are a number of things to do, but the interior fencing inhibits the use of the unprogrammed space. During the mid-morning visit, there was no one using the park, and it is unknown which parts of the site are well-used and which are not.

**Opportunities:** There is no evidence of design standards, and revenue opportunities are low given the small size of the site and the location in a neighborhood. Partnership opportunities and green/environmental opportunities are also low. Greater flexibility in programming could be gained by removing the fence.
HUNTERSVILLE COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 830 Goff Street
Park Type: City Center with Active Recreation

Huntersville Community Center is a large, multi-service center with an attached park containing primarily active recreation elements. The community center serves a number of purposes, but the building is outdated, lacks natural light, and appears unwelcoming. Maintenance, however, is good both inside the facility and outdoors and there are good “eyes” on the athletic fields. Pedestrian connections within the site and to the neighborhood are strong.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Most of the site is visible from a distance, particularly the athletic fields and the community center building. The small playground near O’Keefe Street and the tennis courts behind the center are significantly more hidden and lack “eyes” on them. Pedestrian connections within the site and to the surrounding neighborhood are very strong, with a good system of sidewalks. The site lacks signage and ADA accessibility compliance. A bus route runs along Tidewater Drive, providing direct transit access to the site. The lighted athletic field may be a disruption at night to the nearby residences, causing a land-use conflict.

Comfort | Image: The site is functional, but is not one of the City's most attractive park spaces. The community center building is aging, and its lack of windows and openings is unwelcoming. Beyond the structure, the grounds of Huntersville are well-maintained but plain, and lack shade trees. Some parts of the site—particularly the tennis courts—feel unsafe due to a lack of visibility from outside the park. There are few places to sit outside other than the bleachers at the athletic fields, but seating inside the Community Center is ample.

Uses | Sociability: Huntersville Community Center is a hub for public services, making it an active site throughout the day. The recreation center appears to attract users consistently, but the outdoor recreation elements were not being used at the time of the site visit. A sense of pride and ownership is shown in the cleanliness of the site, and many people tend to linger outside either before or after using the Center.

Opportunities: There is no evidence of design standards, but maintenance standards are high. There is a large degree of programming flexibility both indoors and out, and potential revenue opportunities exist from renting facilities to sports leagues. Green/environmental opportunities are low, but a community garden may be well-suited to the neighborhood and the site.
HYDE PARK PLAYGROUND
Address: 555 Austin Street
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Hyde Park Playground is a small neighborhood park space well-integrated into the fabric of the neighborhood. Although aesthetically pleasant with large shade trees, there is currently little for a visitor to do once at the site.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Because of its location as public space in the middle of Austin Street, there is excellent visibility into the park, and multiple residences provide “eyes” on the site. Walking to the park is easy due to a strong sidewalk network in the neighborhood and a low volume of traffic. Transit access is available three blocks away on Chesapeake Boulevard, though most park users would likely be from the neighborhood and would not need transit access.

Comfort | Image: The park is well-maintained, has excellent shade from its mature trees, and is well-placed in the neighborhood. It feels safe, and although very clean, the presence of the concrete pad without any equipment makes the site seem neglected. Benches are well-positioned to take advantage of the shade trees.

Uses | Sociability: At the time of the site visit, there were no program elements in the park; in fact, there was no playground at Hyde Park Playground. As such, there is little to draw a visitor into the site other than using the open space for a game of catch, or reading on one of the benches. The park would benefit from more activation and could potentially host small neighborhood events.

Opportunities: There is no evidence of design standards, and few opportunities for revenue or partnerships. Because of the small size and location of the site, there is little programming flexibility and few opportunities for green/environmental features.
INGLESIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL and INGLESIDE RECREATION CENTER
Address: 976 Ingleside Road
Park Type: City/School Shared with Active Recreation

Ingleside School and Recreation Center is located amidst light industrial and commercial uses along East Virginia Beach Boulevard. The recreation center is one of the smallest in the City’s park system, and is difficult to see due to its location behind the school. Site facilities are older and in need of renovation, and there is no interior circulation system to help knit the park together. Maintenance is good, however, and trees along the eastern boundary nicely screen adjacent uses.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The site is compatible with the residential neighborhood, but feels out of place next to the light industrial areas along East Virginia Beach Boulevard. Once in the Ingleside neighborhood, the recreation center is easily visible from the street, but park elements along the periphery lack the same visual access. Walking to the park from the neighborhood is easy because of the strong network of sidewalks but once within the park there is no formalized system of circulation. Transit access is available through bus lines along East Virginia Beach Boulevard. The site lacks clear signage, and does not comply with ADA standards for accessibility.

Comfort I Image: Like many of the City’s park sites, Ingleside School and Recreation Center have a functional appearance. The school’s playground equipment along the eastern edge of the site is outdated and needs to be replaced, but overall the park is well-maintained and clean. There are also very few places to sit outdoors. The recreation center’s partial stone finish makes it one of the more welcoming of the City’s centers and the wooded boundary to the east softens the park edge.

Uses I Sociability: At the time of the visit, the recreation center was closed and no one was using the rest of the site. There are, however, a number of things for a visitor to do and the school activates the site for recess and physical education programming. It was unclear at the time of the visit how well-used the center is.

Opportunities: The co-location of the school and the recreation center make the partnership opportunities high, but opportunities for revenue are low. There may be green/environmental opportunities associated with the wooded area directly to the east of the site.
JAMES MONROE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL and PARK PLACE COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 520 West 29th Street
Park Type: City/School with Shared Active Recreation

This shared City/school facility has excellent “eyes on the park” from surrounding residences. The hedges around the property are an attractive feature that soften the edge, and are preferable to the chain link fence around most City and school facilities. Litter was a problem at the time of the site visit.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Visibility into the site from a distance is very good because of the open frontage along Colonial Avenue and the low hedges surrounding the site. Strong pedestrian connections make it easy to walk into the park, and the site is easily accessible by transit from a bus route along Colonial Avenue. Although the outdoor parts of the site lack signage, signage within the community center is good. The elementary school and the community center are compatible with the adjacent land uses. Like most other facilities in Norfolk, the park lacks ADA accessibility.

Comfort I Image: Overall, the site has a functional look, but there is a problem with litter. Although there are a number of “eyes on the park”, the presence of litter gives the impression of a lack of stewardship, and the plantings are not well-maintained. There are very few places to sit outdoors and although protection from poor weather can be found at the community center, there are no shelters outside.

Uses I Sociability: There is a mix of facilities available at the site, including the playgrounds, basketball courts, and flexible open space; additionally, there are multiple programs available at the community center. Because of the presence of the school and services available at the community center, the site is fairly active and used by a range of people. At the time of the site visit, the most common activity was children crossing the park to reach the school.

Opportunities: There is no evidence of design standards or maintenance standards. Revenue opportunities and partnership opportunities are low, but there is a fair amount of programming flexibility between the community center and the large open space. Green/environmental opportunities can be enhanced through cultivating the existing community garden and increasing its presence on the site.
JEFF ROBERSTON PARK
Address: 1220 Azalea Court
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Despite its classification as a Neighborhood Active park, Jeff Robertson Park (formerly Bluebird Park) is predominantly passive wooded space. Because of litter and debris from the tree cover, the park looks unkempt in some areas. Although two sides of the park have “eyes” on it, the ball field is completely hidden from view. There could be more to do at the park, such as a playground that would activate the space; the Elizabeth River Trail runs through the park but abruptly ends.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: There is some visibility into the park, but the natural surveillance from adjoining residential land uses cannot penetrate deeply into the site because of its layout and the concentration of trees. Pedestrian connections to and throughout the park are good. Transit access is available from the bus route on nearby Hampton Boulevard. There is a general lack of signage, but interpretive signage about Jeff Robertson is present. Although the site is compatible with the adjacent residential areas, the industrial land uses and abandoned-looking structures off of Redgate Avenue detract from the park’s appeal.

Comfort I Image: The wooded aesthetic of the eastern half of the site is attractive, but overall the site is plain and lacks visual interest. The park does not feel safe, particularly at the baseball field that is completely hidden from view. There is a problem with litter and tree debris, but the walking path appears to be in excellent condition. There are a number of places to sit, most of which are situated well under shade trees and along the path, but these bench areas also suffer from litter. Additionally, there is no protection from inclement weather.

Uses I Sociability: Despite its comparatively large size for a neighborhood park, there are very few things to do at Jeff Robertson; possible activities include playing baseball, walking along the path, or reading a book. This is mostly due to the placement of the trees, which inhibit large, contiguous open spaces for flexible play. At the time of the site visit, there was no one using the park.

Opportunities: There is little evidence of design and maintenance standards at the park. Because of the trees, there is little programmable space and revenue and partnership opportunities are low. The park is, however, one of the few to have interpretive signage, and there may be opportunities to increase its green/environmental components through the adjacent natural lands west of Armistead Bridge Road.
LAFAYETTE PARK
Address: 3500 Granby Street
Park Type: Community Park

Lafayette Park is one of Norfolk’s oldest park spaces. It has a well-established tree canopy, and has retained some small historic structures that add character to the park. The park has some issues including use by the transient population, litter, and unpleasant aromas from the zoo. It is also very loud along Granby Street, and the park’s periphery feels unsafe because of its proximity to traffic.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Visibility from outside the park is good, mainly because of the park’s location along a major arterial, and because the park is so large. The volume of traffic along Granby may make it difficult for pedestrians from Colonial Place and Park Place to access the site, but there are some crossings available. Transit access is available from bus routes that travel along Granby Street. The park lacks clear signage and information, and generally lacks compliance with ADA standards for accessibility.

Comfort I Image: The park is attractive, has a mature tree canopy, and the historic design details along Granby Avenue add character to the site. There is, however, a feeling that the park may be dangerous due to the presence of a large transient population, and potential “eyes on the park” from adjacent residences are blocked by trees. Despite a surplus of trash cans, there is a problem with litter. For the large size of the park, there are few places to sit, and most of the pavilions are used by the transient population.

Uses I Sociability: Lafayette Park has an even balance of active and passive uses, and the open space provides a great degree of flexibility. At the time of the site visit, there were many users in different sections of the park, including children on the playground; people walking for exercise; young adults playing soccer; and large groups of people hanging out in the pavilions. Overall the park is highly sociable and provides multiple opportunities for the community to gather and recreate.

Opportunities: There is evidence of design standards, and the historic structures in the park make it one of the only City park sites that incorporates heritage resources. Revenue opportunities are low, but there may be opportunities for additional partnerships/connections with the zoo and other community organizations. Green/environmental opportunities are moderate, with the potential opportunity to develop a boardwalk and environmental programming along the waterway south of Zoo Drive, as well as a canoe/kayak launch. Because of the size of the park, there is an excellent opportunity to incorporate a substantial walking trail.
LAKEWOOD PARK
Address: 1612 Willow Wood Road
Park Type: Community Park

Lakewood Park is a large, highly active community park. It is centered in a wooded area that shelters a variety of playground types. There are also a number of special uses incorporated into the site, such as a boathouse and a dance studio. Despite these many uses, there is a great deal of flexible space. There is great opportunity to open the site up to embrace the adjacent waterway.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Because the park is wooded and only borders one major roadway (Willow Wood Drive), only part of the site is visible from the outside; the tennis courts, baseball fields, the boat house, and the dance studio are not visible from the roadway. Walking to the park is possible from the surrounding area, but there is a lack of safe crossings—particularly for Willard Model Elementary School and Lafayette Branch Library. Transit access is available about a quarter of a mile away on Tidewater Drive. The park is compatible with the adjacent neighborhood and interplays nicely with the elementary school and the library, but there is a lack of signage and little evidence of ADA compliance.

Comfort I Image: The park is attractive and pleasant. Despite the fact that there are few “eyes” on the park, the high level of activity makes it feel safe. Generally, maintenance is very good, but some facilities need to be improved or removed, such as the remnants of an old pavilion. The dance studio and the boat house are in good condition. There are many choices for seating, most of which are well-located in the shade. The park offers some protection from inclement weather, but pavilions and structures are clustered toward the north side of the park and leave some areas—such as the athletic fields—without convenient access to shelter.

Uses I Sociability: Lakewood Park is one of the most active parks in the City’s system, with a wide range of users from school-age children, to teenagers practicing sports, to single users taking advantage of the benches and pavilions. The level of activity varies throughout the day, with the peak of activity usually immediately after school hours. There is a high frequency of community events and activities, and most parts of the site appear to be used except for the space behind the dance studio.

Opportunities: There is evidence of both design and maintenance standards. Programming flexibility is high due to the open spaces and range of park facilities, which also create revenue and partnership opportunities. There is also an opportunity to increase the green/environmental component of the park by creating additional water access points and/or a boardwalk.
LARCHMONT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND LARCHMONT RECREATION CENTER
Address: 1167 Bolling Avenue
Park Type: City/School with Shared Active Recreation

The shared recreation components of Larchmont Elementary School and Recreation Center are mostly active and highly exposed to the elements. A communications tower mires the attractiveness of the site, but the adjacency of the historic elementary school gives the site character. There is a surplus of fencing that is unnecessary, a lack of signage, and no access to the waterway.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Visual access into the park is strong from Bolling Avenue, but those traveling along Hampton Boulevard would not be able to see the site. It is easy to walk into the park from the areas immediately north of Bolling Avenue, which is facilitated by the street being low-volume in traffic and the numerous openings in the site’s peripheral fence. Transit access is available within a quarter of a mile on Hampton Boulevard. Signage is very poor—it is difficult to identify the recreation center, and some buildings have no identifying signage at all. The site is compatible with the surrounding land uses, but could embrace its waterfront location much more. There is a lack of ADA compliance.

Comfort I Image: The potential beauty of the park is marred by the large communications tower, and the recreation center building lacks windows and signage. There are fewer trees at the site than others in Norfolk, making parts of the park feel exposed. In general, maintenance is good—the grass was freshly mowed and litter was scarce at the time of the site visit—and there are some “eyes” on the park from surrounding residences. Activity is also generated by the school, which makes the park feel busy and thus safer. Some playground equipment has reached the end of its lifespan, and other parts of the site—particularly the structure near the tennis courts—feel abandoned. There are very few places to sit, and when the recreation center is closed there is no shelter from poor weather.

Uses I Sociability: There is a mix of things to do, but because of the co-location of the school most of the activities are geared towards children. The level of activity depends on the time of day, and if school is in session. Aside from school kids, the only other users observed were an elderly couple playing tennis. Some parts of the site appear under-utilized, particularly the fringe of the park near the water.

Opportunities: There is evidence of maintenance standards, but not of design standards. The fields provide programming flexibility, and there may be revenue opportunities by taking greater advantage of the waterfront location. There is a major opportunity to make the park more connected to the environment by opening up the views to the water, providing access through boardwalks and providing interpretive signage.
MONA AVENUE PARK
Address: 8230 Mona Avenue
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Mona Avenue Park is a small neighborhood park adjacent to a substantial waterway. The park’s location is pleasant, and shade trees provide comfort and visual interest, but there are problems with graffiti.

**Proximity I Access I Linkages:** The park’s only street frontage is on Mona Avenue, and thus has few “eyes” on the park to provide natural surveillance. Also, because of the slope of the site, it is difficult to see the waterfront. There are no sidewalks to the park, but traffic is light on Mona Avenue and walking to the site is not difficult. Although the park lacks signage, the ramp to the playground is evidence of attempted compliance with ADA standards.

**Comfort I Image:** The park is pleasant, but graffiti detracts from its overall image. The neighborhood is well-kept and feels safe, which extends into the park but the lack of “eyes” on the site—especially down by the water—may be problematic, and may be part of the reason graffiti is present. For a park of small size, there are enough comfortable places to sit.

**Uses I Sociability:** Aside from using the playground equipment, there is little to do at the park. There were no users at the time of the site visit.

**Opportunities:** The small size of the site inhibits a great deal of programming flexibility, and there are few opportunities for revenue or partnerships. There is an opportunity to increase the green/environmental component by opening up water access and providing ecological education components.
MONKEY BOTTOM PARK
Address: 9625 Mason Creek Road
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Monkey Bottom Park is a largely passive park space with a beautiful live oak canopy and interesting topography. The park has a playground and a swing set, but lacks an internal path system for circulation.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Visibility into the park is poor due to the topography of the site—the rolling hills create “valleys” that are obscured from other parts of the site. Despite its location near Ocean View Elementary School, there are no formal connections to the school. Walking to the park is possible via the crosswalk on Ocean View Avenue, and Mason Creek Road is low-volume and does not present a barrier. A strong sidewalk network also facilitates pedestrian access to the site, but the site itself lacks internal circulation. There is no signage at the site, and currently it does not comply with ADA standards. Transit access is available on Ocean View Avenue.

Comfort I Image: The park’s undulating topography and large oak canopy make it a unique space quite unlike other parks and open spaces in the city. However, due to this same topography, there is a lack of visibility into the site making some areas feel unsafe. Overall, the park is clean and does not have a litter problem; maintenance does not appear to be an issue, as there is very little grass or equipment that require consistent attention. There are no places to sit, and no protection from inclement weather, nor is there evidence of stewardship from the community.

Uses I Sociability: At the time of the site visit, there was only one park user who was sleeping in one of the hidden nooks of the park. Aside from walking between the trees and using the playground, there are very few things to do at Monkey Bottom at this time. The park in general does not appear to be well-used.

Opportunities: Currently there is little evidence of design standards, and the site offers little flexibility in programming due to its unique features, including highly erodible soils. Any development of green space should balance the tree canopy with the provision of greater visibility into the park.
MONTICELLO VILLAGE PARK
Address: 8075 West Glen Road
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Monticello Village Park is a large, roughly circular neighborhood park surrounded by wetlands and waterways. The park’s different elements are fenced from one another, but there is a large amount of multi-purpose open space that offers flexible programming. The park appears to have an issue with litter and graffiti.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Monticello Village Park is very secluded. Connections to surrounding land uses are poor—nearby houses on Simons Drive have no easy access to the park, and there is no direct path from the park to the adjacent Forest Lawn Cemetery. There are no sidewalks, but it is not difficult to walk to the park due to low volume of traffic on nearby streets. There is no signage, and the park’s features do not comply with ADA standards for accessibility. Although compatible with adjacent land uses, the park is isolated from most of them because of the wetlands.

Comfort I Image: The amount of fencing both around and within the park detract from its overall image. There is little of visual interest in the park, but most of the site is well-maintained. At the time of the site visit, there was a small litter issue near some of the benches. Although visibility into the park is good from Glen Road, there is no visibility into the forested edges of the park. Some seating is available, but there is no protection from poor weather.

Uses I Sociability: The park is dominated by a large, multi-purpose open space but some areas are specifically programmed such as the playground, basketball courts, and a baseball diamond. At the time of the site visit, there was no one using the park, and there was little evidence of community pride in or stewardship of the park.

Opportunities: Because of the large multi-purpose open space, there is great programming flexibility at Monticello Village Park. Revenue and partnership opportunities are low, but there is a great opportunity to be more “green” and incorporate the surrounding wetlands/water into the site design, and provide better connections to the east side of the neighborhood.
NORFOLK FITNESS & WELLNESS CENTER
Address: 7300 Newport Avenue
Park Type: City Center with Active Recreation

The Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center is one of the city’s major hubs for recreation and services. The facilities are varied, and include an attractive outdoor swimming pool; multiple classrooms; a gymnasium; and many special-purpose rooms. The interior is welcoming and pleasant due to the amount of natural light, and maintenance is excellent.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: For such a major hub of activity, the Fitness & Wellness Center is tucked away into a neighborhood and lacks a major road frontage. Much of the site is surrounded by wetlands and water, so “eyes on the park” are minimal, except for at the athletic fields in the northwest corner along North Shore Road. Access to the facility is oriented toward vehicles, but there is a sidewalk connection along Newport Avenue. The closest transit access point is Granby Street, which is quite close in terms of distance, but pedestrian and roadway connections from the center to the bus route are indirect and weak. Within the center, signage is good, and there are multiple examples of effort to make facilities accessible to those with disabilities.

Comfort | Image: One of the first impressions of the site is the unusual dome over the indoor pool, which lends architectural interest to the site. Overall, the site feels safe because of the high level of activity and presence of multiple staff members. The center is very well maintained and there are a number of comfortable places to sit, particularly at the outdoor pool area. There is ample protection from bad weather and a high level of management and stewardship.

Uses | Sociability: At the time of the site visit, the center was very busy with a wide range of users; there were a large number of seniors using the park site and the fitness rooms were busy with patrons. Staff reported that, in general, usage levels are high and there is evidence of a sense of pride and community ownership.

Opportunities: There is a high degree of programming flexibility, both indoors and out. Revenue opportunities and partnership opportunities are also high. The site could become more “green” and interesting by better incorporating the wetlands and the water into the site design. For example, stronger connections to Granby Street are needed and could be incorporated into a boardwalk system along the wetlands.
NORTHSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL/MARY CALCOTT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL/NORFOLK THERAPEUTIC RECREATION CENTER
Address: 180 E. Evans Street
Park Type: City/School Shared Active Recreation

The Therapeutic Recreation Center (TRC) is co-located with both Northside Middle School and Mary Calcott Elementary School. The TRC is the hub for therapeutic recreation in the region, and provides more than 40 programs. The shared outdoor recreation facilities are aging and in need of an upgrade, but overall the grounds are well-maintained. There appears to be unused space adjacent to the TRC to the east.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Most of the site has good "eyes on the park," but in areas along East Evans Street, trees partially obscure the view. It is easy to walk to the park due to the low volume of traffic and strong sidewalk network in the neighborhood. Although there is no direct transit stop in front of the TRC, transit access is available within a quarter mile from bus routes on both Granby Street and Tidewater Drive. In general, there is a lack of signage outside of the TRC building, and given its function as a therapeutic recreation center, there is surprisingly little compliance with ADA standards for accessibility.

Comfort | Image: The TRC is well-maintained and has an excellent sense of stewardship, management, and pride—staff at the TRC are especially warm and welcoming, and are passionate about their work. The structure is clean and feels safe but is small and in need of updates and renovation. Outside, the shared athletic facilities are outdated, have reached the end of their lifespan, and should be replaced soon. There is some litter on the grounds, but otherwise the site is well-maintained. There are few places to sit outside, and seating within the TRC, while plentiful, does not appear to be comfortable.

Uses | Sociability: Because of the co-location of the two schools and the TRC, the site as a whole is fairly active throughout the day. At the time of the site visit, children were having recess outside, and a few people were using the TRC in between programs. Neighborhood and community events are frequent at the TRC, and according to staff there is a strong supportive relationship with nearby residents. The TRC staff reported that there is great interest in their programs and almost every program has a waiting list, but that the TRC lacks the space to hold additional sessions.

Opportunities: There is an opportunity—and a strong need—to update and enlarge the TRC. There is a good deal of programming flexibility with the site's multi-purpose fields, but revenue opportunities are low. There may be interest in having a community garden as part of the TRC's therapeutic programming, which would add a green/environmental element to the site.
NORTHSIDE PARK
Address: 8400 Tidewater Drive
Park Type: Community Park

Northside Park is a large, highly active community park with a range of activities. It has a mature tree canopy, attractive fencing and buildings, and excellent access to transit. Despite being surrounded by water and wetlands, there is no sense of being near the water at the park.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Visibility into Northside Park is limited due to its singular street frontage on Tidewater, and the distance to which the park stretches back. Walking to the park is not easy, as there are no crosswalks over Tidewater Drive, and the surrounding neighborhoods are cut off from the park by the water and wetlands. Transit access is very good however, and there is a designated Northside Park bus stop on Tidewater Drive. There is a lack of clear information and signage, and many parts of the park lack ADA access.

Comfort | Image: Northside is an attractive park with a lot of greenery, activity, and mature trees. Overall it feels safe, though there are some parts of the park hidden from view that may feel unsafe such as behind the baseball fields and along the wood line of the southwestern edge. The park is very clean and well-maintained, with an overabundance of trash barrels. There are many comfortable seating options, but they could be distributed more evenly throughout the site. Protection from poor weather is available at the pool, which is well-maintained. The ballfields in particular are well-kept.

Uses | Sociability: Northside Park is a large community park with a wide variety of things to do, but there is also a good balance of programmed space versus passive open space. The level of activity was high at the time of the visit, with a number of different types of people—families, teenagers, couples—using all parts of the park. There is a sense of pride and ownership at the park that exceeds that of most others in the city. One part of the park does not seem to be used as well as other parts is the collection of small pavilions along the southwest boundary.

Opportunities: There is evidence of maintenance and design standards at Northside Park, and revenue and partnership opportunities are high. The balance of active and passive open space is changing with the addition of a skate park at the site, and future park development should seek to retain remaining opening spaces for flexibility. There is a significant opportunity in the back of the park to develop an environmental boardwalk along the wetlands and waterway. Better linkages across the wetlands to the surrounding neighborhoods would connect the park to the community, and also provide opportunities for environmental education.
NORVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND NORVIEW COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 6401 Chesapeake Boulevard
Park Type: City/School Shared Active Recreation

Norview Community Center is one of the City’s newest recreation facilities. Co-located with Norview Elementary School, the building is beautiful, offers a mix of things to do, and has good physical connections to the neighborhood.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The community center is difficult to see from Chesapeake Boulevard because it is located behind Norview Elementary School, but there is good visibility to the center from Sewells Point Road. It is very easy to walk to the facility, and efforts have been made to provide direct pedestrian connections from the neighborhood to the community center. Transit access is excellent, with bus stops nearby on both Sewells Point Road and Chesapeake Boulevard. Signage at the center is very good, especially inside, and efforts have been made to comply with ADA standards for accessibility. The community center is compatible with the adjacent land uses of the school and the neighborhoods.

Comfort | Image: The community center has an attractive design and is very comfortable due to its cleanliness, abundance of natural light, and the presence of friendly staff. The adjacent athletic fields are functional, but lack amenities like benches and nearby trees. The site feels safe, and there are plenty of “eyes” on the fields and on the center. Inside the center there are ample places to sit, and it provides plenty of protection from poor weather. There is a great deal of evidence of management and stewardship of the site, but staff noted problems with the landscaping around the building.

Uses | Sociability: The community center offers a wide variety of things to do, all in top quality facilities including a gymnasium and a dance studio. The level of activity is high, and the outdoor facilities are populated during school hours with children on recess or in physical education classes. At the time of the site visit, it was unclear whether any parts of the site or the center are under-utilized.

Opportunities: There is clear evidence of design and maintenance standards. Programming flexibility is high, both indoors and out. Partnership opportunities are also very high, especially in terms of classroom space at the center but green/environmental opportunities are low.
OAKMONT NORTH PLAYGROUNDS
Address: 3501 Oakmont Court
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

The Oakmont North Playgrounds consist of a smattering of playgrounds and sports courts interspersed throughout the Oakmont development. Although well-distributed, the majority of the equipment is outdated and/or in need of repair. The site lacks signage, places to sit, and overall feels abandoned.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The playgrounds and sports courts are almost entirely obscured by the housing structures, and are only partially visible from the roadways in the neighborhood. However, it is easy to access the recreation equipment from within the complex, and the playgrounds and sport courts appear well-distributed. There is no signage, and the lack of an interconnected circulation system makes ADA access difficult. The facilities are generally compatible with the adjacent spaces, but electrical towers mar the beauty of the area. There are no safety lights and the site may feel dangerous after dark.

Comfort I Image: Much of the playground equipment is old, outdated, and feels abandoned but some pieces have recently been upgraded. The site does not feel like it is open to the public, nor is it welcoming. Some of the recreation areas have good “eyes” on the park, but others are more isolated and feel unsafe. Generally the site is clean, but without amenities. There are no places to sit, and there is some evidence of management—though who manages the site is unclear to the visitor. The mature tree canopy helps the site to feel more comfortable.

Uses I Sociability: There are a few things to do at the site: play on the playgrounds, use the sports courts, or maybe toss a ball in the open space. At the time of the site visit, there was no one using the facilities. Despite the fact that the playground area is clean and interspersed throughout the housing complex, there was no sense of community ownership of the recreation spaces.

Opportunities: There is no evidence of design standards, and because of its location within the residential complex, programming flexibility is low. Revenue opportunities are low, but partnerships could be possible with the housing authority, and a community garden may invigorate the space and add a green/environmental component.
OCEAN VIEW BEACH PARK
Address: 162 Ocean View Avenue
Park Type: Festival Park

Ocean View Beach Park is the City’s premier oceanfront property. In addition to the beach, there is a large performance pavilion that hosts a number of special events in the summer. The overall look and feel of the park is inviting, but there are some problems with litter.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The park is very visible from West Ocean View Avenue. It is difficult to walk to the park due to the large volume of traffic on Ocean View and the lack of pedestrian crossings, but the roadway does have a transit line. Like other City facilities, there is a lack of signage and the site does not meet ADA accessibility standards. The park is compatible with surrounding land uses, but could have more formalized connections to the nearby residences and the commercial area across the street.

Comfort I Image: The park gives a great first impression, and is a beautiful point of access to the ocean. It feels safe—particularly due to the presence of attractive safety lights—but the dune blocks visibility down to the beach itself. Overall, the park is well-maintained, but litter accumulates easily in the dune. The park offers a number of places to sit that are beautiful and well-located; the grassy bowl in front of the performance pavilion is a perfect place for audiences to sit on blankets and chairs. There is strong evidence of management and stewardship.

Uses I Sociability: In addition to going to the beach, the park is a major festival center for Norfolk. These events mostly occur in the summer months, and this part of the park is not used heavily in other seasons. At the time of the site visit there were a number of people using the park: people were walking along the brick path, tanning, and sitting on benches and reading. There was also a diversity of people using the site, including a group of young women, and a father and his child, and some individual users walking along the water.

Opportunities: There is evidence of design and maintenance standards. The large grassy area offers programming flexibility, and there are many potential partnership and revenue opportunities, such as vendors selling food or renting sporting equipment for the beach. Additional green/environmental opportunities are low. Like Community Beach, there is an opportunity to leverage Ocean View Beach Park and make improves to Ocean View Avenue by making the beach more “present” along the corridor, and improving linkages—both physical and visual—from the roadway to the water.
OCEAN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
Address: 600 East Ocean View Avenue
Park Type: City Center

The Ocean View Senior Center is a small community center with some outdoor recreation elements. The center lacks natural lighting, and its architecture feels institutional. The playground equipment has recently been replaced, but the back of the property is hidden and is a place where the transient population congregates.

**Proximity | Access | Linkages:** Although the center is easily visible from East Ocean View Avenue, the outdoor recreation area is not—the area behind the tennis courts in particular is hidden from view, and is used by the transient population. The site is fairly easy to walk to, with good sidewalk connections, and transit access is available on East Ocean View Avenue. Some efforts have been made to provide access to the site for those with disabilities. The site is compatible with adjacent land uses, but physically lacks connections to the golf course or to its surrounding neighborhood. Considering its location at the extreme north of the city, this may not be the most convenient location for a senior center in Norfolk.

**Comfort | Image:** The center itself is an older cinderblock building with an institutional feel, and lacks natural light. The outdoor area, in particular, does not feel safe due to visibility issues, and the equipment appears to be at the end of its lifecycle and neglected. Many of the facilities are damaged, and maintenance needs to be improved, but overall the center is clean. There are few places to sit outdoors, but the center provides a comfortable lounge area for seniors. There is some evidence of management and stewardship, but not as strong as other City community centers.

**Uses | Sociability:** The center provides a large mix of things for seniors to do, and the outdoor facilities provide basketball, tennis, and a playground. At the time of the site visit, there was one person playing basketball; a small group of transient people hanging out behind the tennis courts; and a large meeting happening in the Senior Center. There is a greater sense of pride and ownership in the center than there is for the recreation facilities outside.

**Opportunities:** There is no evidence of design standards, and very little flexibility in programming. There are few revenue and green/environmental opportunities, but there could be potential partnerships with other agencies and organizations providing senior services.
OLNEY ROAD PARKS
Address: 300-500 W Olney
Park Type: Neighborhood Passive

The Olney Road Parks are passive urban spaces, and are more of an urban-design element of the neighborhood than a recreation feature. The multi-purpose open spaces do provide some programming flexibility, and there are attractive design details. Nearby schools and day cares use the space for recess and physical education.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The parks are very visible from a distance, and all parts of the site can be seen from Olney Road. Walking into the parks is easy, though the cobblestones may inhibit access for the disabled. Transit access is available directly on Olney Road. There is no signage, and the site is not ADA compliant. The parks are compatible with the adjacent residential land uses, and add to the character of the neighborhood.

Comfort | Image: The parks are attractive, well-kept, and pleasant, but lack a visual focus. All three feel safe and are well-maintained. There are benches available, but not many seating options. The tidiness of the parks is evidence of management and community stewardship of the open spaces.

Uses | Sociability: There is little to do at the parks other than enjoy the open green space. Some nearby schools and day cares use the space for recess, and the multi-purpose green space does provide opportunities for a game of catch or a picnic. At the time of the site visit, the activity level was low with a single user sitting on a bench—most users are passing by or through the parks on their way to somewhere else.

Opportunities: There is evidence of a specific design standard, and maintenance standards are present. The parks have some programming flexibility and could probably host small neighborhood events, but revenue, partnership, and green/environmental opportunities are low.
POLLARD STREET PLAYGROUND
Address: 913 Pollard Street
Park Type: Neighborhood Active

Pollard Street Playground is a neighborhood park adjacent to the railway tracks. The entire park is fenced, and some of the surrounding land uses—such as the industrial areas to the west—are unattractive and incompatible with the park. The park does have nice places to sit, and the playground is in good condition.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The park is tucked into the neighborhood, but is completely visible from Pollard Street and Barre Street. The fencing inhibits pedestrian access to the site, and the railroad tracks may be a barrier to some residents further south. The site lacks ADA accessibility, and is not compatible with some of the adjacent land uses, particularly the light industrial use to the west.

Comfort I Image: The park is functional and aesthetically plain, but the plantings on the fence along the railway are attractive and do a lot to soften the site’s edges. The surrounding land uses make the park feel unsafe, but there are some “eyes on the park” from Pollard Street. The park is clean and well-maintained, but the basketball court is in poor condition and needs to be renovated or removed. There are comfortable places to sit that are well-located, and evidence of management is obvious, but it is unclear if the community takes pride or ownership in the space.

Uses I Sociability: For a small neighborhood park, there is a good mix of things to do including playing on the playground, playing basketball, or practicing baseball. At the time of the site visit there was no one using the park. The park is very clean and did not have a litter problem.

Opportunities: There is evidence of maintenance standards, and some programming flexibility due to the multi-purpose open space, but revenue, partnership, and green/environmental opportunities are low.
POPLAR HALL PARK
Address: Curlow Avenue
Park Type: Community Park

Popular Hall Park is a small community park that lacks connections to the rest of the city. Located next to Interstate 264, the park is completely hidden from view. There are a number of things to do, including playing softball, using the playground, and walking on the trail. There is an excellent opportunity for green/environmental elements.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: Poplar Hall Park is not visible from any roadway, nor is it connected through a sidewalk network. There is one connection to the elementary school, but the path is obscured from view and does not feel safe. Walking to the park is difficult due to its location along the interstate and there is no transit access within a quarter-mile of the park entrance. The park lacks signage and is not ADA compliant. Although it is a compatible land use to the school, the park is isolated and thus feels under-utilized.

Comfort | Image: The park itself is attractive, especially with the tree canopy and its small point of access to the water. Because park usage is low, it does not feel safe—there are no “eyes“ on the park. The park is well-maintained and clean, and although some of the playground equipment is new, some has reached the end of its lifespan. There are very few places to sit, and bleachers along the baseball fields are old and outdated. Evidence of management is present in the cleanliness of the park, but there is no sense of community stewardship.

Uses | Sociability: There is a mix of things to do, but because the park is so isolated there is little activity, and it is unclear if the park is consistently busy, though staff notes it is very active during church league softball season. Possible activities include walking on the trail, playing baseball, playing on the playground, and watching the crabs in the water. Some parts of the park are more hidden than others, particularly around the connection to the elementary school.

Opportunities: There is evidence of maintenance standards, and some programming flexibility due to the amount of space. Partnership opportunities are low, but there is an excellent green/environmental opportunity to use the waterway and wetlands as a more prominent feature. Connections over the water to nearby residences would also help populate the park and promote community stewardship.
ST. HELENA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND BERKELEY COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 903 S Main Street
Park Type: City/School with Shared Active Recreation

The shared facilities at St. Helena Elementary School and Berkeley Community Center are located along Interstate 464. The facilities are in poor condition, and the tennis courts in particular feel abandoned. Because of its location next to the interstate, there are few “eyes” on the park and it feels unsafe.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: Although the community center is visible from West Liberty Street, the entrance faces the opposite direction and does not make the building very welcoming. The outdoor facilities are hidden from view by the school, and there are no “eyes” on the ball fields, tennis courts, or outdoor pool. The site is bordered by busy streets, but there are crosswalks available at the school to the neighborhood and transit is available within a quarter-mile. There is signage at the community center, but it is difficult to understand the building’s entrance and functions given its orientation on the site. Although the site is compatible with the neighborhood, the interstate and the industrial lot south of the site are not particularly good neighbors. There is no evidence of ADA compliance.

Comfort I Image: The park feels abandoned, especially the tennis courts and the swimming pool. Adjacent land uses do not provide “eyes” on the park, and nearby residences lack visibility into the site due to the school building. There are no places to sit, but the recreation center does provide protection in the case of poor weather. There is little evidence of management and stewardship, and in general the site exhibits a lower standard of maintenance than other parks in the city.

Uses I Sociability: Although there is a mix of things to do at the park—go swimming, play on the playground, play baseball, use the community center—there was no one present at the time of the site visit. Even with school in session, the site felt empty, and the unkempt hedges and long grass communicate a lack of ownership over the park.

Opportunities: There is no evidence of design or maintenance standards, and few opportunities for revenue sources, partnerships, or green/environmental programming.
SHERWOOD FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL and SHERWOOD FOREST COMMUNITY CENTER

Address: 3035 Sherwood Forest Lane
Park Type: City/School with Shared Active Recreation

Sherwood Forest Community Center shares a number of active recreation facilities with Sherwood Forest Elementary School, including ball fields, basketball courts and playgrounds. There is a vacant lot adjacent to the open space that could be a future opportunity for expansion. Despite the location near the wetlands, the site is completely screened from the natural resource.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The outdoor recreation elements are not visible from the neighborhood due to their location behind the school. The only “eyes” on the park are from the school and the community center themselves, both of which generally lack windows. The fencing around the park inhibits pedestrian access, but nearby streets are mostly low volume in traffic and there is a sidewalk network until one reaches the school/City property. Transit access is a quarter of a mile away on Sewells Point Road. In general there is a lack of signage, and the site is not ADA accessible. The park and the Community Center are compatible with adjacent land uses, but are isolated from nearby neighborhoods because of the wetlands.

Comfort I Image: The site is plain but functional, and the community center building is outdated and could use more natural light. Although the neighborhood feels safe, there are few “eyes” on the outdoor recreation elements and it may feel unsafe after dark. The site is well-maintained but there are issues with litter. There are no places to sit, but protection from bad weather is available inside the community center.

Uses I Sociability: There is a mix of things to do, especially outdoors, and the site is invigorated with activity from school children at recess and physical education classes. There is some sense of pride and ownership in the property. Not all parts of the site appear to be well-used, such as the multi-purpose open space north of the ball field.

Opportunities: There is evidence of maintenance standards, and the multi-purpose space next to the baseball outfield gives the site some programming flexibility. There are few additional revenue and partnership opportunities, but the presence of the wetlands and the water are an opportunity to incorporate green/environmental elements that can be integrated into the school’s curriculum.
TANNERS CREEK PARK
Address: 6700 East Tanners Creek Drive
Park Type: Neighborhood Passive

Tanners Creek Park is more of a large linear green space adjacent to a roadway than a space for recreation. Only one small part has been developed as a park space, and there are no pathways within the park or a sidewalk to the park. The mature pine trees are attractive.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: The park runs adjacent to North Military Highway and is almost completely visible, but it is not evident that the space is a public park. From the west side of Military Highway it is easy to access the park on foot, but crossing Military Highway is exceedingly difficult due to high traffic volumes and a lack of crosswalks. There is no signage, and no evidence of compliance with ADA. It is compatible with adjacent land uses, but does not feel integrated into either the neighborhood or the streetscape of Military Highway. The close proximity to Military Highway, however, does provide the space with ample access to transit.

Comfort | Image: The first impression of the space is that it is “leftover” from the road, and not really a park at all. It feels safe and very open, except for the far north of the site where the benches are. Overall, the site is clean and well-kept, but there is a problem with litter. There are few places to sit throughout the site, and no protection from poor weather. The only evidence of stewardship and management is that the grass is mowed.

Uses | Sociability: There is nothing to do at the park other than walk through it to get somewhere else, or sit on the benches in the northern corner. At the time of the site visit in September, 2009, there was no one using the park, and there was no sense of community ownership over the space. Since the site visit, a new playground has been installed.

Opportunities: Currently there is no evidence of design standards and it has little programming flexibility due its long, linear shape. Revenue opportunities and partnership opportunities are few, but there may be an opportunity for green/environmental features such as a rain garden that filters runoff from Military Highway.
TARRALLTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND TARRALLTON PARK/COMMUNITY CENTER
Address: 2080 Tarrallton Drive
Park Type: Community Park/City Center/School

Tarrallton is a large community park with an emphasis on active athletic facilities. Though it is well-maintained and has plenty to do, there is a lack of shade trees and the site has no internal circulation system. The site is also completely screened from adjacent wetlands that could give more visual character to the park.

Proximity | Access | Linkages: There are few eyes on the park due to its location along the wetlands and on the backyard side of Millard Street. It is easy to walk into the park from the neighborhoods because of the low-traffic streets and strong sidewalk network, but an access point along Millard Street would make it much easier for residents east of the park. Despite being a community park, the site is not accessible by transit—the closest stop is more than one mile away on East Little Creek Road. There is a general lack of signage, and little evidence of ADA accessibility. Although compatible with adjacent spaces, the park is in the backyard of a number of residences and may be a nuisance to the neighborhood during athletic events.

Comfort | Image: Tarrallton Park makes a good first impression because it is well-maintained and there are few hidden areas of the site. Visibility into the site is high and contributes to a feeling of safety, and it’s very clean and lacks the litter problems present at some other City parks. There are very few places to sit. Protection from bad weather is available, though it is not well distributed. The level of maintenance demonstrates a large amount of management and stewardship, present both outside and within the community center.

Uses | Sociability: There is a variety of things to do at the park and at the community center, though at the time of visit there were few people using the site. Community events are often held at the community center, and the large multi-purpose open space provides a great degree of programming flexibility. Staff has noted that the BMX track has created some issues.

Opportunities: There is evidence of design and maintenance standards at the park and the community centers. Revenue opportunities exist in the renting of athletic facilities, and partnerships may also be available. There is a great green/environmental opportunity in connecting to the adjacent wetlands, which would also make the site a more interesting park experience.
TITUSTOWN VISUAL ARTS CENTER
Address: 7545 Diven Street
Park Type: City Center with Active Park Amenities

Titustown Visual Arts Center is a newer community facility that focuses on arts and cultural programming. The building is comfortable, has nature light, is clean, and appears to be well-used by the community. The center’s outdoor areas appear to be less utilized, and there was a problem with trash and vandalism at the time of the site visit.

Proximity I Access I Linkages: The site has good “eyes on the park” from three different sides, but the area behind the building is hidden from view. Additionally, the site is not visible from a major road, which may result in fewer residents taking advantage of the facility because they do not know the center exists, or cannot find it easily. The neighborhood’s sidewalk network gives the site strong pedestrian connectivity. There is a lack of signage, and little evidence of ADA compliance. From the parking lot, one cannot tell that there is a baseball field at the site.

Comfort I Image: The first impression of Titustown Visual Arts Center is positive because of the good condition of the building and the presence of unique architectural elements. Despite evidence of vandalism, the site does feel safe, particularly inside the center. Comfort and image is very positive inside the building, and evidence of community stewardship can be seen in the citizens’ art gallery.

Uses I Sociability: The center has multiple classrooms that are well-designed to maximize natural light and sociability. At the time of the site visit there were a handful of people using the site to attend classes; the gymnasium and fitness room were not being used, but staff noted that they are generally well-used by the community. As the primary center for arts classes in Norfolk, Titustown attracts a broad group of people and appears to be well-loved by residents.

Opportunities: There is evidence of design standards and maintenance standards at the site. Programming flexibility is high, and there are some revenue opportunities in renting out the classrooms. No green/environmental opportunities were noted.
FINDINGS: PHYSICAL ANALYSIS OF PARKS SYSTEM

Norfolk’s existing parks are part of a traditional system in which parks are well-distributed and have an excellent balance of active and passive parks spaces. One of the system’s greatest strengths is that it is neighborhood-based and provides meaningful open space to most residents in the city. This is especially true in terms of community and neighborhood centers that provide central gathering places and resources for residents close to home. Part of this was accomplished through co-locating joint uses with schools. RPOS also offers a broad range of social, cultural, recreation and wellness programs, and is particularly strong in therapeutic recreation opportunities.

From a systems perspective, however, there are some components that Norfolk’s park system lacks. One of the greatest opportunities for improvement would be the development of an interconnected network of parkways, greenways and trails throughout the city. Additionally, there is a lack of attention to local resources—more parks could include natural areas and waterways that are available to the public, celebrate Norfolk’s history and culture and use local buildings styles, materials, and native plants in their designs.

Many of these observations of the parks system are echoed in the individual evaluations of Norfolk’s park sites. In general, the park sites have a satisfactory amount of multi-purpose open space and take advantage of other public investments nearby. However, many parks that are along the city’s rivers do not actually provide access to the water; in fact, wetlands and water consistently act as barriers to accessing parks at both the neighborhood and community level. Some of the newer parks exhibit strong pedestrian connections to their neighborhoods, but older facilities need to be upgraded significantly in this area.

Perhaps the most prevalent site-level observation is that despite adequate levels of maintenance, most of the City’s parks are outdated and have a plain aesthetic. While this is not true of all facilities—some are standouts, such as Captains Quarters and Norview Community Center—most parks are functional in appearance. This is particularly true for the park sites that are joint active recreation sites with schools. Over time, there is an opportunity to upgrade the City’s parks with not only new equipment and facilities, but also with thoughtful design elements that incorporate the city’s natural and cultural resources. As park sites become more comfortable and interesting their usage levels and sociability will improve.

### PHYSICAL ANALYSIS
Finding of Need
- Biking/Walking/Jogging facilities
- Upgrade existing facilities
- Boat ramps/Kayak + canoe launches
- Fishing piers
- Nature/Environmental centers
- Signage
3.3 Interviews with Elected Officials

On September 23, 2009, AECOM interviewed five City of Norfolk elected officials who were asked to discuss the major parks and recreation needs in Norfolk. Some of the interviews also included a discussion of funding mechanisms that should be considered for future improvements. Following is a summary of their comments:

Parks and Recreation Needs
Biking/walking/jogging trails and kayak facilities were the only parks and recreation needs identified by a majority of the elected officials. Two officials also noted swimming pools and soccer fields as priority needs. Other needs mentioned included gathering places; open green space; a marina; community gardens; softball fields; boat ramps; beach volleyball facilities; beach programs; and exercise programs.

Interestingly, some specific needs emerged that are not facility- or program-specific. Two officials noted a strong need to improve existing facilities, and to make the most out of existing resources. Two officials also mentioned the need to better incorporate the school recreation facilities into the system. More than one official noted that the city should become more amenable to hosting marathons and other running events. Other comments included that Norfolk needs to “make being outside fun” and that the parks system should be used to improve education opportunities.

Funding Mechanisms
According to one official, the City historically has a pay-as-you-go mentality and uses money from the General Fund and grants to fund parks system improvements. An Enterprise Fund may be something to consider, and the same official noted the need for a fee study to examine cost recovery options and the use of subsidies.

Other Comments
According to one official, the City has spent $16 million on parks improvements in the last three years, such as the development of the Norfolk Fitness and Wellness Center. Additionally, several major projects have recently been completed, such as the LEED-certified Lamberts Point Community Center, and the $90-million Salvation Army-funded Kroc facility is in its planning stages. Despite these major accomplishments, some officials noted that Norfolk feels “behind,” especially when compared to some Hampton Roads neighbors like Virginia Beach. There is a desire to upgrade facilities to be on par with some of the top recreation centers in the region, and also an interest in creating stronger connections to Virginia Beach through trails and bikeways.

Multiple officials mentioned the need to elevate the importance of health and fitness in Norfolk. Other general comments were that facilities still need to be affordable and safe, and that the City needs to better promote what it is doing and what amenities are offered. Specific improvements suggested include:

- Recreation centers should have more holistic programming that deals with the mind, body, and spirit;
- Youth recreation leagues sponsored by the City should have minimum academic standards that kids must meet in order to participate as an incentive for kids to perform better in school;
3.4 Stakeholder Interviews

Between September 22 and September 25, 2009, AECOM interviewed 15 stakeholders arranged by the City. Stakeholders included City staff, members of the Recreation, Parks and Open Space Commission, representatives from the Norfolk School Board, and parks and recreation directors from neighboring municipalities. Similar to the interviews with elected officials, the discussions ranged from specific parks and recreation needs to long-term, general issues that Norfolk faces.

Parks and Recreation Needs
The needs that stakeholders noted most frequently are the same as those stated by elected officials: biking/walking/jogging trails and water access. Multiple stakeholders also mentioned that indoor swimming pools, community center and after-school programs are priority needs. One stakeholder identified a specific need for an indoor swimming pool at Lake Taylor.

Also mentioned as needs were tennis programs, swimming programs, soccer fields, baseball fields, football fields, therapeutic recreation facilities, senior programs, boxing facilities/programs, dance and drama programs, more programs for girls, water safety programs, fishing programs, dog parks, community gardens, and computer labs.

Other Comments
A consistent theme throughout many of the interviews was the importance of education and a focus on youth. Particularly, multiple people mentioned the need for kids to have a place to go after school, and a need for more collaboration between RPOS and the schools.

Other comments of note include:

- There is a need to examine operations and maintenance to make them more efficient, cost-effective and sustainable.
The Recreation and Parks Plan must tie into the City’s current Comprehensive Plan effort, and reflect existing neighborhood plans. There is a perception that the City is deficient in all types of open space. People do not know what is available and the City’s resources go under-used. There is a large amount of natural lands and wetlands within the parks that are not used and could have greater recreation access with trails and boardwalks. The plaza at SCOPE/Chrysler Hall needs to be re-designed (though this is outside the purview of RPOS). The Navy is a huge resource, but what is the best way to get them more involved in the local community?

**FINDINGS: STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS**

The findings from the stakeholder interviews are consistent with the elected officials’ work. According to interview results, the major parks and recreation needs in Norfolk are:

- Water access points
- Biking/walking/jogging trails
- Indoor swimming pools
- After-school programs

Multiple stakeholders emphasized the importance of youth and education, and noted the opportunities for the parks and open space system to have a positive impact on the community’s children.
FOCUS ON: THERAPEUTIC RECREATION

The RPOS department is faced with trying to serve a growing population of disabled individuals that require varying degrees of therapeutic recreation services. Currently the Therapeutic Recreation Center (TRC) serves approximately 96 patrons, which is not even 1% of the city’s disabled population. RPOS Special Needs staff includes: one full-time Senior Recreation Supervisor II, two full-time Therapeutic Recreation Specialists, two part-time therapeutic recreation specialists, one full-time driver, one part-time driver and three instructors. The current program ratio is approximately 1:5.

The TRC provides recreational programming for citizens across the Hampton Roads area, primarily serving City of Norfolk residents first who have mental and physical disabilities, health conditions, and temporary impairments from ages six and up. The current program is divided into children's programs (ages 6-12), teen programs (13-19), and adult programs (18 and older). The “primary” mental disabilities served are mental retardation, Down syndrome, autism, ADHD, Schizophrenia, Depression, and ODD. The “primary” physical disabilities that served are Severe Arthritis, Cerebral Palsy, Stroke (Paralysis), Visual/hearing impairments, diabetes, hip/knee replacements, and heart conditions.

The TRC has a large variety of adult programs including: aquatic exercise (four levels): low-impact, moderate impact, resistance training, and deep water), land exercise, chair exercise, dance, cooking, ceramics, mosaics, art medley, creative carpenters, bowling (recreational and skill-building), reminiscence therapy, career choices, bingo, game nights, movie nights, outings, workshops, summer day camps, and monthly special events.

The teen programs include: Teen Sports Zone and Teen Excursions. The children’s programs consist of, but are not limited to: bowling, cooking, water activities, arts and crafts, games, Norfolk Mermaid Tour outings, workshops, and special events. According to staff, the most popular programs are aquatic exercise, bowling and ceramics. These programs fill within one hour on the first day of registration thus requiring the staff to maintain a lengthy waiting list. Typically the classes, outings, and workshops fill within one week of registration.

The TRC maintains numerous partnerships throughout the community such as the Norfolk Public School System (Transition Team and Stuart Elementary Even Start Program), Norfolk Community Services Board, Virginia Wesleyan College, Old Dominion University, Norfolk State University, Virginia Zoo, Hope House, Eggleston services, Norfolk and Virginia Beach Mayor’s Committees for Persons with Disabilities, Norfolk Alliance for Persons with Mental Retardation (NAPMR), Virginia Beach Therapeutic Recreation Department, Blaze Sports, Virginia Association for the Blind, and Chesapeake Therapeutic Recreation Department.
3.5 Public Workshops

During the week of September 22, 2009, AECOM facilitated two community-wide public meetings.

WORKSHOP I
The first meeting was held in the evening of September 22nd at Tarralston Community Center, and 85 community members attended. Attendees were shown a brief presentation and then asked to discuss the core values of Norfolk and what makes it a unique place. It should be noted that this workshop had high representation from the local soccer leagues and supporters of therapeutic recreation.

Core Values--What is important in the City of Norfolk? Responses:
- Access to programs/facilities for people with disabilities
- Beach access
- Support for transitional military personnel, many single parents
- Open, equitable access to beaches and lakes
- Unique climate, culture, environment.
- Respect for the natural environment
- Vibrant downtown: Town Point Park, walking, parking
- Affordability
- Small town character—gardens, town centers
- Have a sports culture—need to translate into fitness, wellness
- Value the neighborhoods, green space
- Taking care of special needs, therapeutic recreation
- Arts and culture, festivals (e.g., wine festival), block parties, etc
- Traditional families population blended with highly mobile population
- Diversity—age, ethnicity, intergenerational
- People make the city
- Parks system is great: accessible, free, family-oriented
- Literacy, education for adults

Following the discussion of core values, participants were then asked to “vote” on their top three priority recreation needs. Following is a summary of attendees’ responses; the number in parentheses indicates the number of “votes” the facility or program received.

Prioritization Exercise
Soccer fields (23)
Therapeutic recreation center (15)
Soccer leagues (13)
Open/green space (11)
Therapeutic recreation programs (9)
Beaches (8)
Baseball fields (6)
Outdoor swimming pools (6)
Walking/biking trails (5)
Neighborhood parks (4)
Small community centers (3)
Indoor swimming pools (3)
Large community parks (3)
Nature/environmental centers (3)
Outdoor adventure (3)
Sports instruction classes (3)
After-school recreation programs (2)
Music instruction (2)
Water fitness (2)
Volleyball courts (2)
Boxing (1)
Senior programs (1)
Dance classes (1)
Baseball leagues (1)
Biking/walking groups (1)
Basketball courts (1)
Football/rugby fields (1)
Boat ramps (1)
Playgrounds (1)
Kayak/canoe launches (1)
Fishing piers (1)

To gain more detailed insight into workshop attendees’ parks and recreation needs, each participant was asked to complete a copy of the telephone/mail survey (see 3.6). Results can be found in the Appendix.

WORKSHOP 2
The second workshop was held on the evening of September 24, 2009 at Booker T. Washington High School. A total of 35 community members attended, and the workshop followed the same format as Workshop 1. Instead of a discussion about core values, however, there was a general discussion of the community’s parks and recreation needs.

General Parks and Recreation Needs
- Neighborhood recreation centers—there is a need to take care of kids, especially teens
- Access to cultural experiences
- Things for everyone to do
- Bigger recreation centers
- Adult citizens need more investment, including buildings, programs, and transportation
- Therapeutic recreation needs to be expanded
- Ingleside needs a larger facility for civic leagues and seniors, in addition to a gymnasium
- Registration time doesn’t make sense for therapeutic recreation—need better system, busses to provide transportation
- South side – recreation centers on Leake Street, others—need more space, improved conditions
- Middletown Arch, Stonebridge, Broad Creek: have no recreation centers/facilities
- Shoop Park has nothing to do for 10-14 year-olds; need to have a kids/teen workshop
- Need to partner with schools for safe, wholesome activities
• Core values—green, cultural, big “small town”, neighborhoods
• Developers did not provide parks, open space for new development
• Need to be pedestrian/bicycle friendly
• Need to actively pursue more public/private funding, philanthropy
• Need soccer fields, improvements to existing fields including those at the schools
• Need to get information from Long Range Transportation Plan
• Funding for parks and recreation: increased fees, revolving fund
• Need to improve softball fields

Participants in Workshop 2 also completed a prioritization exercise where each person had three “votes” for priority parks and recreation needs, and had an opportunity to complete the mail/telephone survey.

Prioritization Exercise:
Therapeutic recreation (10)
Soccer fields (8)
After-school organized recreation (7)
Fitness/wellness programs (7)
Community centers—large regionalized (4)
Community centers—small neighborhood (4)
Softball Leagues (3)
Softball Fields/Improvements to existing fields (2)
Basketball leagues (2)
Walking/biking trails (2)
Football Leagues (1)
Soccer Leagues (1)
Dance classes (1)
Music instruction (1)
Nature/environmental programs (1)
Baseball fields (1)
Fitness/exercise facilities (1)
Kayak/canoe launches (1)
Nature/environmental centers (1)
**FINDINGS: PUBLIC WORKSHOPS**

In combining the results from the prioritization exercises and surveys from each workshop, the following facilities and programs are attendees’ priority parks and recreation needs:

- Soccer fields
- Therapeutic recreation facilities
- Soccer leagues
- Therapeutic recreation programs
- Fitness/exercise programs and facilities

Other parks and recreation needs that appear to be a lower priority are:

- After-school programs
- Beaches
- Baseball fields
- Swimming pools
- Walking/biking trails
- Open green space
- Neighborhood parks
- Nature/environmental centers
- Community parks
- Picnic areas
- Community centers
- Special events
- Nature programs

### 3.6 Mail/Telephone Survey

**METHODOLOGY**

Leisure Vision, a national expert in parks and recreation survey research, worked closely with the AECOM consultant team and City staff and conducted a community interest survey in the fall of 2009 to establish priorities for the future improvement of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the City of Norfolk. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the city. The survey was administered by a combination of mail and phone. Leisure Vision worked extensively with City officials, as well members of the AECOM project team, in the development of the survey questionnaire. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance to effectively plan the future system.

Leisure Vision mailed surveys to a random sample of 2,500 households in the City of Norfolk. Approximately three days after the surveys were mailed, each household that received a survey also received an electronic voice message encouraging them to complete the survey. In addition, about two weeks after the surveys were mailed, Leisure Vision began contacting households by phone. Those who indicated they had not returned the survey were given the option of completing it by phone.
The goal was to obtain a total of at least 500 completed surveys from City of Norfolk residents. This goal was far exceeded, with a total of 573 surveys having been completed. The results of the random sample of 573 households have a 95 percent level of confidence with a precision of at least +/- 4.1%. The following pages summarize major survey findings:

MAJOR SURVEY FINDINGS

- **Visitation of City Parks or Recreation Centers.** Sixty-nine percent (69%) of households have visited City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year. Of the 69 percent of households that have visited City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year, 77 percent rated the physical condition of the parks/recreation centers as either excellent or good.

- **Participation in City Recreation Programs.** Twenty-seven percent (27%) of households have participated in recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks, and Open Space during the past 12 months. Of the 27 percent of households that have participated in City recreation programs during the past 12 months, 89 percent rated the overall quality of the programs as either excellent or good.

- **Reasons Preventing the Use of City Parks, Recreation Facilities or Programs More Often.** The most frequently mentioned reasons preventing households from using City parks, recreation facilities or programs more often are: I do not know what is being offered (27 percent), program times are not convenient (12 percent), and security is insufficient (12 percent).

- **Need for Parks and Recreation Facilities.** There are five parks and recreation facilities that over 50 percent of households have a need for: neighborhood parks (65 percent), walking and biking trails (61 percent), fitness and exercise facilities (56 percent), picnic areas and shelters (55 percent), and beaches (54 percent).
Most Important Parks and Recreation Facilities. Based on the sum of their top four choices, the parks and recreation facilities that households rated as the most important are: walking and biking trails (32 percent), fitness and exercise facilities (25 percent), beaches (24 percent), neighborhood parks (20 percent), and indoor pools/aquatics facilities (19 percent).

Figure 3.6c Most Important Facilities to Households
Need for Recreation Programs. The recreation programs that the highest percentage of households have a need for are: fitness/wellness (51 percent) and special events/festivals (49 percent).

Most Important Recreation Programs. Based on the sum of their top four choices, the recreation programs that households rated as the most important are: fitness/wellness (30 percent), special events/festivals (22 percent), swimming lessons (18 percent), and adult continuing education/enrichment (17 percent).

Ways Households Learn About Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Parks & Open Space Programs and Activities. The most frequently mentioned way respondents learn about Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Park and Open Space programs and activities are: from friends and neighbors (48 percent), newspaper articles (36 percent), newspaper advertisements (26 percent), and flyers/posters at parks and recreation facilities (24 percent).

Organizations Used for Indoor and Outdoor Recreation Activities. The organizations used by the highest percentage of households for indoor and outdoor recreation activities during the past 12 months are: City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks (39 percent), churches/synagogue/mosque (25 percent), parks and recreation facilities in other cities (23 percent), and State of Virginia parks (23 percent).

Distance Respondents Would Travel to Use a Neighborhood Park. Seventy-four percent (74 percent) of households would travel at least one mile to use a neighborhood park. This includes 24 percent who would travel one mile, 21 percent who would travel two miles, and 29 percent who would travel more than two miles.

Distance Respondents Would Travel to Use a Community Park. Ninety-one percent (91 percent) of households would travel at least one mile to use a community park. This includes 11 percent who would travel one mile, 22 percent who would travel two miles, and 58 percent who would travel more than two miles.
• **Actions to Improve Parks and Recreation That Households Would Be Most Willing to Fund with Tax Dollars.** Based on the sum of their top four choices, the actions to improve the City of Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Parks and Open Space that households would be most willing to fund with tax dollars are: develop walking and biking trails and parks along the waterfront (30 percent), fix-up park buildings and recreation facilities (23 percent), upgrade existing neighborhood and community parks (21 percent), and develop new indoor recreation centers (21 percent).

**IMPORTANCE-UNMET NEEDS MATRIX**

The Importance-Unmet Needs Matrix is a tool for assessing the priority that should be placed on parks and recreation facilities and recreation programs in the City of Norfolk. Each of the facilities and programs that were assessed in the survey were placed in one of the following four quadrants:

- **Top Priorities** (higher unmet need and higher importance). Items in this quadrant should be given the highest priority for improvement. Respondents placed a high level of importance on these items, and the unmet need rating is high. Improvements to items in this quadrant will have positive benefits for the highest number of City of Norfolk residents.
- **Opportunities for Improvement** (higher unmet need and lower importance). Respondents placed a lower level of importance on these items, but the unmet need rating is relatively high. Items in this quadrant should be given secondary priority for improvement.
- **Special Needs** (lower unmet need and higher importance). This quadrant shows where improvements may be needed to serve the needs of specialized populations. Respondents placed a high level of importance on these items, but the unmet need rating is relatively low.
- **Less Important** (lower unmet need and lower importance). Items in this quadrant should receive the lowest priority for improvement. Respondents placed a lower level of importance on these items, and the unmet need rating is relatively low.
Importance-Unmet Need Assessment Matrix for City of Norfolk Parks and Recreation Facilities
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and unmet need ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Figure 3.6e Importance-Unmet Need Matrix: Facilities
Figure 3.6f: Importance-Unmet Need Matrix: Programs

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (November 2009)
FINDINGS: MAIL/TELEPHONE SURVEY
The mail/telephone survey is the strongest, most accurate tool available to determine the parks and recreation needs of the general population. According to the survey results, Norfolk residents show a high attendance rate at the community and recreation centers, and that most who do utilize the facilities are satisfied with their quality. A much smaller percentage of residents participate in RPOS programs, but almost all who do indicated there were satisfied or very satisfied with their experiences. This may indicate a need to better market what is available so that more people can take advantage of what RPOS offers.

Residents also indicated that the following facilities are their priority parks and recreation needs:

- Walking/biking trails
- Neighborhood parks
- Fitness/exercise facilities
- Picnic areas/shelters
- Beaches

In terms of programming, residents communicated a strong need for the following:

- Fitness/exercise programs
- Special events

Residents were also generally supportive of actions that the City could take to improve the parks system, and were most supportive of upgrading existing facilities.

MAIL/TELEPHONE SURVEY
Finding of Need
- Biking/Walking/Jogging facilities
- Fitness/exercise facilities
- Neighborhood parks
- Open green space
- Picnic areas
- Playgrounds/Tot lots
- Swimming pools/Aquatics center
- Adult/Continuing education
- Arts programs
- Biking/Walking programs
- Fitness/exercise programs
- Nature/environmental programs
- Special events
- Swimming lessons
- Water fitness programs
- Upgrade existing facilities
- Beaches
- Community/Recreation center
- Large community park
- Nature/Environmental center
- After school programs
- Historic/interpretive programs
- Music instruction
- Outdoor adventure programs
3.7 Level of Service Analysis

The purpose of a Level of Service (LOS) analysis is to quantify how well the existing parks system is meeting the recreation needs of residents. The National Recreation and Park Association’s definition of LOS is “an allocation mechanism for the delivery of park land and basic recreation facilities throughout a community. By adoption of such a standard, a community in essence says that all citizens, regardless of the taxes they pay or the use they will make of the services provided, will have an equal opportunity to share in the basic menu of services implicit in the standard and accompanying spatial distribution and allocation policies.”

For the City of Norfolk, equal opportunity was measured based on three basic principles:

- **Acreage (Amount of Park Land)** - Every resident, neighborhood and community should have an equal or similar allocation of park land.
- **Access (Distance or Travel Time)** - Every resident should be able to access recreation facilities within similar walking, bicycling, and/or driving distance.
- **Capacity Analysis (Capacity of Facilities)** – Every resident should have access to sports facilities that are able to accommodate demand for use.

**ACREAGE**

*Every resident, neighborhood, and community should have an equal or similar allocation of park land.*

Acreage of park land per 1,000 residents remains the most common technique of expressing equal opportunity, even though conditions and needs vary greatly between areas. There is no universally accepted methodology that defines the minimally acceptable number of acres per 1,000 residents—it is up to each community to determine what is appropriate for its own needs and circumstances. However, the underlying principle for Acreage LOS is that most communities believe that significant open space should be set aside for recreation, environmental protection, aesthetics and health.

The community also must define what “counts.” For example, should private recreation facilities and conservation lands count towards the LOS analysis? Or just publicly owned parkland? Or all land owned by the City’s parks department?

The City of Norfolk has a particularly complex system in terms of facility types and owners. For this reason, the Acreage LOS analysis includes a baseline acreage and an expanded acreage evaluation. The baseline analysis includes all neighborhood and community park spaces operated by the City. The expanded evaluation includes City-operated parks, as well as other land, or “special-use” facilities, operated by the parks department, such as cemeteries, golf courses, beaches, etc. See Appendix C for a list of which park sites are included in each analysis.

Acreage LOS is calculated by taking the total population and dividing it by the number of parks acres. This number is helpful because it can help the City of Norfolk compare itself to other communities. The following charts illustrate Norfolk’s acreage LOS as it was in 2000, and using population projections for 2010, 2020, and 2030.
**FINDINGS: ACREAGE LOS**

Because Norfolk’s population is projected to grow in small increments over the next 20 years, the change in LOS is negligible. When analyzing only neighborhood and community park spaces, the city currently has an LOS of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. If all parks department acreage is counted—including special-use facilities such as the cemeteries, the Botanical Gardens, and the golf course—the LOS is 9 acres per 1,000 residents. Compared to other communities throughout the U.S., an LOS of 5 acres per 1,000 residents may be adequate, but some of the most livable cities in the country, such as Portland, Oregon, have an LOS of 15 acres or more per 1,000 residents. Even when expanding the definition of parks acreage to include almost every open space, Norfolk’s current amount of parkland is significantly lower than the parks acreage in the most livable cities in North America.
ACCESS LOS
One shortfall of the Acreage LOS is that it only examines total acreage, and does not take location into account. Access LOS fills this gap by expressing LOS as the service area—either a distance or travel time—that a park facility serves. The distance or travel time standards should be based on the development patterns, street networks, bicycle/pedestrian networks, demographics, climate, and other variables in the community. The Access LOS analysis is most useful in examining the distribution of parks that are not resource-based and can theoretically be located anywhere in the community.

The City of Norfolk has not established service area standards for parks facilities in its Comprehensive Plan. Typically, different access standards are established for different types of facilities. A small playground, for example, will have a small service area since it is intended to serve residents in its immediate area, and should be within walking distance of peoples’ homes. By contrast, tournament-level soccer fields are intended to serve a much larger community, and could reasonably have a service area of many miles.

For the City of Norfolk Access LOS, nine different facility types were mapped with the following baseline service areas:

- Neighborhood Parks – ½ mile
- Gymnasiums – 1 mile
- Bicycle Paths – 2 miles
- Water Access – 2 miles
- Recreation Centers – 2 miles
- Baseball Fields – 2 miles
- Soccer/Football Fields – 2 miles
- Indoor Swimming Pools – 4 miles

Below is a summary of each facility, its preliminary service area, and the results. Pages 3-63 through 3-70 contain maps that illustrate each facility analysis.

FINDINGS: ACCESS LOS
Overall, the City of Norfolk’s parks and recreation facilities are well-distributed throughout the community. As the maps show, almost all residents have reasonable access to soccer/football fields and baseball fields. With a few exceptions, most residents also have equal access to indoor swimming pools and recreation centers. The facilities with the lowest levels of access are bicycle paths; neighborhood parks; gymnasiums—though this service area may need to be adjusted depending on community priorities; and to a lesser extent, water access points. Neighborhoods that are most in need of access to recreation facilities are Elizabeth Park/Woodbine; Poplar Halls; East Ocean View; Fairmount Park; and western Willoughby.
Neighborhood Parks – ½-Mile Service Area

A neighborhood park should meet residents’ close-to-home recreation needs such as multi-purpose open space, a playground, and picnic areas. Ideally, every resident should be able to walk a half-mile or less to reach this kind of parks space. The map above shows a half-mile service area in green for every neighborhood park. In Norfolk, they are generally well-distributed throughout the city, but there are areas that are not covered by the current system. This is partially because there are not enough neighborhood parks, but also because some busy roadways such as Tidewater Drive, Military Highway and Chesapeake Boulevard are barriers to pedestrian access. Neighborhoods that lack access to a neighborhood park within a half-mile include the western area of Willoughby; parts of West Ocean View and Northside; parts of Bayview; South Bayview; parts of East Ocean View; North Camelia Acres; Camelia Shores; Meadowbrook Forest; parts of Lake Taylor; Hollywood Homes/Maple Hall; River Forrest Shores; Woodbine; parts of Poplar Halls; parts of Ingleside; Estabrook; Fairmount Park; parts of Larchmont/Edgewater; and parts of Lakewood.
Currently there are 11 gymnasiums open to the public in Norfolk. For the Access LOS analysis, an aggressive service area of one mile was used. The map above shows that many residents in Norfolk do not have access to a gymnasium within one mile of their homes; this is especially true in all neighborhoods south of Interstate 264; Ingleside; Broad Creek; Lafayette/Winona; Larchmont/Edgewater; Colonial Place; Suburban Acres; the entire area east of Interstate 64 and south of Little Creek Drive; parts of Bayview; Northside; and Willoughby. If the service area were to increase to two miles, the coverage would expand markedly, but there may still be a need in the neighborhoods south of Little Creek Drive and in the Lafayette/Winona areas.
Greenways + Trails – 2-mile Service Area

The City of Norfolk currently has one trail under development, the Elizabeth River Trail. Although some phases have not yet been constructed, the analysis assumes that the entire trail will be operational. In the map above, a two-mile service area around the Elizabeth River Trail is shown in green. The trail is accessible to most residents south of the Lafayette River, and as far east as the Ingleside area. However, all neighborhoods north of the Lafayette River lack access to a meaningful trail experience. It should be noted that in an ideal parks system, the travel distance to a trail should be shorter, such as 1/2 mile.

Map 3.7c  Greenways and Trails Access
**Map 3.7d  Canoe, Kayak and Water Access**

**Canoe – Kayak – Water Access – 2-Mile Service Area**

One of Norfolk’s best resources is its extensive system of waterways and beach access points. The map above shows in blue the areas of Norfolk that are served by an existing point of access to water within two miles. Although some areas such as Little Creek Road may never have access to the water because of geography, there are many areas within two miles of a lake or river that currently lack access points to water. These areas include the neighborhoods that abut Lake Whitehurst; the neighborhoods south of the Elizabeth River; neighborhoods north of the Lafayette River; and Roosevelt Gardens.
The City of Norfolk has made continued investments in providing recreation centers throughout the community. As such, almost every resident in Norfolk lives within a two-mile trip (shown in orange) of a recreation center. Areas that do not have equal access to a recreation center are Lakewood, Poplar Halls, Elizabeth Park/Woodbine; Bromley; and parts of Northside.
Soccer/Football Fields – 2-Mile Service Area
There are a number of soccer/football fields within the City of Norfolk. When each is mapped and analyzed for a two-mile service area, virtually every resident in Norfolk has equal access except for a handful of people in Poplar Halls, Elizabeth Park, and Woodbine.
The City of Norfolk has a large number of baseball and softball fields. When mapped with a two-mile service area, virtually the entire city has access to a field with the exception of the western area of Willoughby.
Indoor Swimming Pools – 4 Mile Service Area

Currently Norfolk has three indoor swimming pools. Because indoor swimming pools are such large public investments, typically they have larger service areas and are meant to serve many neighborhoods. With a four-mile service area, almost every resident in Norfolk has equal access to an indoor pool except for residents in Hollywood Homes, west Willoughby, East Ocean View, and parts of Azalea Acres. The City is currently planning a new aquatics center in the southern neighborhoods, which will greatly improve access for residents in this area who currently must cross the river for swimming facilities.
CAPACITY ANALYSIS
With the help of athletic facility staff, AECOM analyzed the capacity of the City’s current soccer, football, baseball, and softball fields, and the City’s sport courts. The chart below illustrates the estimated demand for the facilities based on actual permit requests from 2009-2010. The capacity column reflects the City’s existing capacity for each athletic facility. Staff then determined the number of fields that are in need of an upgrade in order to carry to perform at top capacity. The final column reflects the difference in demand and capacity, assuming that the targeted fields can be upgraded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Demand Details</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>In Need of Upgrade</th>
<th>Additional Facilities Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer/Football</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Game fields: 15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice fields: 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lighted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Game fields: 30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice fields: 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lighted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Game fields: 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice fields: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lighted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Sport Court</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Game courts: 7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practice courts: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Findings
According to staff, the major issue to address is field quality. Currently there is a marked difference in the quality and maintenance of game/tournament-grade fields and the practice fields. The result is that demand for the game/tournament fields is very high, and the practice fields are not carrying as much as the demand as possible. The primary need for sports fields in Norfolk is to upgrade and fix the existing sports fields. Additionally, there appears to be a need for about 13 more sport courts, 8 more soccer/football fields, 2 baseball fields, and 3 additional softball fields.

FINDINGS: LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS
According to the three LOS techniques, the City of Norfolk has a need for the following:

- Bicycle paths/trails
- Neighborhood parks
- Gymnasiums/Sport Courts
- Water access
- Community/recreation centers
- Softball fields
- Boat ramps/kayak and canoe launches
- Football/soccer fields
- Upgrade/fix existing facilities

LOS ANALYSIS
Finding of Need
- Basketball courts
- Biking/Walking/jogging facilities
- Gymnasiums
- Neighborhood parks
- Upgrade existing facilities
- Softball fields
- Boat ramps/kayak + canoe launches
- Community/recreation centers
- Football/soccer fields
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3.8 National Recreation Trends

Parks and recreation needs are not static—over time, trends emerge that reflect what people seek from their parks and recreation experiences. Although some recreation needs are specific to geography and population, some recreation trends are prevalent throughout the nation. Following is a brief summary of parks trends that have emerged in the past two to five years that are pertinent to the development of Norfolk’s Recreation, Parks and Open Space System Plan.

PARK FACILITIES

New Facility Types and Recreation Experiences
Nationwide, parks departments are witnessing shifting needs and preferences in the facilities that residents want. Some key trends include:

- **Bikeways/Sidewalks/Trails** – In dozens of recreation surveys completed across the country, trails, bikeways, and greenways consistently rank in the top three most needed facilities regardless of the community size, location or demographics.

- **Aquatics** – The trend is toward creating aquatic complexes that offer something for the whole family, such as splash pads and other smaller, interactive water experiences.

- **Alternative sports for adults** – Interest has grown in non-traditional sports leagues like kickball, dodgeball and ultimate Frisbee, particularly among young adults.

- **Special Events** – People attend community festivals more frequently, especially festivals celebrating arts, culture and food. Another popular trend is “movies in the park” during warm months.

- **Adventure Sports** – More people are mobilizing for recreation facilities such as mountain bike parks (especially in or near urban areas) and skate parks. This is especially true among teenagers who are not involved in traditional sports and have fewer recreation options.

- **Large, Multi-Purpose Centers** – Cities are increasingly centralizing facilities—particular indoor recreation facilities—at large, multi-purpose centers rather than dispersing facilities in smaller centers throughout the municipality. Most places have adopted this approach due to the savings in maintenance and staffing costs.

Challenges in Meeting Operations and Management Costs
In a survey conducted in 2008 by Resources for the Future, more than half of the responses from parks and recreation directors indicated that insufficient funds for operations and management is a “major” or “huge” challenge. Compared to other questions that asked directors about challenges in programming, staffing, and safety, keeping up with maintenance and operations was by far the most common challenge."
Sustainability
There is increasing interest in making public investments more “green” and sustainable. Parks are a natural partner for localities wishing to increase the longevity of their sites and structures, particularly in gaining multiple benefits from investments such as water features that double as stormwater treatment mechanisms; community centers built to LEED standards; and native plantings and other low-impact design features that both reduce maintenance costs and minimize ecological effects. Another aspect of this is economic sustainability, which includes a trend towards fixing and upgrading existing facilities rather than spending scarce resources building new parks and facilities.

Nature Deficit Disorder
With the publication of Richard Louv’s Last Child in the Woods, there is increasing concern that children are spending too much time indoors, and not interacting enough with nature. One offshoot of the book has been the creation of the Children & Nature Network, a movement that aims to reconnect children with nature. Currently, there are 68 regional campaigns across the country, many of which are led by local governments, to encourage more nature programming and access to natural areas close to home.

PROGRAMS AND MARKETING

Online Learning
More and more people—from young students to adults—are turning to online learning to meet their education needs. As the number of household with Internet access increases, more people can take advantage of online learning opportunities. Additionally, community computer labs continue to be popular, and can double as classrooms for continued education using the latest technologies. Parks and recreation departments are increasingly called upon to provide these services, and also make their own websites more informative and interactive.

Online Networking
In addition to online learning, people are more interested in using social media sites such as Twitter and Facebook. These communication tools are free and local governments are increasingly using them to market events and programs, and provide other information to residents. Although these tools previously were used primarily by young people, the audiences are expanding and they now reach a very diverse audience.

“Staycations”
With the challenging economic environment, many people are forgoing expensive vacations and instead are becoming tourists in their own communities. Some call this approach to time off as taking a “staycation.” According to parks and recreation professional Stacy Turner, staycations have resulted in an increase of 4 to 6 percent in campsite bookings nationally. Festivals and other low-fee community events are increasingly popular. This trend is an opportunity to get more residents using park facilities and cultivating a greater sense of pride and ownership in community open spaces.
Farmers Markets/Local Food Movements
Between 2000 and 2005, the number of farmers markets nationwide increased by 43 percent. According to a study by the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), farmers markets during that time were most successful in urban areas on the coasts. Additionally, markets in the Mid-Atlantic states and the West Coast had double the sales of other regions. As communities begin farmers markets, there is a greater need for venues that can be filled by parks departments. This not only benefits the markets, but is a source of income for the locality and activates park spaces. Additionally, parks can be a source of food through the cultivation of community gardens.

FINDINGS: NATIONAL RECREATION TRENDS
The trends discussed above are by no means inclusive of all recreation and parks trends in the nation, but provide examples of how parks systems have evolved and are now serving a greater diversity of people and their needs. People increasingly want a broader mix of activities in their parks, and want additional ways to connect with the community. To provide these services for the people of Norfolk, the City should consider developing the following facilities and programming:

- Bikeways/trails
- Special events
- Outdoor adventure programs
- Nature/environmental center
- Nature programs
- Community gardens
- Adult continuing education classes

Within the economic context of 2010, however, parks departments are expected to do more with fewer resources, while still maintaining existing parks and recreation facilities to the same standards. It is this focus—doing more with less—that helps frame the City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks System Master Plan to make the best use of existing resources to not only maintain the city’s quality of life, but enhance it for years to come.
3.9 Needs Assessment Summary

The City of Norfolk’s park system currently follows a traditional model of providing numerous small facilities distributed throughout the community. This distribution gives residents fairly equal access to facilities, choices of gathering spaces, and a broad range of programs. Most parks also exhibit a large proportion of passive open space, another indicator of a traditional system.

Through the different types of analysis, a number of priority parks and recreation needs have emerged; the chart below is an overview of the findings from each analysis type. The results from most of the needs analyses show that biking/walking/jogging facilities are a priority need in Norfolk. Such facilities will provide more recreation opportunities while also providing linkages within the city for alternative modes of transportation, and encourage tourism by linking downtown to major cultural and historic features.

Water access was another need that showed up repeatedly in the needs analyses. Many people acknowledged Norfolk’s great water resources, but said the resources aren’t capitalized upon, either in terms of physical access—such as kayak launches and fishing piers—or visual access.

Other facilities that repeatedly were mentioned as needs include swimming pools, soccer fields, community/recreation centers, therapeutic recreation facilities, fitness/exercise facilities, neighborhood parks and to an extent, nature/environmental centers. The need for these facilities is reflected in the finding from the LOS Analysis that revealed a need for additional parks acreage—if Norfolk wants to become a more livable city, additional parks acreage will be needed to “catch up” to other cities that have a higher quality of life. In the acquisition of additional park land, special attention should be paid to areas that are currently under-served by the existing parks system, such as Elizabeth Park/Woodbine; Poplar Halls; East Ocean View; Fairmount Park; and western Willoughby.

In addition to facilities, the needs assessment shows a need for additional programming. In Norfolk, the two high priority program needs are fitness/exercise programs and special events. Other priority needs include adult/continuing education classes, after-school programs, nature/environmental programs, outdoor/adventure programs, and therapeutic recreation programs.

Though not a specific facility or program type, the needs assessment also revealed the sentiment that the City needs to fix and upgrade existing facilities, and make sure facilities are maintained and up to date. Given the challenging economic climate, it is also important for the City to consider how to do more with less, and maximize existing resources to their fullest. This speaks to the issue of the City’s backlog of deferred maintenance, and the need to address it.

Another area for improvement includes facilities that are co-located with schools: there is a need to make this relationship more beneficial to the city, both in terms of building relationships with additional schools and ensuring that the maintenance of school-city facilities is on par with other parks facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Service</th>
<th>Physical Analysis</th>
<th>Elected Officials</th>
<th>Stakeholder Interviews</th>
<th>Public Workshops</th>
<th>Mail/Telephone Survey</th>
<th>LOS Analysis</th>
<th>Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball fields</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking/Walking/Jogging facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/Kayak + canoe launches</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/recreation center</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer labs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/exercise facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football/Soccer fields</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community park</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Environmental centers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open green space</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds/Tot lots</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools/Aquatics centers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic recreation facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/continuing education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating/Fishing programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking/Walking programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/exercise programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic/interpretive programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music instruction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer leagues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic recreation programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade existing facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Vision
4  VISION

4.1 Overview

Norfolk’s recreation, parks and open space system has great potential to help reinvigorate the city in these difficult economic times. Great park systems have been shown throughout the country to improve property values, attract tourists, attract new businesses, improve public health, and contribute positively to environmental and social sustainability. The system already has a strong foundation—but what are the key ways to make it better?

Using feedback from the needs assessment, the planning team determined that there are eight focus areas, or “sub-systems” for improvement: parks, athletic fields, community character, bikeways and trails, water access, community and recreation centers, programs, and operations and maintenance. From January 12-14, 2010, the planning team, City staff, and others met to determine how these eight areas should be addressed. Participants broke into groups representing the focus areas and drafted guiding principles and a vision plan for each sub-system. From this exercise, three themes emerged:

REFRESH – The “bones” of a great parks system are already in place in Norfolk, but much of the system needs to be refreshed and updated with new facilities and additional activities. This section details the vision to refresh Norfolk’s parks and recreation facilities through the following:

- 4.2 Parks
- 4.3 Athletic Fields
- 4.4 Community Character

RE-CONNECT – Despite a dense roadway network, Norfolk currently has limited connectivity by bike, foot, or paddle. This section describes the vision to re-connect Norfolk’s community assets through:

- 4.5 Bikeways and Trails
- 4.6 Water Access

RE-FOCUS – Over the years, the City—particularly the Department of Recreation, Parks and Open Space (RPOS)—has taken on a wide span of responsibilities. To achieve the City’s vision of an excellent parks and recreation system, Norfolk must re-focus its energies and resources in the following key areas:

- 4.7 Community and Recreation Centers
- 4.8 Programs
- 4.9 Operations and Maintenance

The graphic on page 4-2 is an illustrative concept of Norfolk’s refreshed, reconnected, and refocused parks system to be achieved in the next ten to twenty years. To become one of the most livable cities on the east coast, the long-range goal (50 years) of the City is to achieve a level of service (LOS) of 15 acres of park land per every 1,000 residents.
Map 4.1a  Illustrative Recreation, Parks and Open Space Vision
FOCUS: STRONG PARKS, STRONG NEIGHBORHOODS

In the period of February-March, 2009, Norfolk City Council affirmed a number of neighborhood plan recommendations that pertain to recreation, parks and open spaces. These plans include the Broad Creek Revitalization and Implementation Plan, the Fairmount Park Neighborhood Revitalization Implementation Plan, the Comprehensive Plan for Greater Wards Corner, A Strategic Plan for Southside, the Comprehensive Plan for Military Highway Corridor, and the Plan for Downtown Norfolk. Specific recommendations for additional parks and improved connectivity have been incorporated into the Recreation, Parks and Open Space vision where appropriate. From these neighborhood planning efforts, a number of general parks and open space system recommendations emerged:

- **Providing Transportation Choices**
  - Create or improve bicycling routes
  - Improve pedestrian systems, including crossings and connections
  - Pursue Safe Routes to Schools programs

- **Promoting Environmental Sustainability**
  - Protect and enhance natural resources and vistas
  - Improve pedestrian systems, including crossings and connections

- **Creating and Maintaining Healthy and Vibrant Neighborhoods**
  - Explore development of community gardens and tot lots

- **Delivering Quality Community Facilities and Services**
  - Improve infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, street lighting, and water/sewer)
  - Improve access to the water
  - Enhance recreational programming
  - Expand child care and senior programs

- **Preserving Community Character and Identity**
  - Improve streetscapes to enhance pedestrian environment and community aesthetics
  - Improve beach access ways and the roads leading to them

These recommendations are consistent with the City-wide vision presented in this plan, and have been expanded upon in greater detail to neighborhoods that currently lack specific plans. It should be noted that at this time of this plan, the Central Hampton Boulevard Area Plan has not yet been adopted; once it has, the Recreation, Parks and Open Space Plan should be updated to reflect recommendations for the area.
REFRESH

One of the major findings from the Needs Assessment is that Norfolk already has excellent open space “bones” — a good distribution of parks spaces, a number of recreation facilities, and a rich backdrop of water, history and culture. To capitalize on these existing resources, the City should focus on refreshing its parks and open spaces through the upgrade of existing facilities and the development of a few key new spaces.

4.2 PARKS

Parks are the building blocks of Norfolk’s open space system, and are the primary venues for recreation and community sociability. But because the city is already built out, there are few opportunities to acquire additional large tracts of park space. It is essential then that the existing parks spaces are upgraded to deliver maximum community benefit. In the few neighborhoods that currently lack a neighborhood park space, strategic investments should be made to provide access to a meaningful open space. The guiding principles below outline criteria for the maximization of Norfolk’s parks spaces. Note that “minor waterways” can be defined as those that can be crossed by a footbridge without blocking the access of private docks to larger waterways.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

All Parks
- At least 50 percent of every park should be multi-purpose green space (with an exception for special-use facilities)
- All parks that abut water or wetlands should provide at least one point of physical access to the resource
- All parks should be designed to maximize flexibility and be easily adapted to demographic changes
- All parks should be designed or retrofitted to meet the latest standards of green design and environmental sustainability
- All facilities should have prominent signage and wayfinding

Community Parks
- Every resident of Norfolk should be able to reach a community park within three miles of their home
- All community parks should have at least ten things to do at any single time
- All community parks should be accessible by transit and should be located on at least one bicycle route
- All community parks should have safe pedestrian crossings at all major roads located within one mile of the park
- If desired by the neighborhood, residents who live within one mile (as the crow flies) of a community park but are separated by minor waterways should be able to access the park by a pedestrian bridge.
Neighborhood Parks
- Every resident of Norfolk should be able to reach a neighborhood park within a half-mile of their home
- At least 50 percent of every neighborhood park should be multi-purpose green space
- Specific facilities for each neighborhood park should be determined through a community process
- If desired by the neighborhood, residents who live within a half-mile (as the crow flies) of a neighborhood park but are separated by minor waterways should be able to access the park by a pedestrian bridge.
- Every neighborhood park should have a continuous sidewalk network within a half-mile radius of the site

Shared School Facilities
- Where feasible, outdoor school facilities should be open and accessible to residents outside of school hours
- All City of Norfolk park facilities shared with schools should allow fair, consistent access to recreation facilities with general operating hours clearly posted
- All shared school facilities should have safe pedestrian crossings across all major roads located within one mile of the park
- If desired by the neighborhood, residents who live within one mile (as the crow flies) of a shared school facility but are separated by minor waterways should be able to access the park by a pedestrian bridge

Special Use Facilities
- All special use facilities should have safe pedestrian crossings across all major roads located within one mile of the park
- If desired by the neighborhood, residents who live within one mile (as the crow flies) of a special-use facility but are separated by minor waterways should be able to access the park by a pedestrian bridge if the community supports it.

A detailed system map and inventory of all park sites can be found in Appendix C.
RECOMMENDATIONS

UPGRADES TO EXISTING FACILITIES

Continued investment in existing resources is key to long-term sustainability. Every existing park in the system should be evaluated against the pertinent guiding principles. As funds become available to upgrade parks, the City should hold a public meeting with the surrounding neighborhood to determine residents’ needs and desires for the park space. This input, combined with the application of the parks principles, should form the core of each park’s upgrade plan.

AECOM visited 40 parks as part of the physical system analysis. Based on observations on access, comfort, and sociability in Section 2, the following parks are recommended as priority sites for upgrades and enhancements:

- Barraud Park
- Airport Gateway Park
- Jeff Robertson Park
- Monkey Bottom Park
- Monticello Village Park
- Oakmont North Playgrounds
- Tanners Creek Park

One of the major findings from the physical system analysis was the difference in quality between the City-owned recreation facilities and those shared with the schools. The City and the Norfolk School Board need to strengthen their relationship and raise the quality standards of the shared facilities to those of the rest of the City parks. The following shared facilities should be prioritized for upgrades and enhancements:

- Chesterfield Elementary School and Pool
- Crossroads Elementary School
- James Monroe Elementary School
- Northside Middle School/Mary Calcott Elementary School
- St. Helena Elementary School
- Sherwood Forest Elementary School

The upgrades to School/Park sites are not just physical; the City will continue to work with the School Board to improve access to park and recreation facilities after school hours.
Figure 4.2a Oakmont North Playgrounds: Before and After
NEW FACILITIES
To provide equal access to neighborhood parks for all residents, 13 new neighborhood parks are needed (as identified in the Access LOS analysis, Section 3). AECOM recommends the acquisition and development of neighborhood parks in the areas below. At a minimum, each should have multi-purpose open space, a playground, and a picnic area. An estimated acreage is also included for each. Wherever possible, new neighborhood parks should not only provide recreation opportunities but also help to improve neighborhood connectivity.

- Willoughby (western) – 0.5 acres
- Ocean View (Bay Oaks) – 11 acres
- East Ocean View (eastern) – 0.5 acres
- Camelia Shores – 1 acre
- South Bayview – 0.5 acres
- Bromley/Azalea Acres – 1 acre
- Greenwood/Elmhurst – 1 acre
- Fairmount Park – 3 acres
- Larchmont (northern) – 0.5 acres
- Freemason – 0.5 acres
- Ingleside – 1 acre
- Poplar Hall (northern) – 0.5 acres
- River Forest Shores/Pleasant Point – 0.5 acres

Though not in areas with the greatest need for parks spaces, previous neighborhood plans have identified several future park projects as identified below;

- Improvement of the open space adjacent to the Madison School in Lamberts Point
- Development of a neighborhood park in Park Place bounded by Omohundro Avenue, Granby Street, 30th Street, and 29th Street
- Future site linkage for open space and water access at Somme Ave. along the Lafayette River
Focus: Greener Parks
One major area for improvement is developing the environmental sustainability of Norfolk's parks. As existing parks are upgraded and new neighborhood parks are developed, the City should use the opportunity to re-design the sites in ways that require less maintenance and minimize negative impacts on the environment. Following is a discussion of basic green design principles to consider:

Attention to Context
- Where possible, support or replant historic vegetative communities in non-programmed spaces
- Create and cultivate landscapes that respond to their environmental and cultural context

Plants
- Use predominantly native plants
- Remove existing exotic plants and avoid planting Category I and Category II invasive species
- Plant trees to support City goal of 40% tree canopy
- If native plants cannot be used, select regionally adapted non-native plants
- Use plants to optimize the ecosystem services they provide, such as air and water filtration; support of wildlife habitat; regulation of greenhouse gases; and restoration of regional system
- Test soils prior to planting design to determine the plants most suitable for the site. Soil tests should be conducted by a licensed professional testing agency and samples should be taken at random across the site. Minimally soil tests should include fertility, pH and composition.
- Use predominantly low-maintenance plants
- Use pest-resistant plants
- If a pest problem occurs, use physical/mechanical treatments such as pruning as the first line of defense, or bio-pesticides
- Replace sod with low-maintenance ground cover and/or mulch where not needed for play

Irrigation
- Arrange plants in hydrozones and use the most efficient irrigation system as possible where long-term irrigation is required
- Irrigation sources should include predominantly reclaimed/reuse water, horizontal wells created below stormwater ponds, or water cisterns/rainwater harvesting systems

Use of plants native to the Hampton Roads region, such as the grass juncus effuses (rush), are not only visually interesting but are a more sustainable material choice.

Belltown, Washington’s “Cistern Steps” are an example a water cistern/rainwater harvesting system that also integrates public art.
Fertilizers
- Maximize the use of organic, composted material in lieu of synthetic fertilizers
- Establish on-site composting systems
- Time irrigation with fertilizer applications
- Do not apply fertilizers except immediately prior to the appropriate timeframe for update by plants
- Do not use fertilizers within 25 feet of a water body
- Do not use weed-and-feed products that contain herbicides and fertilizer together
- Do not fertilize if heavy rain is forecast

Hardscapes
- Use pervious paving where feasible
- Use durable materials that will withstand Norfolk’s environment and will last 40 to 60 years
- Use low-maintenance finishes that do not require harsh chemical cleaning
- Use materials with a high recycled content or that can be recycled at the end of its life-cycle
- Use locally produced and harvested materials with low embodied energies
- Do not over-design structures, including engineering components; for example, do not use a 10’x10’ when an 8’8 will work
- Reduce light pollution by selecting full cut-off fixtures or shielded light sources

Other
- Where appropriate, the use of solar energy should be used to provide power to park structures such as community centers

The Norfolk Division of Environmental Storm Water Management recently completed a study evaluating Greenway Park in Colonial Place for wetland restoration and improvements. The Division also plans to develop the Myrtle Park Wetland Project in Larchmont as a continuation of the project completed in FY 2011. Both of these projects represent excellent opportunities for RPOS and the Division of Environmental Storm Water to work together and produce multi-functional public spaces.
4.3 ATHLETIC FIELDS

Athletic fields are a core recreation service provided by the City. They host and sustain City-run sports leagues, as well as many private leagues. When fields are high quality, they can generate revenue by increasing league participation and enabling Norfolk to host sports tournaments. Additionally, quality athletic fields can help activate neighborhood and community parks, and are a valuable tool in creating positive experiences for youth. Norfolk currently has a number of athletic facilities, but many are in need to be refreshed with new turf, field lights, and amenities that make it possible to hold tournaments. To achieve their potential, the following guiding principles should be applied to Norfolk’s athletic facilities:

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
1. Provide equitably distributed fields throughout the city
2. Locate fields in places that do not negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods
3. Every field should be maintained to a quality that provides either a quality practice field experience or can be used for tournament-level competition

RECOMMENDATIONS
There is concern that Norfolk residents who want to participate in sports leagues are traveling to surrounding municipalities that are able to provide very large sports complexes, such as the Boo Williams Sports-Plex in Hampton. Because of the lack of available land in Norfolk, the City cannot provide a facility that is comparable to a large, multi-field sports complex. Therefore, the recommended strategies below aim to provide a similar quality playing experience by utilizing smaller, individual fields throughout the city.

UPGRADE EXISTING FACILITIES
The most efficient and cost-effective way for the City of Norfolk to meet demand for athletic facilities is to upgrade existing facilities to a standard that will maximize their use. From the preliminary capacity analysis completed in the Needs Assessment (section 3.7), City staff identified the following upgrades:

Soccer/Football Fields
The 14 fields listed below are mostly unlit, multi-purpose recreation fields that do not meet the needs of soccer players. For these fields to be fully functional, AECOM recommends an upgrade of each to a quality, multi-purpose practice field that provides a recreational experience similar to that of the game or tournament-grade fields. To achieve this, the upgraded multi-purpose practice fields must be well-drained, have a level playing surface, and be lighted when possible (provided that they are not a nuisance to surrounding land uses). In addition, because of the heavy use these fields will have to sustain, they must have a maintenance schedule similar to the game and tournament fields.

Map 4.3a Soccer/Football Field Upgrades
Figure 4.3a Soccer Field at Lafayette Park: Before and After
Higher Priority
- Berkley Park
- Huntersville
- Lafayette Park (2)
- Lakewood Park (2)
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center
- Tarrallton Park (2)

Medium Priority
- Barraud Park
- Rosemont

Lower Priority
- Ballentine
- Lafeyette Middle School
- James Monroe Elementary School

Baseball Fields
The 23 fields listed below are mostly unlit practice fields or multi-purpose fields that do not meet residents’ needs for baseball. AECOM recommends upgrading each to a quality baseball practice field that includes an adequate backstop, team seating areas, and a fully vegetated, level playing surface. The field surface should be well maintained and well drained. In addition, because of the heavy use these fields will have to sustain, they must have a maintenance schedule similar to the game and tournament fields. Lights should also be provided where they are not already present and will not be a nuisance to surrounding land uses. RPOS recognizes that one of the highest priorities for baseball fields is in the Ocean View neighborhood, and staff is committed to working with the area leagues to find a solution based on the available resources and the direction provided from the City Manager’s Office and the City Council.

Higher Priority
- Booker T Washington High School
- Ingleside
- Lafayette Park
- Larrymore
- Ocean View (3)
- Oceanair (2)

Medium Priority
- Berkley Park
- Crossroads
- East Ocean View (already lighted)
- Larchmont Park
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center
- Northside Middle School (3)
- Fairlawn (already lighted)

This soccer field in Indianapolis illustrates what a refreshed practice field in Norfolk would look like.

Practice-level baseball fields do not need fencing, as shown in this example in New York City. Though a more urban example, the quality and amenities of the above field is appropriate for Norfolk.

Map 4.3b Baseball Field Upgrades
Lower Priority
- Ballentine
- Bayview
- Camp Allen (2)
- Norview Middle School
- Rosemont

Near the end of this master planning process, important changes occurred in the availability of baseball and softball fields. Previously home to substantial youth leagues, the baseball fields at the Naval base will no longer be available for public use. RPOS will continue to work with the displaced league to find solutions based on available resources, and will look for potential new land acquisitions as opportunities arise.

Softball Fields
Similar to the baseball fields, the 12 softball fields listed below are mostly unlit practice fields or multi-purpose fields intended to meet residents’ needs for softball facilities, but are not meeting community expectations. AECOM recommends that each facility be upgraded to a quality practice softball that includes an adequate backstop, team seating areas and a fully vegetated and level playing surface. The field surface should be well maintained and well drained. Like the baseball fields they must have a maintenance schedule similar to the game/tournament fields.

Higher Priority
- Booker T. Washington High School
- Fairlawn
- Lakewood Park
- Poplar Halls (2)

Medium Priority
- St Helena
- Grandy Village
- Larchmont
- Sherwood Forest
- Willard Model School

Lower Priority
- Easton Elementary School
- Jacox
- Jeff Robinson
- Ruffner

Softball fields, like one in Central Park shown above, can not only be functional but help give form to other park elements like pathways and benches.
DEVELOP NEW FACILITIES + ADDITIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS
In addition to upgrading existing facilities, the preliminary capacity analysis from the needs assessment indicated that Norfolk needs five new soccer fields, three new football fields, three new softball fields and thirteen new gym courts. The analysis is intended to give a rough estimate of what is needed to meet the existing demand for athletic fields, but is not an in-depth study. Therefore, AECOM recommends that eventually the City should commission a formalized Facility Capacity Study. In the meantime, the City should focus on the upgrade of existing facilities.

4.4 COMMUNITY CHARACTER
Community character is the collection of qualities that give a city its sense of place. Although Norfolk has many unique qualities, four in particular have a major impact on the city’s character:

- **Water** – Norfolk has been shaped by its location on the Chesapeake Bay. The tidal rivers that shape the city boundaries—particularly the Lafayette and Elizabeth—have given Norfolk its current form. Water extends into the interior of the city through smaller rivers and ribbons of wetlands.
- **Port and Transportation History** – From its inception, Norfolk has been a port city. This role has created a diverse place where cultures converge, goods and ideas are traded, and the waterfront is vibrant. The port is not all about water, however: Norfolk has been the transportation crossroads of the region for generations, and is still a place where you hear the train whistle as it rumbles by, filled with coal from points west.
- **Military History** – Because of the city’s strategic location on the water, Norfolk has had a military presence for more than 200 years. This tradition continues with the presence of one of the largest U.S. naval stations in the country, and the NATO Allied Command Transformation forces.
- **Cultural Diversity** – Norfolk is home to people of many different racial and ethnic backgrounds who make the city diverse and give it a rich history. In particular, the African-American community has played a large role in shaping the city.

The City of Norfolk’s parks and open spaces are ideal places to celebrate community character. Not only can they help “tell the story” of Norfolk’s history and culture, but parks and open spaces can be refreshed through integrating design elements that embrace these qualities. Community character can be expressed in parks through a number ways including interpretive signage; environmental restoration; incorporation of new design details; heritage programming; the installation of public art; and hosting special events. Furthermore, RPOS can work with other departments to help preserve actual heritage resources as part of the public realm. The exploration of Norfolk’s water heritage in parks should be closely linked with developing the city’s system for water access (see 4.5 Water Access).

*This park space in Mount Vernon, Washington incorporated native materials, views of the water, and public art to create a unique public space.*
GUIDING PRINCIPLES
1. Every park, recreation, and open space improvement should reflect Norfolk’s heritage and character.
2. Every library, school and recreation center is an opportunity to integrate heritage and arts into the community.
3. The parks and open space system should tell the story of Norfolk through the four themes of water, the port and transportation, the military, and cultural diversity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UPGRADE EXISTING RESOURCES/FACILITIES
The celebration of community character is best achieved through the upgrade of existing resources and facilities.

Heritage and Culture Hubs
Through the vision process, six parks were identified as existing or potential heritage and cultural hubs:

- Town Point Park
- Lafayette Park/Virginia Zoo
- Norfolk Botanical Gardens
- Northside Park
- Ocean View Park
- Poplar Hall Park

These sites were identified as hubs because of the opportunities they present to explore Norfolk’s four major community character themes, geographic distribution, and significant historic or cultural resources already present. As these park sites are upgraded through the process outlined under Parks (above), special attention should be paid to the development of community character. To do so, AECOM recommends working closely with the City Historian, City Historic Preservation staff, the public art program, and Festevents during the design process.
Other parks

In addition to the Heritage and Culture hubs, many other parks in Norfolk offer opportunities to celebrate community character, as charted here at right. Based on location and history, the parks in the chart at right have opportunities to explore one or more of the four community character themes.

Additionally, some parks and open spaces may have a history that is site-specific and does not fit neatly in Norfolk’s four broad themes. These opportunities should be fully explored to give residents and visitors the richest experience possible of Norfolk’s history. When upgrading parks, the City Historian and Historic Preservation staff should be consulted prior to the design process.

Heritage Trails

- **Self-guided trails.** Norfolk’s richest heritage resources are its historic neighborhoods. The City’s 14 recognized historic districts are all walkable in their scale and development pattern. To help meet the need for more walking facilities in Norfolk, RPOS should work with City Historic Preservation staff to create self-guided walking tours of the historic districts. Once tour routes have been identified, staff should work with the Public Works Department to identify any pedestrian barriers or missing sidewalks on the trail. Brochures describing the walking trails should be available both online and at local businesses and public facilities. The Cannonball Trail should also be more widely marketed and developed as part of this system of trails.

- **Enhancement of Elizabeth River Trail.** As design and construction of the Elizabeth River Trail is completed, there are opportunities to celebrate all four themes along the trail route. RPOS staff should coordinate with the City Historian and the public art program to ensure that these opportunities for interpretation are not missed.

- **Ocean View Avenue Promenade.** Ocean View Avenue has the potential to be a showcase of community character. Despite running parallel to the Chesapeake Bay beach for over six miles, there are few indicators of the water’s presence. As part of the vision to refresh Norfolk’s public realm, AECOM recommends upgrading Ocean View Avenue into a premiere corridor for experiencing the city’s unique character through well-signed beach access points,
improved visual access to the Chesapeake Bay, streetscape improvements, walking paths, public art, and small public spaces. An essential aspect of this is to strengthen connections across Ocean View Avenue, particularly at the existing beach access points. The goal would be to make Ocean View Avenue a destination, which could be supported by water-based commercial recreation opportunities and other entertainment.

**Historic Lafayette Paddling Trail**

Many people are unaware of the impressive historic resources in Norfolk. One major of example is a collection of 18th- and 19th-century farmhouses that spread along the city's tidal rivers—particularly along the Lafayette River and its tributaries. These homes include the Pomfret House, Boush-Tazewell House, Cohoon House, Talbot Hall, Talbot Cocke House, and Pearce House. In collaboration with City Historic Preservation staff, RPOS should create a laminated paddling trail guide available at all Lafayette River kayak/canoe launches describing the resources.

**Libraries and Schools**

Although outside the purview of the RPOS, the city’s public libraries and schools offer many opportunities to build upon the community character themes established in the parks system. Staff from RPOS should coordinate with the School District and library staff to ensure that exhibits and installations are not duplicative, and cross-reference one another. Ideally, local history lessons can be developed into school curriculums and include visits to the city’s parks and other resources.

**Acquire/Develop Other Resources**

While the bulk of opportunities to enhance community character are in the upgrade of existing parks, the City may want to consider the acquisition of significant properties to include in the parks and open space system. In the current process of updating Norfolk’s General Plan, Historic Preservation staff have identified a number of “at-risk” properties that may present opportunities for acquisition and incorporation in the City’s public realm. RPOS should work with staff to determine if any of these sites are appropriate opportunities to develop recreation and parks facilities and/or programming.

**Fort Norfolk** – Fort Norfolk is one of the most significant historic resources within the city. Currently, the site is owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), but the Norfolk Historical Society has been involved with its restoration since 1991. Not only is the structure significant in terms of its age and historic roles, Fort Norfolk has a beautiful location along the Elizabeth River and is adjacent to the Elizabeth River Trail. Should the opportunity arise in the future, the City should consider working with ACOE to acquire the site for public parks space.
Figure 4.4b  Fort Norfolk: Before and After
RECONNECT
Throughout the Needs Assessment, residents consistently stated a desire for better connectivity throughout Norfolk. The city has an excellent network of streets in place, but there are opportunities to enhance the roadways to better accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians. The vision is to provide improved linkages between the parks, open spaces, neighborhoods, and other points of interest throughout Norfolk—without having to get into an automobile.

Reconnecting is not only about pavement, it’s about water ways as well. Norfolk has an enviable system of rivers, lakes, and beaches but lacks a system of water access points to fully take advantage of these assets. By improving kayak and canoe launches, boat ramps, fishing docks and even scenic lookouts, this vision not only improves physical connectivity within Norfolk, but reconnects residents to one of the city’s primary features.

4.5 BIKEWAYS AND TRAILS
Bikeways and trails are the highest priority recreation need in Norfolk. Because Norfolk is urbanized and “built out,” opportunities for large, off-street trails are few. However, the existing roadway network is dense and has a great deal of redundancy, providing multiple opportunities for the development of on-road bicycle facilities. With adjustments to the existing roadway network and the development of trails and neighborhood loops, Norfolk has the necessary ingredients to reconnect and evolve into a bike-friendly city.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
1. Provide safe bikeways and trails for commuters, residents, children and the elderly
2. Create regional linkages to surrounding cities, transit, light rail and key areas of Norfolk
3. Ensure that every parks and recreation facility is safely accessible by bike and foot and has secure parking.
4. Ensure all neighborhood streets are bike- and pedestrian-friendly, either through sidewalks or low-speed “share the road” accommodations
5. Provide education and promotion for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians; integrate with schools and health and wellness activities such as the Safe Routes to Schools program and Bikewalk America.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UPGRADE EXISTING FACILITIES
It is essential that the Elizabeth River Trail is completed and marketed as a recreation resource to residents and visitors alike. With a successful trail, it is easier to gain community support for additional bikeway and trail facilities.

DEVELOP NEW FACILITIES
There are three types of bicycle and trail facilities recommended for the City of Norfolk: super trails, arterial routes and neighborhood loops. The following recommendations are currently in a conceptual stage and serve as preliminary guidelines for trail development. Extensive coordination with the Public Works Department Division of Transportation will be needed to design and adjust these preliminary corridors for feasibility.
Super Trails
Super trails are off-road trails, ideally with between 10 and 12 feet of pavement and 2 feet of clearance on each side. These trails would be part of a regional system of circulation and would accommodate both bicycle and pedestrian uses. The primary use would be for recreation; the Elizabeth River Trail is a good example. Super trails are recommended for the following locations:

- **Light Rail**: The Interstate 264/Light Rail Corridor
- **Military Highway**: South Military Highway from the Elizabeth River to East Princess Anne Road
- **Railway**: Along the north-south railway corridor between Interstate 264 and the Naval Base, then west to Hampton Boulevard
- **Hampton Boulevard**: Hampton Boulevard from Larchmont Branch Library to D Avenue (Naval Base)

Arterial Routes
Arterial routes are on-street bicycle facilities, preferably five feet in width. These routes are intended to connect the major commercial centers of Norfolk like Downtown, Norfolk State University (NSU), Wards Corner, Old Dominion University (ODU), Military Circle, Five Points, Ocean View, Little Creek/Shore Drive and the Norfolk Naval Base. Where possible, the most direct route is preferred. Arterials with lower volumes, such as Azalea Garden Road, Granby Street north of the bridge and Chesapeake Boulevard, are opportunities to restripe. Roadways with higher volumes of traffic or limited rights of-way will likely require easements where practical, and may require a trade-off resulting in a decrease of vehicular capacity.

*East-West Trails*
- **Berkley Avenue**: Berkley Bridge to eastern boundary of the city
- **Virginia Beach Boulevard**: From Elizabeth River Trail, West Olney Road to eastern boundary of the city
- **Princess Anne Road**: From Brandon Avenue to Northampton Boulevard to eastern boundary of the city
- **26th/27th/Lafayette**: From Bowdens Ferry Road to the Railway Super Trail
- **34th Street**: From West 27th Street to Granby Street
- **Willow Wood Drive/Norview Avenue**: From Granby Street to the airport
- **Little Creek Drive**: From Hampton Boulevard to Shore Drive
- **Ocean View Avenue**: From Willoughby Point to Shore Drive
- **Bay Avenue**: From Naval Base to Granby Street
Figure 4.5a Light Rail Super Trail: Before and After
Figure 4.5b Ocean View Avenue Arterial: Before and After
North-South Trails

- **Campostella Road**: From I-264 to southern boundary of the city
- **Newtown Road**: From Elizabeth River to East Virginia Beach Boulevard
- **Kempsville Road**: From Newtown Road to Princess Anne Road
- **Azalea Garden Road**: From East Virginia Beach Boulevard to Little Creek Road
- **Shore Drive**: From East Ocean View to eastern boundary of the city
- **Sewells Point Road**: From Azalea Garden Road to Chesapeake Boulevard
- **Chesapeake Boulevard**: From Princess Anne Road to East Ocean View
- **Church Street**: From Elizabeth River Trail to Granby Street
- **Granby Street**: From Elizabeth River Trail to Ocean View Avenue
- **Colley Avenue**: From Elizabeth River Trail to Hampton Boulevard
- **Bowdens Ferry Road**: From East 27th Street to the Elizabeth River Trail

Local Neighborhood Loops

Local neighborhood loops are designated routes that preferably are shared streets, but bicycling may be permitted on the sidewalks where appropriate. The routes would be based on street circulation and neighborhood context, and would reconnect schools, parks and recreation centers. The routes should be kid-friendly, can highlight neighborhood character and should ultimately be refined through a neighborhood involvement process. Maps of neighborhood routes should be available, and signage and wayfinding—including simple mechanisms like pavement stamps or lines—can be used to designate the routes.
4.6 WATER ACCESS

Water is one of the defining elements of the City of Norfolk and access to the city's waterways should be improved. Currently, the city has about eight miles of public beach that face the Chesapeake Bay, and about 15 square miles of rivers, lakes and wetlands. As a result of the visioning process, a Water Access Committee has formed to further evaluate access points throughout the City and refine recommendations.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. All bodies of water in Norfolk should be accessible to the public
2. Access to the water should be through methods that are safe, sustainable and environmentally responsible
3. Multi-dimensional experiences with water should be created to cultivate community appreciation of natural and cultural resources
4. Water access points should be used as an opportunity to educate citizens on Norfolk’s environmental issues and initiatives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations below are based on Moffat & Nichols boat ramp evaluation (Appendix D), the 2001 City of Norfolk Waterway Trails System document, and input from the Water Access Committee. The 2001 Plan identified four primary water trails for development:

- Lafayette River Trail
- Urban River Trail
- Ocean View Trail
- Reservoir Trail

For system planning purposes, there are three types of water access points:

- **Hub** – These are the major locations of water access in Norfolk and contain multiple types of access. This may include boat ramps for motorized vehicles, launches for kayaks and canoes, boardwalk systems, fishing docks, and scenic lookout points. Hubs are also places where most water programs would be based, and are also opportunities for vendors to rent boats and other equipment. These locations would also have the most amenities such as restrooms, parking, and other park elements.
- **Site** – This is a general term for water access points that lack the scale of hubs, but provide some form of physical access such as a boat ramp, canoe launch or fishing dock. Amenities at many sites will be limited, as will parking, but each site should have signage and information pertaining to the trail and environmental education installations where appropriate.
• **Lookout** - A lookout is a place with a substantial vista of the water. Typically, lookouts do not offer physical access to the water, but have places to sit, facilities to lock a bicycle, and sometimes on-street parking. Where appropriate, there may also be interpretive signage and public art.

Below is a brief description of each water trail and charts outlining the water access points. The charts summarize each location of water access, and its type; whether it is existing, used unofficially, or proposed; and if parking is located on-site or within a reasonable distance (indicated with a check mark). Water access points with a red star indicate a high priority improvement. On the location diagrams, hubs are graphically designated by a “+” and sites by a dark blue dot. RPOS staff will work closely with the Public Works Departments in determining the exact locations of access points, particularly in bulkhead areas.

**Lafayette River Trail**

The Lafayette River is home to many great residential areas and cultural sites (see 4.4 Community Character, above). Furthermore, there are a number of partnership opportunities, including Old Dominion University, the Hermitage Foundation, the Norfolk School Board, and the Norfolk Historical Society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larchmont Library</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>unofficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Crescent I Hanover Avenue</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>unofficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU I Larchmont Recreation Center</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>45th Street Boat Ramp</em></td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitting Mill Creek</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower Road I New Hampshire</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Creek Boat Ramp</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lafayette Park Boat Ramp</em></td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Circle</td>
<td>lookout</td>
<td>unofficial</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barraud Park</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lakewood Park</em></td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>partial exist</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab Creek I Granby Elementary School</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Avenue</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage Park</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* priority improvement

Map 4.6a Lafayette River Trail
Figure 4.6a  Lafayette River Trail Site: Before and After
Ocean View Trail
Ocean View Trail starts from the waters of Willoughby Bay, stretches along the Chesapeake Bay beaches of Ocean View, and extends east to Little Creek. Of the four water trails, Ocean View Trail is the most developed and has the greatest number of access points. There are two existing hubs on the western end of the trail: one at Captains Quarters and one at Ocean View Beach Park. Currently, there are two direct access points to Willoughby Bay, and one at a third hub at the East Ocean View Community Center. The trail includes about 30 open water access points to the beach, which have not been individually evaluated as part of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain’s Quarters</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby Boat Ramp</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby Point Beach</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Beach</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Beach Park</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*East Ocean View Beach</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>partial exist.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Avenue Park</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarallon Park</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban River Trail
The Elizabeth River is the heart of Norfolk, and one of the major form-givers to downtown. In terms of surrounding land uses, it is the most highly developed and urbanized of the four trails, and provides a unique experience by being part of a “working” river. The trail connects the Lafayette River, follows the coast line around Sewell’s Point, travels into and past some of Norfolk’s most historic neighborhoods, goes by downtown and tapers into two spurs, one at Broad Creek and one that travels east to Virginia Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Little League Fields</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers Edge Road</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Hall Park</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>partial exist.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGinnis</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strambost Creek</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River Road</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Harbor Park Boat Ramp</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Point Park</td>
<td>lookout</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler Museum</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundaff</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowbray Arch</td>
<td>lookout</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Norfolk</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* priority improvement
Reservoir Trail
The Reservoir Trail is the least developed of the four proposed trails. It is focused on the water resources of Lake Whitehurst, which currently lacks access points due to the closure of the Whitehurst ramp located on airport property. The experience of paddling in a lake environment is also different than the tidal rivers and the ocean, and there is an opportunity to tell the story of Norfolk’s water supply and its linkages to public health. The Norfolk Botanical Garden is the recommended hub, but access to the lake should be outside the gate to the park so that visitors do not need to pay the entrance fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Botanical Garden</td>
<td>hub</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Acres Playground</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* priority improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Opportunities
- **Northside Park** – While not located on one of the four main water trails, there is an opportunity to create a boardwalk system, a canoe launch and a fishing dock. This would open access to Mason Creek, which currently lacks any public, water-access points.
- **Lake Taylor** – Though thematically part of the Reservoir Trail, there are opportunities to provide public access to Lake Taylor at Lake Taylor High School. There is a particularly good opportunity to incorporate heritage and environmental interpretation with the presence of the water works nearby.

Boardwalks in Parks
A large number of City of Norfolk parks are adjacent to water or wetlands but currently do not offer public access. As part of the park upgrade evaluations (see 4.2), the City should prioritize creating water access points through docks, lookouts and boardwalks.

**UPGRADE EXISTING FACILITIES**
The following are recommendations based on the Boat Ramp Evaluation conducted by Moffat & Nichol.

- **45th Street Boat Ramp** – Repair the deteriorated parts of the ramp at the tidal zone, and replace broken-down asphalt at the toe of the ramp. The shoreline should also be evaluated for revegetation and stabilization.
- **Lafayette Boat Ramp** – Currently the ramp is not functional for larger motorized boats. Because of the problems involved with upgrading the site and expanding parking for large watercraft, the Lafayette Boat Ramp should transition into a canoe/kayak launch. A new launch facility will need to be constructed, and standard parking spaces should be provided within a reasonable distance from the launch.
• Habor Park Boat Ramp – To improve operations, a portion of the ramp should be removed and a new section should be constructed to provide adequate slope for ingress and egress of boats. Shoreline stabilization and a fixed pier for mooring are also recommended.

The Water Access Committee is currently evaluating existing water access points and will make specific recommendations for upgrades and renovations. Preliminary recommendations from the Committee include the following priority updates:

• Lakewood Park hub - Where there will be little to no environmental impact, the Water Access Committee recommends building a wooden pier; providing a sandy area for a soft launch, installing signage and upgrading the parking lot.
• Willoughby Point - Willoughby Point needs a more defined path and better signage.
• East Ocean View Beach – To improve access to beach launches, there is a need to upgrade the parking lot and add signage.

DEVELOP NEW WATER ACCESS POINTS
The Water Access Committee is currently evaluating all proposed water access points for development. Based on the findings from LOS Analysis of facility locations, AECOM recommends prioritizing the development of the Reservoir Trail for residents to gain access to Lake Whitehurst.
REFOCUS
Residents of Norfolk have a diverse ranges of parks and recreation needs and desires. Over the years RPOS has responded to a broad variety of these desired facilities and services, but is now faced with balancing these demands with limited resources. The vision for Norfolk’s parks and open space system is to refocus the investments of RPOS to provide key services. This is particularly important in determining the future of the City’s community and recreation centers, programming, and the responsibilities of RPOS operations and maintenance staff.

4.7 COMMUNITY AND RECREATION CENTERS
The City of Norfolk’s community centers has evolved over the years into a collection of:

- Community centers
- Recreation centers
- Aquatics centers
- Therapeutic recreation center
- Fitness/wellness center
- Senior centers
- Arts/technology center
- Dance/music center

The number and quality of amenities, activities, programs and services varies from center to center, and is not consistent across the city. Some programs are offered in centralized facilities, while others are available in multiple centers.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
1. Focus on large, multi-purpose centers with diverse programs and facilities
2. Every resident should have access to a community center within two miles of their home
3. Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle routes to centers
4. Ensure transit access to every center
5. Work with schools, non-profits and libraries to provide a ‘finer grain’ system of local, neighborhood facilities

RECOMMENDATIONS
In order to better serve residents and to provide a consistent level of recreation facilities, programs and services, it is proposed that the Community Center system will ultimately be comprised of six (6) types of facilities:

Managed by RPOS
- Large Community Centers
- Medium Community Centers
- Special Centers

Managed by Others
- School Gymnasiums/After-School Centers
- Neighborhood Centers
Libraries

The City of Norfolk has already made a substantial investment in its community centers, and almost all residents have access to an existing center. Therefore, AECOM does not recommend the development of additional centers at this time. Following are details about each facility type, and the Norfolk facilities in need of upgrades to meet the definitions.

**UPGRADE EXISTING FACILITIES**

**Large Community Centers**
There are three recommended facilities to serve as Large Community Centers: Tarrallton Community Center, Norfolk Fitness and Wellness Center, and the proposed new Kroc Center. Ideally, these facilities should be about 90,000 to 100,000 square feet. Tarrallton and the Fitness and Wellness Center should be upgraded to include the following:

- Indoor and outdoor swimming pools (Olympic size)
- Dual gymnasium
- Fitness room
- Dance studio
- Art room
- Game room
- Computer lab
- Music lab
- Auditorium
- Classrooms/Multi-purpose rooms
- Music lab
- Community history exhibits/public art
- Racquetball courts
- Multi-use fields
- Indoor track
- Locker rooms
- Playground
- Storage
- Large parking lot
Medium Community Centers.
A Medium Community Center is generally about 20,000 to 40,000 feet, and provides traditional community center facilities. In Norfolk, the medium community centers are the Bayview Community Center; Berkley Community Center; Fairlawn Community Center; Norview Community Center; and Lamberts Point. These facilities should be upgraded as needed to accommodate the following:

- Fitness room
- Game room
- Computer lab
- Class room
- Art room
- Gym
- Multipurpose room
- Community history exhibits/public art
- Parking
- Storage
- Locker rooms
- Playground

Special Use Centers.
Special Use Centers typically focus on specific facility types. In Norfolk, these facilities include the new Aquatics Center; the Therapeutic Recreation Center; Captain’s Quarters; the Gymnastics and Dance Center at Lakewood Park; the Boxing Center at Barraud Park; the Titustown Visual Arts Center; and the Outdoor Adventure Center at East Ocean View Community Center. Because of their specialized use, there are no general recommendations that apply to each facility. Many of these facilities are also in good condition, such as the Titustown Visual Arts Center. The two Special Use Centers in most need of an upgrade are the Boxing Center at Barraud Park and the Therapeutic Recreation Center. The existing Senior Center site is slated to have a new golf clubhouse in the future.

Boxing Center at Barraud Park – The current facility is outdated and lacks the space needed for a quality boxing program. Recommendations for improvement include increasing the square footage to accommodate additional rings and workout areas, and upgrading locker rooms.

Therapeutic Recreation Center (TRC) – The Therapeutic Recreation Center provides a comprehensive leisure service program for individuals with disabilities or special needs. Center staff are passionate about their mission and have indicated a strong need to upgrade and expand the existing center. A
major priority is expanding the program capacity of the center, as existing classes consistently fill up and have waiting lists. To fulfill the vision of the TRC’s staff, the following facilities are needed:

- Gym
- Kitchen
- Large Multi-Purpose Room
- Massage Therapy Room
- Computer Lab
- Art Rooms (2)
- Woodworking classroom
- Exercise/dance room
- Weight room/fitness area
- Game room
- Classrooms/meeting rooms (4)
- Staff offices (6)
- Storage areas

**Senior Center** – As noted in Section 3, the Senior Center is in need of upgrades. The senior population of the city (defined as 55 years or older) is an integral part of the community, and it is important to improve their access to recreation opportunities. Additional programming for seniors is recommended, as is improved transportation options to the existing Center. As the City moves forward with upgrades to the large and medium community centers, consideration should be given to provide senior-focused facilities and programming at a range of locations.

**School Gymnasiums and After-School Centers**
The City must continue to work with the Norfolk School Board to open school gymnasiums for the community outside of school hours. With the help of partnerships, every school should also serve as an after-school center for neighborhood children.

**Neighborhood Centers**
Eight neighborhood centers currently serve local residents: Grandy Village, Park Place, Huntersville, Sherwood Forest, Campostella, Ingleside, Crossroads, Merrimack Landing, and Young Terrace. Maintaining this large number of small facilities taxes the City’s resources. However, many of these neighborhood centers are loved by their neighborhoods and should continue to provide services and help stabilize communities. To re-focus scarce resources, AECOM recommends that existing neighborhood centers be gradually turned over to non-profit agencies. Those that do not remain viable can be converted into neighborhood parks or turned over to the schools to which they are attached. Further study on the future of each neighborhood center is recommended.

**Libraries**
Libraries already serve as *de facto* community centers, and provide a great deal of programming and gathering spaces for the community. The City should continue to look for partnership opportunities with local library branches, such as the canoe and kayak launch at Larchmont Library.
4.8 PROGRAMS

One of the greatest strengths of RPOS is the level of programming that it offers. As part of the “Refocus” initiative, the vision for the City’s recreation programs is to continue to offer core programs, but be flexible enough to respond to changing resident needs and interests.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Provide diverse, accessible recreation programs to all citizens
2. Consistently track program participation and costs to ensure the best allocation of resources
3. New programs should be developed where there is a demonstrated interest
4. Focus on developing new programs in fitness/wellness; biking and walking; adult/continuing education; special events; nature/environmental education; swimming lessons; water fitness and dance.
5. Cultivate partnerships with other City departments, neighboring municipalities, and non-profit organizations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UPGRADE EXISTING PROGRAMS

The City is evaluating current programs to determine demand based on participation rates. Once the analysis is complete, RPOS program staff will need to make a decision regarding the minimum participation rate for a program to continue. In addition to participation, the City should consider the cost of providing the program and the potential for cost recovery.

DEVELOP NEW PROGRAMS

According to the Mail/Telephone Survey results, the following programs have the greatest unmet need and the highest priority amongst residents:

- Fitness and Wellness
- Biking and Walking
- Adult and Continuing Education
- Special events
- Nature and Environmental
- Swimming Lessons and Water Fitness
- Dance

Following are programming ideas for each of these unmet needs. These lists are intended to be a starting point for further evaluation; AECOM recommends selecting pilot programs from each list to test community participation levels, and/or conducting surveys at on-site at recreation centers to determine programs with the most interest.

Fitness and Wellness
- Beating Fatigue
- Stress Management
- Healthy Habits
- Relaxation Techniques
- Massage Therapy
- Diet
• Prenatal & Post Natal Fitness
• Healthy Cooking
• Skin & Beauty
• Fun Fitness
• Fitness on a Budget Workshop
• Cold/Flu Survival
• Disease Control & Prevention
• Women’s Health Issues Workshops
• Men’s Health Issues Workshops
• Aging Parents
• Boot Camp
• Traditional Fitness Classes (Aerobics, Yoga, Calisthenics, etc.)
• Provision of Quality, Well-Maintain Fitness Studios (areas for cardio equipment, strength equipment, flexibility equipment, etc.)
• Spin Classes
• Marathons/Triathlon training classes and competitions
• Support for 5Ks, 10Ks, and 15Ks
• Functional Training (train your body to cope with daily activity)
• Personal Trainers
• Personal Wellness Coaches
• Lifestyle Intervention (youth, teens, adults)
• Provision of packaged health foods & drinks at all facilities as an alternative to traditional vending fare

Biking and Walking
• City-Wide Bike-Sharing Program (maybe grow region-wide)
• Bicycle Safety/Education Programs
• Bicycle Care/Repair Clinics
• Bicycle Recycle Program
• Earn a Bike Community Service Program
• Unicycling
• Unicycling Troupe (performs, participate in local parades, etc.)
• Mountain Biking (build areas in park for urban experience)
• BMX/Tandem Biking (build areas in park for urban experience)
• Host Bike Races
• Create Walking & Bike Paths/Trails
• Cycling Training Programs
• Indoor Cycling Training Programs
• Family Walk to the Recreation Center Day
• Laps Around Norfolk (Determine the mileage around the Norfolk city limits and start a “Laps Around Norfolk” Program. For example, if it is 40 miles around the boarder of Norfolk, then for every 40 miles walked, the person has done a lap around Norfolk. Issue mile marker awards and gifts.)
• Guided Educational/Historic Walking Tours
• Community Walk-a-thons
• Create, publish and distribute walking maps (there is one map in a frame in the parking garage that has the Cannonball Trail. That’s a start. How many other trails can we make just using the sidewalks?)
• Walk to work programs
• Downtown Lunch Walking Clubs
• Morning Stretch & Walk (neighborhood-based)
• Beachcombers Walk (walk programs on the beach)
• Man’s Best Friend Walking Program (Dog owners)
• 30-Minute Walkers
• 60 Minute Walkers
• Stroller Strutters (Babies & Parents)
• Power Walking (or Speed Walking)
• Race Walking
• Nordic Walking (Trend is sweeping North America--- it’s walking with poles using a modified cross country ski technique that has been used in Europe for many years. This simple addition to your walking gets about 90% of your muscles
working. Simple, smooth and easy.)

- 10,000 Steps Challenge (incentive program to strive for 10,000 steps per day)
- Stairway to Health (meet in a facility with steps or personal incentive program to take the stairs--- call it Flight to Fitness--- incentives based on number of flights climbed. Example: 15 steps equal one flight.)
- Walk the Parks Program
- Walk the Trails (wherever we can establish and continue to establish trails)

**Adult and Continuing Education**

- Money Management (Youth, Teens & Adults)
- Getting Organized (De-Clutter)
- Time Management
- Personal & Professional Life Coaching Courses
- Life/Work Balance

- Mall Walking Program
- Mermaid Scavenger Hunt (different walking trails laid-out based on the placement of Mermaids. Have map with hints on where to look. Some Mermaids are obvious; others are up in the air, etc.)
- Create Walking & Bike Paths/Trails
- Build Outdoor Walking Tracks with impact surface
- Build Indoor Walking Tracks with impact surface

- Vacation Planning
- Healthy Pets
- Dog Obedience Courses
- The activity list for this category is limitless and needs to be defined by the demands of the citizens.

**Special Events**

The City of Norfolk already has the ability to host large-scale special events at Town Point Park and other venues. However, hosting smaller-scale neighborhood-based and/or multi-neighborhood based programs will allow for more accessibility and customization of themes to meet the needs and culture of the neighborhoods. Also, annual special events can be planned that rotate locations. If these events grow in popularity and participation, they could become City-wide events that are hosted at Town Point Park. Currently, the City of Norfolk Mayor has declared the third Saturday in September to be Play Day and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Open Space hosts a Play Day Celebration with the plan to rotate locations each year. It is expected that this event will one day grow into an event that will require location such as Town Pointe Park that can handle a large-scale special event. As with any programming venture, the interests of the community must be considered. Programming ideas to consider are:

- Celebrations based on local historical events
- Holiday celebrations
- Cultural and ethnic celebrations
- Community Center milestone anniversary events (5, 10, 15 year, etc.)
- Concerts and Entertainment in the Parks (revive the amphitheatre or role in the Showmobile if needed)
- Movies in the Park/Film Festivals
- Local Talent Shows
• Old-Fashioned Picnic Day with traditional games

Nature and Environmental Programming
• Astronomy Programs  
• Oceanography Programs  
• Fishing Programs  
• Nature Study/Discovery Programs  
• Hiking  
• “Tyke Hykes” (Parents & Toddlers)  
• Building Wildlife Habitat (ex. – Build bat houses, lady bug houses, etc.)  
• Bird-Watching (combine with a walking program element)  
• Weather Studies & Preparedness  
• City-Wide Gardening in the Parks Program (food and/or flowers)  
• Tree Identification Program (in celebration of being a Tree City, USA)  

• City-Wide Park & Beach Litter Patrol Programs  
• Adopt-a-Spot Parks & Open Space Mowing Programs  
• Create Nature Trails in Parks that identify plant and wildlife  
• Go Green Education Courses  
• Camping Trips (or overnight in the parks)  
• Volunteer Jr. Ranger & Ranger Programs (Youth-Adults)  
• Build Nature Education Centers/Conservatories in Parks

Swimming Lessons and Water Fitness
The Swim Lesson Program currently offered by City of Norfolk is comprehensive, but limited based on total available facilities and adequate amenities at facilities. Currently only finite numbers of part-time instructors are permitted to be hired. Numbers of instructor positions should be unrestricted to meet the demands for courses needing to be taught. Some programs that could be added include:
• Springboard Diving  
• Open Water Swimming  
• Synchronized Swimming  
• Expanded Swim Team Program  
• Hosting of Large-Scale Swim Meets

Dance
The Dance Program currently offered by City of Norfolk is comprehensive, but centralized at the Lakewood Dance & Music Center. To address this, dance classes are being offered at various recreation centers throughout the City. Eventually the Lakewood Dance & Music Center will be host to advanced levels of dance for individuals who aspire to study dance more seriously with the programs at the recreation center being primarily beginner/introductory level courses. As trends change, the dance program will introduce courses to meet the changing demands. However, the program will continue to provide the traditional core foundation of dance such as ballet, tap, jazz as well as social dance courses.

Though not indicated as a high priority or unmet need by many residents, the City should also consider developing additional programs in Adventure Recreation and After-School organized recreation programs for children and teens.

Adventure Recreation
• Rappelling Clinics  
• Belay Clinics  

• Slackline Clinics  
• Introduction to Climbing Clinics
• Lead Climbing Clinics
• Bouldering Clinics
• Geocaching Clinics
• Kayaking and Canoeing Quickstart and Introduction Clinics
• Kayaking and Canoe Trips
• Backpacking Trips
• Rock Climbing Day Trips

• Teambuilding Activities & Initiatives
• Low-level Activities
• Elevated Challenge Course Activities
• Climbing Wall Activities

After-School Organized Recreation for Elementary & Teens
In order to dedicate staffing and resources to provide an enhanced Elementary After-School Program at each recreation center and to develop a comprehensive Teen Program, the Before & After-School Day Care Program needs to be eliminated. The foundation of programming for both the Elementary and Teen Programs will be based on the 40 Developmental Assets (see the following page). Programs will be planned to expose participants to a balanced recreational experience. Activities will be planned to include all categories of recreational programming as follows:

• Arts
• Crafts
• Dance
• Music
• Performing Arts
• Sports/Athletics
• Alternative Games
• Fitness & Wellness
• Mental/Linguistic
• Literary
• Technology Education
• Aquatics
• Environmental/Nature
• Adventure Recreation
• Special Events
• Historical/Interpretation
• Multi-Cultural/Intergenerational
• Hobbies
• Life-Skills (ex. - Money Management, Getting Organized, Time Management,
• Personal & Professional Life Coaching Courses, etc.)
40 Developmental Assets: Setting Up Norfolk’s Children for Success

The Search Institute has identified the following building blocks of healthy development—known as Developmental Assets—that help young children grow up healthy, caring, and responsible. Building blocks in bold indicate those in which Norfolk’s parks and recreation system can have a major positive impact.

- Family Support
- Positive Family Communication
- Other Adult Relationships
- Caring Neighborhood
- Caring Climate in Child Care and Educational Settings
- Parent Involvement in Child Care and Education
- Community Cherishes and Values Young Children
- Children Seen as Resources
- Service to Others
- Safety
- Family Boundaries
- Boundaries in Child Care and Educational Settings
- Neighborhood Boundaries
- Adult Role Models
- Positive Peer Relationships
- Positive Expectations
- Play and Creative Activities
- Out-of-Home and Community Programs
- Religious Community
- Time at Home
- Motivation to Mastery
- Engagement in Learning Experiences
- Home-program Connectoin
- Bonding to Programs
- Early Literacy
- Caring
- Equality and Social Justice
- Integrity
- Honesty
- Responsibility
- Self-regulation
- Planning and Decision Making
- Interpersonal Skills
- Cultural Awareness and Sensitivity
- Resistance Skills
- Peaceful Conflict Resolution
- Personal Power
- Self-Esteem
- Sense of Purpose
- Positive View of Personal Future
4.9 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

A major focus of the “Refocus” vision is to streamline operations and maintenance. Currently RPOS maintenance staff has a number of responsibilities throughout the City, not all of which are essential to providing an excellent parks and recreation system. The following is a preliminary examination of the responsibilities of maintenance staff, and suggestions on how to re-focus resources that will have the greatest benefits to the parks system as a whole.

After extensive discussion among Parks and Urban Forestry (P&UF) staff, the following areas are core parks operations and maintenance services:

1. **Mowing** which includes litter collection, mowing, edging, cleanup, fertilization and pesticide applications.
2. **Landscape maintenance** which consists of plant trimming, fertilization, mulching, weeding, installation (infill only) and pesticide applications.
3. **Beach maintenance** which consists of sanitation/sifting of sand, debris removal (large items such as dead marine animals, boats, lumber, etc.) and litter and trash collection.
4. **Forestry operations** which consists of trimming, removal and replacements.
5. **Athletics/field maintenance** which consists of athletic turf care and dirt on diamonds.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE
1. Concentrate on delivering the five core services of mowing, landscape maintenance, beach maintenance, forestry, and athletics/field maintenance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UPGRADE EXISTING OPERATIONS + MAINTENANCE PRACTICES

**Improve Core Services** - Each of the core services has a wide range of operational levels which are a function of funding and other resource availability. A higher standard of operations that pays attention to aesthetics and visitor experience requires additional time, money and Department resources.

**Mowing**
Mowing operations require a large amount of staff time. Major issues are described below, along with suggestions for improvement.

- **Adequate Staffing Levels.** Staff levels are needed that provide mowing of public spaces, parks, medians, and public building sites on a ten working-day or less mowing cycle to ensure that all maintained areas are mowed every two weeks or less.

- **Begin Meadows Pilot Project.** The use of meadows as a technique to both reduce mowing operations and enhance the environment is a program with significant positive impacts in other communities. This approach should be considered for Norfolk, including possible changes to the existing nuisance landscape/grass ordinances that currently would make this program difficult to implement. Staff should identify two to three locations where this type of program can be tested on a pilot basis.
• **Monitor Forest Canopy Program Results.** Several agencies are currently in the process of jointly developing areas for reestablishment of the forest canopy. This program is currently being lead by the Office of Environmental Services with full and active participation by staff. The pilot location at Lakewood Park has been identified and discussions are currently underway for tree installation. As these areas are planted mowing operations will cease and the area will revert to a more natural condition.

• **Additional Study Needed.** Staff has recently embarked on a three year program that will assess and modify the reporting and functional structure of mowing operations. This activity will address the best way to accomplish the task, schedules, viability of the use of third party contractors as primary or supplemental resources, design and equipment needs, the feasibility of developing zone and mowing standards and other concerns that may arise. At the conclusion of the study, recommendations should be made that will maximize RPOS resources and minimize costs.

**Landscape Maintenance**
Landsaping activities are broken into four basic categories: new installations; replacement plantings; routine maintenance such as pesticide applications, trimming and removal of weeds; and winter work such as remulching and replacement of dead or poorly performing plants in existing beds. Recommendations to improve landscape maintenance are as follows:

• **Acquisition of Mulching Machine.** The City should consider the purchase of a machine that can process existing tub grindings into high quality mulch with necessary fungicides and insecticides added to extend mulch life and minimize replenishments.

• **Bed Maintenance Hierarchy.** Create a set of bed maintenance standards that will tier maintenance responsibilities and actions. Positions and/or equipment may be reallocated, surplused or abolished as a result of the establishment of this system.

**Beach Maintenance**
Currently beach operations and maintenance procedures are running smoothly. Equipment is in acceptable condition and on the replacement schedule and staff are well-trained, but there is sometimes a problem with litter collection. The following recommendations can assist with this issue:

- **Use the Weekdenders Program.** Utilize of the Sheriff Department’s “weekenders” program for litter collection at the largest public beaches, dune and fore dune areas on weekends.

- **Establish Pack In, Pack Out areas.** in low traffic beach access points.

**Forestry**
Forestry operations are currently backlogged, with a six- to twelve- month backlog considered to be “normal”. Because of this, forestry work is primarily reactive rather than proactive. The following actions are recommended to facilitate more efficient use staff time:

- **ROW Crews.** Establish one additional trim crew and one additional stump crew that will work exclusively in the ROW of VDOT eligible roads and streets.
**Athletic Fields**

The maintenance of safe recreational environments is an essential service, as athletics are one of the most commonly used facilities in Norfolk. Therefore, it is important that expertise and equipment be available to mitigate the impacts of use and maintain the integrity of the resources. Recommendations include:

1. Creating a professional turfgrass management plan to ensure that safe, playable surfaces are maintained to standards described in section 4.3.

2. Purchasing equipment specifically designed for the maintenance of dirt infields and base lines.
Implementation
5 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Implementation of the recommendations and improvements outlined in Section 4 is estimated to cost approximately $138 Million, as shown in Appendix E, Order of Magnitude Estimate of Costs. To determine a phasing and funding strategy for these improvements, AECOM met with City staff for an implementation workshop on July 7, 2010. The purpose of the workshop was to review costs; identify existing and potential funding sources; and develop an Implementation Plan for the proposed parks and recreation system.

FUNDING ESTIMATES

Workshop participants first reviewed and discussed potential, realistic funding sources for implementation. Available and projected annual funding sources include:

- General Fund $0/year
- Bonds $5,000,000/yr
- Grants $250,000 – 500,000/yr
- Development Cash Proffers $250,000 – 500,000/yr
- Philanthropy/Foundation $250,000 – 500,000/yr
- Partnerships $250,000 – 500,000/yr
- Easements/Donations TBD
- Concessions TBD

Total Estimated Annual Funding $6 – 7,000,000/yr

This is consistent with the City’s historic spending on public realm improvements over the past ten years, including parks, trails, sidewalks and bike lanes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total CIP Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No Park &amp; Recreation CIP Funding (only Zoo &amp; Botanical)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1.9 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$3.17 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.97 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$2.36 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$6.96 million</td>
<td>Includes renovations to NFWC and citywide boat ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$18.51 million</td>
<td>Does Not Include $750,000 Neighborhood CIP for Shoop Park; Includes $6.0M to renovate Town Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$11.65 million</td>
<td>Includes Town Point Park and Broad Creek Linear Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$8.50 million</td>
<td>Does Not Include $1.0M purchase of Bluestone Ave. property; Includes $3.95M to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5.75 million</td>
<td>renovate Town Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes $250,000 to replace fountain at Waterside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* None of the above figures include the Virginia Zoological Park, Golf Courses, or Botanical Gardens

While the current economic downturn will prevent the City from sustaining this level of spending in FY 2011, it is hoped that spending levels will resume in FY 2012. Assuming that the City sustains this level of annual spending, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan can be implemented over a period of approximately twenty (20) years.

**2010 – 2012 PRIORITIES**

The City’s current Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) includes funding for the following improvements:

- Construct Indoor Aquatic Facility in Southside $4,548,800
- Plan & Construct Ingleside Gymnasium $1,815,000
- Improve Neighborhood Parks $1,000,000
- Therapeutic Recreation Center Expansion $500,000
- Improve Existing Community Centers $600,000
- Fitness and Wellness Center Improvements $135,000
- Soccer Field Improvements $4,250,000
Total Three (3) Year CIP $9,833,800

It is recommended that the City update the Needs and Priorities Assessment in 2012 to verify spending priorities for the following two years (FY 2013, 2014). As mentioned above, the Master Plan can be implemented by the year 2032 if the City sustains an annual investment of approximately $6 – 7 million in capital improvements.

It is important to note that Operations and Maintenance costs will increase along with capital spending. According to industry “rule-of-thumb” standards, O & M costs will increase annually by approximately 5 – 10% of capital costs. This equates to an annual increase in the parks and recreation O & M budget of approximately $300 – 700,000 based on the recommended $6 -7 million annual investment in capital improvements.

**ADDITIONAL PLANS**

This Master Plan is intended to be a broad, long-range plan that outlines a general direction for RPOS to develop the City’s parks and open space system over the next ten to twenty years. Many of the projects identified will require additional planning and design processes before they can be implemented. Priority planning projects for the upcoming years include:

- **City of Norfolk Bikeways, Trails and Sidewalks Plan** - Due to the high demand and public support for bikeways and trails in Norfolk, a detailed Bikeways, Trails and Sidewalks Plan is recommended. The plan should analyze the feasibility of the corridors recommended in this Master Plan, and adjust the actual locations as determined by legal, safety, and design restrictions. This should be the highest priority planning effort for RPOS in the coming year.
- **Field Capacity Plan**—A formal field capacity analysis is recommended so that all leagues in the City have access to well-maintained, functional fields now and in the future.
- **Reservoir Water Trail Plan** – The closure of the Whitehurst boat ramp has effectively removed access to the water resources of Lake Whitehurst. To bring recreation back to the lake, AECOM
recommends prioritizing the creation of the Reservoir Water Trail Plan to provide alternative points of access.

- **Parkland Opportunity Analysis** – In order to meet the City’s goal of 15 acres of parkland per resident in the next 50 years, a proactive study is recommended to identify specific opportunities for the expansion of existing parks and the addition of new park sites.

All of the recommendations contained within this plan should also be incorporated into the City’s *General Plan of Norfolk*. 
Meeting Date: May 18, 2009

Project: Norfolk Recreation Master Plan

Location: Recreation Office, Norfolk, VA

Purpose: Kick-Off Meeting

Attendees: Dave Barth, Carlos Perez, Allison Crnic, Chad Morris, Shirley Deibler, Doug Ehman, Darrell Crittendon, Paul Forehand, Deborah Morton, LaDonna Gardner, Dean Bowles, Dave Pfiffer

Compiled By: Allison Crnic

- Getting a lot of properties from City purchases—the “180 Day List”
- About 600 properties on the nuisance list
- Parks and Recreation maintains all city green space
- Funeral make 2.5 million dollars that goes to the General Fund
- Throughout the planning process, team needs to check in with the City Manager and the Recreation Advisory Group
- Plan objectives: improve neighborhoods
- We should talk to the Planning Commission and have a representative from that department at our meetings
- Park evaluations—City wants Glatting to lead the effort, but no grades
- Glatting will work with Chad to complete evaluation form
- City has five boat ramps, two are accessible to the public. Need to create parameters. Want to know about access—City does not have money for repairs.
- Some boat ramps are disruptive to the neighborhoods
Because the city is neighborhood-driven, how do you serve larger community needs?

Norfolk is not a bicycle-friendly city

Mayor is very important in Norfolk

Need to include Planning Commission stakeholders. Also speak to Housing Authority, military families, Hispanic community

Don’t have a written agreement with schools—just a handshake. But schools function as parks after school hours

Interested in policy templates

Build a nice skate park, but might be too far for some kids—would like to see a skate park in every quadrant

Rec. Riders program in Newport News. 75 cents/ride to subsidize access

City of Portsmouth has visitors guides/programs in historic cemeteries

Norfolk’s West Point cemetery is historic

Dean will provide list of key parks for us to visit

Chad will coordinate GIS

Need to get key dates determined

Glatting needs information “dump” within next two to three weeks

Council meets about planning issues on the 4th Tuesday of the month

City Manager has her own vision for Norfolk

Includes capital projects from cemetery, have a cemetery study

Chad will be giving Deborah and Darrell a weekly report

Would like a way to handle outrageous request from citizens. The Needs Assessment will help with this.
Meeting Minutes

On Thursday, January 14, 2010 David Barth, Allison Crnic, and Ryan Cambridge of AECOM Design+Planning presented the needs assessment findings for Norfolk, as well as the preliminary results of the visioning charette at City Hall.

Notes:

1. If boat ramps are to be listed in the report, the City wants credit for those that exist on their reservoirs.
2. The City has expressed concern over public involvement, and lack thereof related to the Bay Oaks Group.
3. The City also expressed concern over the public’s interpretation of the access LOS map for pools.
4. There is question that the “voice” of the teen demographic was not accurately represented in the ETC survey results. ACM Odell has contacts with several teen oriented groups that could be contacted. It is important to the City that the teen demographic be well served in order to provide positive experiences/activities in lieu of inappropriate behavior. Opportunities for teens are limited in Norfolk; basketball program participation limited for older teens.
5. The City expressed concern over the elected official’s resistance to support a bicycle/trail plan. This resistance is said to be related to the implementation feasibility of such a plan in Norfolk. Any plan presented must be compelling in its ability to be implemented.
6. The City expressed a desire to include the findings and recommendations of this study in their general plan to preserve the initial vision.
7. During the discussion related to the bicycle network proposed during the vision workshop, the City indicated that including a trail within the light rail right of way would not be possible.

8. When questioned about the feasibility of an expansion to the Therapeutic Recreation Building, the City indicated the challenge of doing so because the building shares a site with a local school. The Board of Education has certain site-size requirements for each type of school facility that would be impacted by the expansion of the TR building.

9. In addition, the City expressed concern about the impact of an expansion to the Tarrallton Recreation Center would have on the surrounding neighborhoods.

10. Fort Norfolk might be available for acquisition if the Army Corps of Engineers finds a new location for their operations; but not before.

11. Murray High School Pool is available for City use after school hours per an existing agreement.

12. The City expressed the desire to hold an additional public input meeting prior to the council presentation.

13. AECOM believes there is a need for a signage and wayfinding component in Norfolk.
Meeting Minutes

Subject: Review Presentations – Norfolk RPOS Master Plan

Date: July 8, 2010
Time: Noon; 5:30
Location: City Hall; RPOS Commission
Attendees: Not recorded
Prepared: July 13, 2010
Prepared by: Allison Crnic
Distribution: July 13, 2010

Notes from Planning Commission:
- Include beach acreage in LOS analysis

Notes from RPOS Commission:
- Reduce emphasis on bat ramp evaluation
- Add benchmarking chart
- Correct spelling of stakeholders (Balance, Bonney)
- Define matrix methodology
- Policy – Action – 50% open space
- Emphasize importance of staffing
- Economic basis for higher valuation
- Vision without resources is a hallucination
- Need a bike/ped plan
- Check for Plum Point water access
- Add slide for neighborhood centers (civic leagues)
- Add cemeteries to recommendations
- Refresh community centers, make sure Captains Quarters is included
- Joint use agreement with schools
Meeting Date: September 24, 2009

Project: City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan

Location: Booker T Washington High School

Purpose: Public Workshop

Attendees: See attached list

Compiled By: Allison Crnic, David Barth

- Need to update existing facilities, including lighting and restrooms (2)
- More facilities needed, especially multi-purpose fields for soccer and football (3)
- Boxing facility is temporary, need large, permanent facility (centralized). Should include boxing specific workout facilities
- Need more indoor sports facilities, especially gymnasiuims for soccer/baseball/indoor walking track (4)
- Need better relationship with schools (1)
- Need gymnastic program and center
- Gyms need to be shared by all ages (1)
- Multi-purpose facility at Barraud Park
- Need certified kitchens at facilities
- Need for volunteer coaches, football fields
- Need coordination between school and recreation leagues, particularly in terms of seasonal coordination (1)
- Need bus/transportation for leagues/activities (1)
- Need to modify age verification system; need alternatives to providing original birth certificate
Aquatics:

- Need therapeutic pool, not cold water (2)
- Increased ADA pool access
- Therapeutic pool would be great, but may not be as high of a priority as increased therapeutic recreation space/meetings rooms/other facilities.
- Need more pools, two are planned but still need two more (7)
- Update existing aquatics facilities (1)
- Diving facilities/capability needed
- Pools need adequate building facility
- Increase number of blueways/kayak launches (1)
- Need additional fishing piers and tackle shops
- Increase access to water in general
- Need more walking trails
- Increase diversity of program diversity in water-based activities like kayaking
- Need water park at Ocean View (3)
City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan
Stakeholder Interviews
September 22, 2009

9:00 am  **Department Directors**
Darrell Crittenden, Director of Recreation, Parks and Open Space
Bruce Marquis, Police Chief

- Get kids educated, keep them involved in meaningful activities
- Kids at risk are at lower end of social-economic scale – black kids, Hispanic kids; that’s where we need to address these things
- Darrell and Bruce are doing more w/ prevention programs, re: PALs
- Examples – boxing program, Save our Children initiative
- Measures: % of kids graduating high school (need to get drop-out rate from schools, less military kids); program participant numbers; reduction in juvenile crime
- Needs to be a collaboration between police, parks, schools, City Manager’s office
- Schools charge fees to use for after-school programs
- Possible to use Navy volunteers?
- City can’t pick up football players for rec leagues after being cut from Middle School; City has asked School to start league earlier
- Need advocate for Save Our Children, should be in Parks and Rec?
- Only 20 out of 50+/- principals will allow rec use
- Have enough ballfields
- No demand for soccer yet, slight increase in Hispanic kids

Top priorities (Chief):
- **Tennis programs**
- **Swimming pools, programs**
- **Community centers, large and small**
- **Boxing facilities, programs**
- **Bike paths, trails**
- **Dance, drama programs**
- **Boating, water safety, water-related programs (surrounded by water)**

Darrell:
- **Access to water for kayaking, canoeing, fishing**
- **Bike paths, trails**
- **Joint school use agreements**
- **Fishing programs**
- **After school organized recreation**
9:45  **Doug Ehaman - Parks, grounds**  
Peter O'Hakkoran - Buildings

- Mowing 850 properties right now, plus another 500 properties under nuisance abatement; mow all City properties
- Need to look at operational side, as well
- Peter to send facilities maintenance analysis
- Facilities are neighborhood-driven; fire stations, community centers, etc
- Neighborhood-based delivery of services is more expensive
- Norview is 25,000 square feet; not large enough?
- Doug and Peter to send summary of needs, estimated costs
- Issues:
  - Parks and Urban Forestry re-organized 4 years ago, organized around magisterial (geographic) districts; medians, etc divided into 4 or 5 districts
  - Differentials in school maintenance
  - Beautification of medians created higher maintenance demands; needed to make adjustments in types of equipment, etc
  - Solution: look at staffing, equipment, make adjustments; tried to change out, no success

10:30  **Recreation, Parks and Open Space Commission:**  
Paul Balance, Don Musacchio, Courtney Doyle, Hal Bonnie, Tim Forbes

- Consider using “I-Neighbors” to solicit input; City to put info on Norfolk.gov
- Consider using a word other than “Vision”; conjures up images of process

Needs:
- Soccer, baseball, football fields; a lot of open space that’s not being used; no tournament quality fields, starting soccer program
- Enhancing access to water, rivers, in neighborhoods throughout the City
- Bike paths, trails, walking paths; consider signed bike routes, route maps on web site; look at San Diego as example
- Walkability within each neighborhood
- Need centers for congregation; e.g. Pretlo library, Norview: gym, computers, library
- Distance may not matter; if you build it they will come
- Study the use of each center; internal evaluation, utilize what we have
- Need additional therapeutic recreation facilities
- Destination for sporting events, make use of water, topography, good climate
- Senior programs
- Funding – private / public partnerships, beneficiaries in wills
- Do we have adequate staffing, manpower, etc for City this size?

11:15  **Joel Wagner, Director of Athletics, Norfolk Schools**
• Need to share vision with schools, get buy-in on a school-by-school basis
• Every child should have an alternative, whether it’s school or recreation program
• Renovating, down-sizing schools; school population projected to decrease slowly
• Need swimming pool at/near Lake Taylor High School
• Indoor swimming pools; don’t need more outdoor pools
• How do we use schools for after-school programs?
• A lot of upward/downward mobility within Norfolk
• Big push; programs for women and girls, such as softball, cheering
• Top priorities: 1) after-school tutoring, computer programs, GED programs w/ Norfolk
• Redevelopment and Housing; 2) teaching adult life skills e.g. golf, rowing, etc; 3) every kid will
• learn how to swim
• Example: Catholic school, place could be falling down, come away with a great education; need
to focus on developing people
• Funding sources: user fees don’t work for low-income population, consider sales tax, others
• How do you get Navy involved in community?
• Public use of navy facilities?
• Need better transportation system

**September 23, 2009**

8:15 **Vice Mayor Burfoot**
• City is divided into Wards
• We’re behind – how do we catch up, do what they’re doing? How do we get ahead of Virginia
• Beach?
• How does our model look? How do we operate as a corporate entity, eg YMCA; need standards
• at facilities
• Upgrading libraries; don’t want to overlap, need to coordinate with libraries
• Enhance with open space, make outside fun again, flow from one community to another, break
• boundaries -
• Recipients of Kroc facility, 100,000 sf facility
• Balance indoor/outdoor, enhance w/ natural resources, recreational green space
• Create open space to attract retail, commercial
• Don’t be consumed with today, think about tomorrow
• Incorporate schools – can’t put facilities in every neighborhood
• Create places to gather – schools, libraries, etc. Taxpayers want use out of buildings
• Council working with schools - need a policy to allow use: Superintendent,

9:00 **Councilman Barclay Winn**
• Only one trail, Elisabeth Creek Trail. Light rail has a trail corridor

Priorities (Burfoot and Winn):
• Bike trails, walking trails, jogging trails; need trails system from downtown
• Open green space
• Marathon venue other than streets
• Interchangeable use of schools, rec centers
• Pools – philosophically, everyone in Norfolk should be able to swim
• Need public, full service marina (behind Waterside?; City has done study, channel is too close)
• Kayak trail from City Park to Harbor Park
• Health and fitness: jog, bike, kayak, row
• Community gardens
• Take care of what we already have
• Softball fields, soccer fields
• Technical education in parks re: landscape design, recreation, etc; lectures, lab work, etc through internships; exposure to opportunities
• Need to improve “learn to earn” program
• Kids struggling in math, science; use rec centers to show kids applications to real life; teachers to work in rec center
• Rec centers should deal with mind, body and spirit

9:45 **Councilman Randy Wright**
• Have historic cemetery
• Don’t do pie in the sky, unrealistic plan
• Needs: boat ramps, beach volleyball, running events, beach programs, some neighborhood parks are under-utilized, WALKING AND BIKING TRAILS, soccer fields and programs
• Therapeutic Rec – How many people ride Thera-ride, Ward’s Corner has highest population
• Funding: Had 5 years of parks funding, made up some ground; invested $16 million in last three years. Bought JCC (wellness center) for $6.5. Going to be toughest budget coming up. Starting construction for skateboard park.

1:15 **Councilwoman Daun Hester**
• Need places to go for swimming, exercise, leisure, etc
• Affordable and accessible, safe
• Reason for large facilities in southeast portion of the City is that they accommodate multiple needs
• Possibilities for transforming small facilities into specialty neighborhood centers; more support for families e.g. GED, work force, fitness classes, AA, etc
• Could be managed by non-profits, others; need standards; neighborhood task force, boards
• Have after-school programs at 3 middle schools: Office of Youth Development
• Goal: playground within 1 mile of every home
• Need kayak classes in conjunction with new kayak ramps
• Need to promote what City is doing, kayak races, etc
• Youth Recreational Leagues - City provides facilities, officials, certifications; academics not necessarily emphasized, need to require good grades (C or better) to play
• Need to renovate Lafayette Park; more parking, beautifications, exercise paths, mile markers

Funding:
• Pay as you go mentality; don’t typically borrow money for capital improvements, etc
• People know that projects take 5 or 6 years as they get in the pipeline
• Differential fees for Neighborhood Centers vs. Community Centers
• Major funding sources are General Fund, grants, user fees. Consider a City-wide taxing district?
• Consider Enterprise Fund; recycle revenues back into Parks and Rec
• Need fee study re: cost recovery, subsidies, etc
• Need median standards
• Charge clean-up fees

4:30 Councilwoman Theresa Whibley, MD
• Need safe routes for bicycling; shared streets, temporal closings
• Shared streets
• Improve playground equipment, fields, parks, swimming pools; need swimming lessons expanded K-6; improvement to aquatics programs
• Need to improve water access, canoeing/kayaking
• AARP has identified where people live longest, incorporate into cities; e.g. town of Minnesota, starting to mimic these other areas in the world; see AARP Blue Zones
• Volunteers: Civic Leagues – neighborhoods. Association of Civic Leagues
• Emphasis on wellness, e.g. Denver
• Green spaces are poorly cared for; other ways to accomplish?
• Connections to Virginia Beach, Portsmouth, other communities

Friday, September 25, 2009:
Gary Bernstein, ODU
Frank Duke, Planning
David Freeman, Neighborhood Presentation
Rod Woolard, Development
Steve Harper, Cultural Facility
Mike Morris, Portsmouth Parks & Rec

• Parks Plan needs to be tied into Comprehensive Plan
• 116 organized neighborhoods; had 82 Neighborhood Plans. See parks recommendations, priorities. Use as part of needs assessment matrix
• Pocket parks – require a lot of maintenance, not enough to do; could re-use, increase revenues; need standards re: size, programs, etc
Needs:

- Perception that we are significantly deficient in open space of all types
- Need to make people more aware of available resources; hidden resources throughout – need to improve marketing, signage, wayfinding; unfortunately has resulted in single use perception
- Access to water for boating, kayaking, trails along waterfront
- Huge amount of land just designated as open space – wetlands, etc – could be used for trails, boardwalks, water access
- NRHA has recreation facilities, Botanical Gardens have facilities, how do we not duplicate public/private?
- Need for dog parks, particularly in western part of town; have 12 throughout the City; newest is Stockley Gardens
- Space for Community Gardens, particularly in older neighborhoods; use GEM lots? Frank has map showing available sites
- Need programs for kids for graffiti art
- Need computer labs, coordinate with libraries, schools, NRHA
- Need wireless hot spots low hanging fruit?
- Scope/Chrysler Hall plaza needs to be re-designed
- 25% of City is in public ownership, not including public ROWs
- Include, identify Navy facilities, ODU, TCC, Norfolk State
Dear Mr. Crittendon:

I am unfortunately unable to attend the public meeting by the Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Spaces scheduled for Thursday, September 24. However I would like to make a comment as you develop your priorities for the future for your department.

I am very impressed with your Therapeutic Recreation program in Norfolk and have recommended it to many of the individuals we serve who live in Norfolk, as I do with individuals who live in other Hampton Roads cities that offer such programming. The activities the Therapeutic Recreation Department offers are very creative and varied and appropriate for individuals with cognitive and physical problems as a result of brain injuries, as well as other disabilities.

Unfortunately, I have received the feedback from individuals that I have referred, both adults and children, that the classes are generally unavailable because of the number of individuals who apply. I am told that individuals desiring to enroll line up at the registration location in the early hours of the morning, before dawn, to have an opportunity to enroll. Therefore, many of the individuals I have referred are not able to be served, despite their best efforts. It would appear to me that the Therapeutic Recreation Department needs to expand its services. I understand the City of Norfolk’s economic constraints when I say this. However, this program serves the most vulnerable and needy of our city with activities that promote inclusion, socialization and health to disabled individuals. This is a critical need and should be high on your department’s priority list.

I have read in the Virginian Pilot recently that your department is considering moving the Therapeutic Recreation facility to the Lake Taylor Hospital area with a primary focus on aquatic activities. This is a concern because of the possible loss of classes in other than aquatics. I would suggest, as an alternative, that your department consider expanding the current location of the Therapeutic Recreation facility. I have visited the facility to observe and it is difficult to imagine having to present varied programming in such as small space. I would, also, think that a primary emphasis on aquatics would not meet the many and varied needs of individuals with disabilities.

Thank you for an opportunity to give this feedback regarding the Department of Therapeutic Recreation and for your Department's good work in so many areas of our city and in the lives of it's citizens.

Respectfully,

Marylin Copeland, MSW
Certified Brain Injury Specialist
Regional Coordinator
Brain Injury Association of Virginia
The mission of the Brain Injury Association of Virginia is to create a better future for Virginians through brain injury prevention, research, education, advocacy and support.
Hi Mr. Morris,

I would like to apologize for being unable to attend the two night forums held at Tarrallton Rec. and BTW high school last week. I am a soccer coach for a U9 team and we have practices scheduled on both evenings.

As you are aware, soccer is growing exponentially in Norfolk as well as in the U.S. I believe the Norfolk United has over 1,300 kids in recreation and advance levels playing the sport. This is a healthy number of kids who would like to take part in this activity. Unfortunately, limited fields make it very difficult to make plans for the practices as well as games. Because of this, we are losing most of our talented players to the neighboring cities – specifically to Virginia Beach.

Perhaps, Northside and Lakewood parks can be redesigned to allow for several fields for this sport thus eliminating the mix use baseball and football fields. Tarrallton can also be redesigned to allow for official soccer games that will take place on Saturdays and Sundays. This planning may also bring more revenues to the city as soccer tournaments have been gaining popularity and unfortunately Norfolk teams end up attending the ones organized by other cities instead of having a tournament in Norfolk. I respectfully request that you consider the needs of soccer enthusiasts within your master plans.

Please let me know if you have any questions or I can be any help.

Ali Gunbeyi
Hi Mr. Morris,

I would like to apologize for being unable to attend the two night forums held at Tarrallton Rec. and BTW high school. I am a soccer coach for a U12 team and my two other sons also play soccer which makes for a busy week.

I was raised in Norfolk and I am a current resident in the Bel-Aire neighborhood. My closest recreational center is Tarrallton less than a mile from my house. I have always enjoyed living near such a wide open property.

I am also a soccer fan. I grew up playing soccer in Norfolk having to use baseball and football fields to practice my sport. At the time soccer had a smaller voice then it does currently. Now, hundreds and hundreds of children in Norfolk play a sport that incorporates all who want to play. My request is that when considering a master plan for Norfolk's parks, a keen eye, be placed on the needs of such a large segment of the city's population; the soccer enthusiasts.

Tarrallton currently has six goal posts for soccer. Two of these goals have been repaired numerous times due to rust and fatigue. The remainder of the goals could certainly use an upgrade. Most of the goals are not properly secured in the ground and could be a possible hazard. Two to three fields could be graded and equipped with new goal posts to allow games to be scheduled truly utilizing this space. Soccer games on Saturdays typically start around 8:00 a.m. and continue throughout the day at most complexes until 3 or 4 p.m. 15 to 20 games could be played on these fields on one day alone as well as practices during the week.

This would also take some stress off the fields at Lake Taylor. The city would be giving a lot of kids in the area a place to play the sport they love.

Thank you for your time and effort in this matter,

Mike Rose
Pat Mac Keil, Therapeutic Recreation Advisory Council
423-7609

1) Pool not necessary at this time
2) [Need] More classrooms, staff- so that when classer are filled – we can open up more
3) Therapeutic services are more than “something to do” or “someplace to go” – they are opportunities to travel, eat out, use money, read a menu, interact with their peers
4) As it is – people sit home because classes fill up – even when we get on line before 5 in the am to sign up
5) If we have everything else we need, yes give us a ther[apeutic] pool - lovely
City of Norfolk’s recreation, parks, and open space system master plan:
- Re-focus
- Refresh
- Reconnect

Guiding Principles
1. Provide equitable access to a variety of recreational facilities that meet the needs of the residents of Norfolk, regardless of age, ability, or affluency
2. Upgrade and maintain existing facilities
3. Evaluate (continuously) and increase the utilization of existing facilities
4. Understand and provide for the changing recreational needs of Norfolk

Open Space Guiding Principles
Every park, recreation, and open space improvement should reflect Norfolk’s heritage and character.

Community Centers Guiding Principles
1. Focus on large, multi-purpose centers (with diverse programs and facilities)
2. Every resident should have access within +/- 2 miles of home
3. Provide safe routes, transit access to centers
4. Work with schools, non-profits, and libraries to provide a ‘finer grain’ system of local, neighborhood facilities

Water Access
Vision: to provide citizens of the City of Norfolk and visitors with safe, sustainable, and environmentally responsible waterfront parks, amenities, and access to waterways in support of:
- recreation
- education
- transportation
- cultural heritage appreciation
along and within Norfolk’s unique waterways.

Proposed Park Improvements
1. Additional small, multi-purpose neighborhood parks and green spaces
2. Upgrade and energize existing parks
3. New signage and wayfinding system
4. More local programs, activities, and events
5. Digital registration, communications, and access

Summary of Athletic Facilities Findings
- For accurate understanding of capacity and demand, the city will need an updated, detailed inventory of its facilities
- Meeting demand depends on upgrading many of the existing facilities; will need cost estimates
- Once cost is established, a work plan will need to be developed
- Need to identify areas where additional parkland can be acquired to help satisfy the need for multi-purpose practice space
Meeting Date: September 22, 2009

Project: City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan

Location: Tarrallton Community Center

Purpose: Public Workshop

Attendees: See attached list

Compiled By: Allison Crnic, Dave Barth

Core Values—what is most important? What makes Norfolk special?

- Access to programs/facilities for people with disabilities
- Beach access
- Support for transitional military personnel, many single parents
- Open, equitable access to beaches and lakes
- Unique climate, culture, environment. Respect for the natural environment
- Vibrant downtown: Townpoint Park, walking, parking
- Affordability
- Small town character—gardens, town centers
- Bicycle/pedestrian access should be improved—should be able to ride a bike from Downtown to Willoughby
- Have a sports culture—need to translate into fitness, wellness
- Value the neighborhoods, green space
- Taking care of special needs, therapeutic recreation
- Need things for teenagers to do—reduction in juvenile crime
- Arts and culture, festivals (eg: wine festival), block parties, etc
• Traditional families population blended with highly mobile population
• Need to support sports training programs for kids
• Need year-round sports (eg: “dome”)
• Diversity—age, ethnicity, intergenerational, eg. Bocce ball courts?
• People make the city
• Parks system is great: accessible, free, family-oriented
• Literacy, education for adults

Prioritization Exercise

Soccer fields (23)
Therapeutic rec center (15)
Soccer leagues (13)
Open/green space (11)
Therapeutic rec programs (9)
Beaches (8)
Baseball fields (6)
Outdoor swimming pools (6)
Walking/biking trails (5)
Neighborhood parks (4)
Small community centers (3)
Indoor swimming pools (3)
Large community parks (3)
Nature/environmental centers (3)
Outdoor adventure (3)
Sports instruction classes (3)
After-school rec programs (2)
Music instruction (2)
Water fitness (2)
Volleyball courts (2)
Boxing (1)
Senior programs (1)
Dance classes (1)
Baseball leagues (1)
Biking/walking groups (1)
Basketball courts (1)
Football/rugby fields (1)
Survey Results:

Total submitted: 43*

* Not all surveys were completed; therefore, results may not add up to 43 (100%)

2. Have you or members of your household visited any City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year?

   YES – 38 (88%)

   NO – 3 (7%)

2a. Which three parks or recreation centers in the City of Norfolk do you visit most often?

   Northside – 18 (42%)
   Tarralton – 11 (26%)
   Lakewood Park – 8 (19%)
   Larchmont – 6 (14%)
   Therapeutic Rec Center – 6 (14%)
   Lake Taylor – 5 (12%)
   Fitness & Wellness Center – 4 (9%)
   East Ocean View – 4 (9%)
   Bay Oak Park – 3 (7%)
   Ghent Elementary – 2 (5%)
   Larrymore – 2 (5%)
   Lafayette Park – 2 (5%)
   Fergus Reid – 1 (2%)
   Elizabeth River Trail – 1 (2%)
   Town Point Park – 1 (2%)
   Tidewater – 1 (2%)
   Willow wood – 1 (2%)
   Titustown – 1 (2%)
   Suburban – 1 (2%)
2b. Based on your knowledge and experience, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers you have visited?

- Excellent – 2 (5%)
- Good – 8 (18%)
- Fair – 27 (63%)
- Poor – 4 (9%)

3. Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department during the past 12 months?

- Yes – 28 (65%)
- No – 14 (33%)

3a. How would you rate the overall quality of programs in which you and members of your household have participated?

- Excellent – 9 (21%)
- Good – 11 (26%)
- Fair – 9 (21%)
- Poor – 1 (2%)

4. Please CHECK ALL the reasons the prevent you or other members of your household from using parks, recreation and sports facilities or programs of the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department more often.
Facilities lack the right equipment – 19 (44%)
Facilities are not well maintained – 11 (26%)
Desired program or facility not offered – 11 (26%)
Lack of quality programs – 10 (23%)
Class full – 9 (21%)
Do not know what is being offered – 8 (19%)
Program times not convenient – 7 (16%)
Registration for programs is difficult – 7 (16%)
Security is insufficient – 6 (14%)
Use services of other non City agencies – 6 (14%)
Too far from our residence – 5 (12%)
Poor customer service by staff – 4 (12%)
Lack of parking by facilities and parks – 4 (12%)
Other – 4 (12%)
Use facilities in other cities – 2 (5%)
Not accessible for people with disabilities – 2 (5%)
Fees are too high – 2 (5%)
I do not know locations of facilities – 1 (2%)
Facility operating hours not convenient – 1 (2%)

5. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the park/facility.

Beaches – 35 (81%)
Open/green space – 35 (81%)
Walking/biking trails – 33 (77%)
Neighborhood parks – 32 (74%)
Nature/Environmental Centers – 28 (65%)
Indoor swimming pools – 26 (60%)
Fitness and exercise facilities – 26 (60%)
Outdoor swimming pools – 25 (58%)
Community gardens – 25 (58%)
Soccer fields – 23 (53%)
Large community parks – 23 (53%)
Picnic areas and shelters – 23 (53%)
Community centers – small – 22 (51%)
Playground equipment – 19 (36%)
Tennis courts – 19 (23%)
Boat ramps/kayak and canoe launches – 19 (23%)
Fishing piers – 18 (42%)
Golf courses/driving ranges – 17 (40%) 
Community centers – large – 17 (40%)
Baseball fields – 15 (35%)
Basketball courts – 14 (33%)
Indoor walking track – 12 (28%)
Fishing piers w/ bait and tackle – 11 (26%)
Football/rugby fields – 11 (26%)
Volleyball courts – 10 (23%)
Other (Softball – 3) (7%)

6. Which four of the facilities from question 5 are most important to your household? (tallies not differentiated between 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc)

Open green space – 15 (35%)
Walking/biking trails – 15 (35%)
Indoor pool – 13 (30%)
Soccer – 13 (30%)
Beach – 12 (28%)
Neighborhood parks – 8 (19%)
Outdoor pool – 6 (14%)
Fitness and exercise facilities – 6 (14%)
Community centers – small – 5 (12%)
Community gardens – 5 (12%)
Tennis – 3 (7%)
Playgrounds – 3 (7%)
Nature/Environmental Centers – 3 (7%)
Softball – 3 (7%)
Therapeutic rec – 2 (5%)
Boat ramp – 2 (5%)
Picnic areas – 2 (5%)
Baseball – 2 (5%)
Walking track – 2 (5%)
Football – 2 (5%)
Kayaking – 1 (2%)
Community park – 1 (2%)
Community centers – large – 1 (2%)
“Training ground” – 1 (2%)
Volleyball – 1 (2%)
Fishing – 1 (2%)
Basketball – 1 (2%)

7. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs listed below.

- Fitness/wellness – 29 (67%)
- Special events/festivals – 27 (63%)
- Nature/environmental – 26 (60%)
- Outdoor adventure – 23 (53%)
- Soccer leagues – 22 (51%)
- Swimming lessons – 19 (44%)
- Biking/walking groups – 16 (37%)
- Sports instruction -16 (37%)
- Water safety – 15 (35%)
- Historical/interpretive – 14 (33%)
- After-school organized rec – 14 (33%)
- Adult continuing education/enrichment – 13 (30%)
- Softball leagues – 13 (30%)
- Water fitness – 12 (28%)
- Baseball leagues – 12 (28%)
- Basketball leagues – 11 (26%)
- Football leagues – 11 (26%)
- Dance class – 10 (23%)
- SCUBA/snorkeling – 10 (23%)
- Fishing programs – 9 (21%)
- Music instruction – 9 (21%)
- Adapted programs for people with disabilities – 7 (16%)
- Boating lessons – 7 (16%)
- Lifeguard certification – 7 (16%)
- Drama class – 7 (16%)

8. Which four of the programs from question 7 are most important to your household? (tallies not differentiated between 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc)

- Soccer – 19 (44%)
- Fitness/wellness – 15 (35%)
- Natural/environmental – 14 (33%)
- Outdoor adventure – 13 (30%)
- Special events – 13 (30%)
- Bicycling/walking groups – 7 (16%)
Therapeutic rec – 6 (14%)  
Swimming lessons – 6 (14%)  
Adult/continuing ed – 5 (12%)  
After-school organized rec – 5 (12%)  
Softball leagues – 5 (12%)  
Baseball leagues – 5 (12%)  
Sports instruction – 4 (9%)  
Historic/interpretive – 4 (9%)  
Water fitness – 3 (7%)  
Football leagues – 3 (7%)  
Fishing – 2 (5%)  
Music – 2 (5%)  
Dance – 2 (5%)  
Basketball – 2 (5%)  
Drama – 1 (2%)  
Boating – 1 (2%)  
Water safety – 1 (2%)  
Lifeguarding – 1 (2%)

9. Which four of the programs from the list in question 7 do you currently participate in most often at City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks facilities?

Soccer leagues – 15 (35%)  
Natural/environmental – 12 (28%)  
Fitness/exercise – 12 (28%)  
Therapeutic rec – 6 (14%)  
Softball leagues – 5 (12%)  
Basketball leagues – 5 (12%)  
Outdoor adventure – 5 (12%)  
Historic/interpretive – 4 (9%)  
Swimming lessons – 3 (7%)  
Dance – 3 (7%)  
Fishing – 3 (7%)  
Sports instruction – 3 (7%)  
Bicycling/walking – 3 (7%)  
Football – 3 (7%)  
Water fitness – 2 (5%)  
After-school organized rec – 2 (5%)  
Baseball leagues – 1 (2%)  
Music instruction – 1 (2%)
10. Please check all the ways you learn about Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department programs and activities.

From friends and neighbors – 24 (56%)
Web site – 23 (53%)
“Good Times” Magazine – 20 (47%)
Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec Centers – 16 (37%)
Conversations with rec and parks staff – 16 (37%)
City of Norfolk Channel 48 – 8 (19%)
Newspaper advertisements – 7 (16%)
Radio – 5 (12%)
Other – 3 (civic leagues, email) (7%)
Flyers distributed at school – 1 (2%)

11. From the following list, please check all the organizations that you or your household have used for indoor or outdoor recreation and sports activities during the last 12 months.

Parks and red facilities in other cities – 22 (51%)
City of Norfolk Parks and Rec – 22 (51%)
School District facilities – 16 (37%)
Private youth sports leagues – 15 (35%)
State of Virginia Parks – 15 (35%)
Churches/synagogues/mosques – 8 (19%)
Private clubs (tennis, fitness, golf) – 8 (19%)
JCC – 7 (16%)
HOAs/apartment complex – 1 (2%)
Boys and Girls Club – 1 (2%)
Other – 1 (2%)
None – 1 (2%)

13. In the City of Norfolk a Neighborhood Park is a smaller park which may have a play area, a picnic area, and a small outdoor open area. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?

½ mile – 11 (26%)
1 mile – 9 (21%)
14. In the City of Norfolk a Community Park is a larger park which may have a larger outdoor open area, play areas, athletic fields/game courts, a community building/gym, a childcare center or senior center. How far would you go to visit a park like this?

- ½ mile – 3 (7%)
- 1 mile – 6 (14%)
- 2 miles – 7 (16%)
- 2+ miles – 21 (49%)

15. If cemetery areas were made open and available to walking and bicycling, would you utilize them?

- Yes – 17 (40%)
- No – 22 (51%)

16. Would you be interested in walking tours of city-owned cemeteries?

- Yes – 19 (44%)
- No – 20 (46%)
Meeting Date: September 24, 2009

Project: City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan

Location: Booker T Washington HS

Purpose: Public Workshop

Attendees: See attached list

Compiled By: Allison Crnic, Dave Barth

- Need neighborhood recreation centers—there is a need to take care of kids, especially teens
- Access to cultural experiences
- Things for everyone to do
- Bigger recreation centers
- Adult citizens need programs too, especially those for the mentally handicapped, including buildings, programs, and transportation
- Therapeutic recreation needs to be expanded
- Ingleside needs a larger facility for civic leagues and seniors, in addition to a gymnasium
- Registration time doesn’t make sense for therapeutic recreation—need better system, busses. 4 sessions/year
- South side – recreation centers on Leach, others—need more space, improved conditions
- Middletown Arch, Stonebridge, Broad Creek: have no rec centers/rec facilities
- Shoop Park has nothing to do for 10-14 year-olds; need to have a kids/teen workshop
- Need to partner with schools for save, wholesome activities
• Core values—green, cultural, big “small town”, neighborhoods
• Developers did not provide parks, open space for new development
• Need to be pedestrian/bicycle friendly
• Need to actively pursue more public/private funding, philanthropy
• Need soccer fields, improvements to existing fields including those at the schools
• Need to get information from Long Range Transportation Plan
• Funding for parks and rec: increased fees, revolving fund
• Need to improve softball fields

PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE:

Therapeutic rec (10)
Soccer fields (8)
After-school organized recreation (7)
Fitness/wellness programs (7)
Community centers—large regionalized (4)
Community centers—small nhood (4)
Softball Leagues (3)
Softball Fields/Improvements to existing fields (2)
Basketball leagues (2)
Walking/biking trails (2)
Football Leagues (1)
Soccer Leagues (1)
Dance classes (1)
Music instruction (1)
Nature/environmental programs (1)
Baseball fields (1)
Fitness/exercise facilities (1)
Kayak/canoe launches (1)
Nature/environmental centers (1)

Survey Results:
Total submitted: 18*

Page 2 of 9
* Not all surveys were completed; therefore, results may not add up to 43 (100%)

2. Have you or members of your household visited any City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year?
   YES – 15 (83%)
   NO – 0

2a. Which three parks or recreation centers in the City of Norfolk do you visit most often?

   Northside – 3 (17%)
   Larchmont Elementary – 3 (17%)
   Lake Taylor – 3 (17%)
   Titustown – 3 (17%)
   Town Point Park – 3 (17%)
   Huntersville – 3 (17%)
   Lakewood – 2 (11%)
   Ghent Elementary – 1 (5%)
   Botanical Garden – 1 (5%)
   Zoo – 1 (5%)
   Berkeley Park – 1 (5%)
   Berkeley Rec Center – 1 (5%)
   Campostella Rec Center - 1 (5%)
   Azalea Acres – 1 (5%)
   Evans Street – 1 (5%)
   Tarrallton – 1 (5%)
   Senior Center – 1 (5%)
   Heath and Wellness Center - 1 (5%)
   Fairlawn – 1 (5%)
   Brambleton – 1 (5%)
   Norview - 1 (5%)
   Bluebird – 1 (5%)
   Southside – 1 (5%)
   Therapeutic Rec Center – 1 (5%)

2b. Based on your knowledge and experience, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers you have visited?

   Excellent – 0
3. Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department during the past 12 months?

   Yes – 15 (83%)
   No – 0

3a. How would you rate the overall quality of programs in which you and members of your household have participated?

   Excellent – 1 (6%)
   Good – 8 (44%)
   Fair – 8 (44%)
   Poor – 0

4. Please CHECK ALL the reasons the prevent you or other members of your household from using parks, recreation and sports facilities or programs of the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department more often.

   Facilities lack the right equipment – 7 (39%)
   Facilities are not well maintained – 7 (39%)
   Desired program or facility not offered – 5 (28%)
   Lack of parking by facilities and parks – 5 (28%)
   Security is insufficient – 5 (28%)
   Too far from our residence – 4 (22%)
   Lack of quality programs – 3 (17%)
   Class full – 2 (11%)
   Do not know what is being offered – 2 (11%)
   Use facilities in other cities – 2 (11%)
   Fees are too high – 2 (11%)
   Registration for programs is difficult – 2 (11%)
   Poor customer service by staff – 1 (5%)
   Program times not convenient – 1 (5%)
   I do not know locations of facilities – 1 (5%)
   Facility operating hours not convenient – 1 (5%)
5. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the park/facility.

- Neighborhood parks – 9 (50%)
- Walking/biking trails – 9 (50%)
- Picnic areas/shelters – 8 (44%)
- Playground equipment – 8 (44%)
- Community centers – small – 8 (44%)
- Open green space – 8 (44%)
- Fitness/exercise facilities – 7 (39%)
- Indoor swimming pools – 7 (39%)
- Nature/environmental center – 6 (33%)
- Beaches – 6 (33%)
- Soccer fields – 6 (33%)
- Large community/regional park – 5 (28%)
- Football/rugby fields – 5 (28%)
- Basketball courts – 5 (28%)
- Outdoor swimming pools – 5 (28%)
- Tennis courts – 4 (22%)
- Baseball fields – 4 (22%)
- Indoor walking/running tracks – 4 (22%)
- Community gardens – 4 (22%)
- Boat ramps/kayak canoe launches – 4 (22%)
- Fishing piers – 3 (17%)
- Volleyball courts – 3 (17%)
- Community centers – large – 3 (17%)
- Fishing piers with bait, tackle – 2 (11%)
- Golf courses/driving ranges – 2 (11%)
- Other-Skate park – 1 (5%)
- Other-bowling – 1 (5%)

6. Which four of the facilities from question 5 are most important to your household? (tallies not differentiated between 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc)

- Soccer – 5 (28%)
- Football fields – 4 (22%)
- Fitness/exercise facilities – 4 (22%)
- Community center – small – 4 (22%)
Neighborhood parks – 4 (22%)
Indoor swimming pools – 3 (17%)
Community center – large – 2 (11%)
Baseball – 2 (11%)
Volleyball – 2 (11%)
Playgrounds – 2 (11%)
Outdoor swimming pools – 1 (5%)
Nature/environmental centers - 1 (5%)
Bicycle/walking trails – 1 (5%)
Picnic area/shelters-1 (5%)
Skate park – 1 (5%)
Golf – 1 (5%)
Fishing piers - 1 (5%)
Indoor walking track – 1 (5%)
Large community park – 1 (5%)
Bowling – 1 (5%)
Open green space - 1 (5%)

7. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs listed below.

Special events/festivals – 8 (44%)
Fitness/wellness – 7 (39%)
After-school organized rec – 6 (33%)
Swimming lessons – 6 (33%)
Soccer – 6 (33%)
Sports instruction - 5 (28%)
Dance – 4 (22%)
Basketball league – 4 (22%)
Football league – 4 (22%)
Softball league – 4 (22%)
Music instruction – 4 (22%)
Nature/environmental - 3 (17%)
Adult/continuing ed – 3 (17%)
SCUBA/snorkeling – 3 (17%)
Water fitness – 3 (17%)
Baseball league – 3 (17%)
Outdoor/Adventure - 2 (11%)
Historic/interpretive – 2 (11%)
Water safety – 2 (11%)
8. Which four of the programs from question 7 are most important to your household? (tallies not differentiated between 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd}, etc)

- After-school organized rec – 5 (28%)
- Swimming lessons – 5 (28%)
- Soccer – 4 (22%)
- Fitness/exercise – 3 (17%)
- Football leagues – 3 (17%)
- Basketball leagues – 2 (11%)
- Historic/interpretive – 1 (5%)
- SCUBA/snorkeling – 1 (5%)
- Music – 1 (5%)
- Nature/environmental – 1 (5%)
- Baseball – 1 (5%)
- Dance – 1 (5%)
- Sports instruction – 1 (5%)
- Special events – 1 (5%)
- Adult/continuing ed – 1 (5%)

9. Which four of the programs from the list in question 7 do you currently participate in most often at City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks facilities?

- Soccer leagues – 5 (28%)
- Bicycling/walking groups – 2 (11%)
- Dance – 2 (11%)
- Football – 2 (11%)
- Special events – 2 (11%)
- Outdoor adventure – 2 (11%)
- Basketball – 2 (11%)
10. Please check all the ways you learn about Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department programs and activities.

From friends and neighbors – 11 (61%)
Conversations with rec and parks staff – 8 (44%)
“Good Times” Magazine – 7 (39%)
Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec Centers – 6 (33%)
Newspaper advertisements – 6 (33%)
Web site – 5 (28%)
City of Norfolk Channel 48 – 3 (17%)
Flyers distributed at school – 2 (11%)
Radio – 1 (5%)
Other – Civic league - 1 (5%)

11. From the following list, please check all the organizations that you or your household have used for indoor or outdoor recreation and sports activities during the last 12 months.

City of Norfolk Parks and Rec – 14 (78%)
School District facilities – 7 (39%)
Private youth sports leagues – 7 (39%)
Parks and red facilities in other cities – 6 (33%)
Private clubs (tennis, fitness, golf) – 3 (17%)
State of Virginia Parks – 3 (17%)
Churches/synagogues/mosques – 2 (11%)
YMCA – 2 (11%)
JCC – 2 (11%)
HOAs/apartment complex – 2 (11%)
Boys and Girls Club – 2 (11%)
Other – Botanical Garden - 1 (5%)  
None – 1 (5%)

13. In the City of Norfolk a Neighborhood Park is a smaller park which may have a play area, a picnic area, and a small outdoor open area. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?

- ½ mile – 4 (22%)
- 1 mile – 5 (28%)
- 2 miles – 2 (11%)
- 2+ miles – 4 (22%)

14. In the City of Norfolk a Community Park is a larger park which may have a larger outdoor open area, play areas, athletic fields/game courts, a community building/gym, a childcare center or senior center. How far would you go to visit a park like this?

- ½ mile – 2 (11%)
- 1 mile – 1 (5%)
- 2 miles – 1 (5%)
- 2+ miles – 9 (50%)

15. If cemetery areas were made open and available to walking and bicycling, would you utilize them?

- Yes – 11 (61%)
- No – 6 (33%)

16. Would you be interested in walking tours of city-owned cemeteries?

- Yes – 11 (61%)
- No – 6 (33%)
Appendix B | Mail/Telephone Survey
Community Interest and Opinion Survey: Let your voice be heard today!

The City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department would like your input to help determine priorities for parks, greenways, open space and recreation for our community. This survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. We greatly appreciate your time.

1. Counting yourself, how many people in your household are?
   Under age 5 ____  Ages 15-19 ____  Ages 35-44 ____  Ages 65-74 ____
   Ages 5-9 ____  Ages 20-24 ____  Ages 45-54 ____  Ages 75+ ____
   Ages 10-14 ____  Ages 25-34 ____  Ages 55-64 ____

2. Have you or members of your household visited any City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers during the past year?
   ____ (1) Yes [Please answer Question #2a & #2b.]
   ____ (2) No [Please go to Question #3.]

   2a. Which three parks or recreation centers in the City of Norfolk do you visit most often?
      Most Often: ____________  2nd Most Often: ____________  3rd Most Often: ____________

   2b. Based on your knowledge and experience, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers you have visited?
      ____ (1) Excellent  ____ (2) Good  ____ (3) Fair  ____ (4) Poor

3. Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department during the past 12 months?
   ____ (1) Yes [Please answer Questions #3a.]
   ____ (2) No [Please go to Question #4.]

   3a. How would you rate the overall quality of programs in which you and members of your household have participated?
      ____ (1) Excellent  ____ (2) Good  ____ (3) Fair  ____ (4) Poor

4. Please CHECK ALL the reasons that prevent you or other members of your household from using parks, recreation and sports facilities or programs of the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department more often.
   ____ (01) Facilities are not well maintained  ____ (11) Poor customer service by staff
   ____ (02) Desired program or facility not offered  ____ (12) I do not know locations of facilities
   ____ (03) Facilities lack the right equipment  ____ (13) Use services of other non City owned agencies
   ____ (04) Security is insufficient  ____ (14) Not accessible for people with disabilities
   ____ (05) Lack of quality programs  ____ (15) I do not know what is being offered
   ____ (06) Too far from our residence  ____ (16) Facility operating hours not convenient
   ____ (07) Class full  ____ (17) Registration for programs is difficult
   ____ (08) Program times are not convenient  ____ (18) Lack of parking by facilities and parks
   ____ (09) Use facilities in other cities  ____ (19) Other: _______________________
   ____ (10) Fees are too high
5. Please indicate if **YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD** has a need for each of the parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the park/facility.

If YES, please rate ALL the following parks and recreation FACILITIES of this type in Norfolk on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Facility?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Neighborhood parks 1-10 acres</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Large community &amp; regional parks</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Off-leash dog parks</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Beaches</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Shelters and picnic areas</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Youth soccer fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Youth baseball fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Youth softball fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Youth football and rugby fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Adult softball fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Adult soccer fields</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Outdoor volleyball courts</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Playground equipment</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Outdoor splash parks</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Skate parks</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Community gardens</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Open/green space</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Indoor community centers</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Indoor gyms (basketball/volleyball)</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indoor fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indoor running/walking areas</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indoor pools/aquatic facilities</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Boat ramps/kayak launch areas</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Which FOUR of the facilities from the list in Question #5 are most important to your household?**

[Using the letters or numbers in the left hand column of Question #5 above, please write in the letters or number below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____ 4th _____ NONE
7. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has a need for each of the recreation programs listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the recreation program.

If YES, please rate the following recreation PROGRAMS on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Program?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Youth swim programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adult swim programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Before and after school programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Youth summer camp programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Youth sports programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Youth fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Youth art, dance, performing arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Martial arts programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Adult fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Water fitness programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Adult art, dance, performing arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Adult sports programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Senior programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Programs for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Golf programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Special events/festivals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Nature/environmental programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Adult continuing education and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrichment programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Outdoor adventure programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Parent-child programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Walking/biking groups</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Other:______________________________</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Which FOUR of the programs from the list in Question #7 are most important to your household? [Using the letters in Question #7 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____ 4th _____ NONE

9. Which FOUR of the programs from the list in Question #7 do you currently participate in MOST OFTEN at City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks facilities? [Using the letters in Question #7 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____ 4th _____ NONE
10. Please check ALL the ways you learn about Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department programs and activities.
   (01) "Good Times" Magazine
   (02) Web site
   (03) Newspaper articles
   (04) Radio
   (05) City of Norfolk Channel 48
   (06) Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities
   (07) From friends and neighbors
   (08) Flyers distributed at school
   (09) Conversations with Rec & Parks staff
   (10) Newspaper advertisements
   (11) Other: ___________________________

11. From the following list, please check ALL the organizations that you or members of your household have used for indoor and outdoor recreation and sports activities during the last 12 months.
   (01) School District facilities
   (02) Churches/Synagogue/Mosque
   (03) Private youth sports leagues
   (04) City of Norfolk Rec and Parks
   (05) YMCA
   (06) YWCA
   (07) JCC (Jewish Community Center)
   (08) Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf)
   (09) State of Virginia Parks
   (10) Parks and recreation facilities in other cities
   (11) Homeowners associations/apartment complex
   (12) Boys and Girls Clubs
   (13) Other: ___________________________
   (14) None. Do not use any organizations.

12. For each of the age groups shown below, please indicate which TWO organizations listed in Question #11 you and your household USE THE MOST for sports and recreation programs and services. [Use the number by each organization in Question #11. If there is no-one in your household ages 0 to 17, write the word NONE in the space provided below for ages 0 to 17.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Use Most</th>
<th>Agency Use 2nd Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 0 to 17 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18 years and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In the City of Norfolk, a Neighborhood Park is a smaller park which may have a play area, a picnic area, and a small outdoor open area. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?
   (1) 1/2 mile    (2) 1 mile    (3) 2 miles    (4) More than 2 miles

14. In the City of Norfolk, a Community Park is a larger park which may have a larger outdoor open area, play areas, athletic fields/game courts, a community building/gym, a childcare center or senior center. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?
   (1) 1/2 mile    (2) 1 mile    (3) 2 miles    (4) More than 2 miles

15. If cemetery areas were made open and available for walking and bicycling, would you utilize them?
   (1) Yes    (2) No

16. Would you be interested in walking tours of city owned cemeteries?
   (1) Yes    (2) No
17. Following are actions that the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department could take to improve the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space system. Please indicate whether you would be very supportive, somewhat supportive, or not supportive of each action by circling the number next to the action.

How supportive are you of having Norfolk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Purchase land to develop neighborhood parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Purchase land for additional athletic fields &amp; larger recreational areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Purchase land for additional trails or bikeways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Upgrade existing youth/adult athletic fields</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Upgrade existing neighborhood and community parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fix-up/repair existing park buildings/recreation facilities and centers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Fix-up/repair existing swimming pools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Fix-up/repair existing playground areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Develop walking &amp; biking trails and parks along the waterfront</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Develop new trails and connect existing trails</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) Develop new indoor recreation centers with gymnasiums, fitness facilities, indoor walking/running tracks, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Develop new outdoor family aquatic centers with slides, sprays, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Develop new water splash pads (i.e. Shoop Park)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Utilize School Facilities for City recreation programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Develop new nature trails, nature centers, and nature programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Develop new outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q) Develop new specialized park features (e.g. skate parks, off-leash dog parks, board game areas, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Develop new programs/activities at existing facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Other:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Which FOUR of the actions from the list in Question #17 would you be most willing to fund with your City dollars? [Using the letters in the left hand column of Question #17 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____ 4th _____ NONE

Demographics

19. How many people live in your household? _______

20. What is your age? _______

21. Your gender:

___ (1) Male

___ (2) Female

22. What is the Zip Code of where you live? ___________
23. How long have you lived in the City of Norfolk?
   ______ (1) Under 1 year ______ (4) 11-19 years
   ______ (2) 1-5 years ______ (5) 20 years or more
   ______ (3) 6-10 years

24. Are you or members of your household of Hispanic or Latin ancestry?
   ______ (1) Yes ______ (2) No

25. Check ALL of the following that describes your race/ethnicity?  (Check all that apply.)
   ______ (1) African American/Black ______ (4) White/Caucasian
   ______ (2) Asian ______ (5) Native American
   ______ (3) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ______ (6) Other: ____________________

26. Are you a military family?
   ______ (1) Yes ______ (2) No

27. What is your household income?
   ______ (1) Under $25,000 ______ (5) $100,000-$149,999
   ______ (2) $25,000-$49,999 ______ (6) $150,000-$199,999
   ______ (3) $50,000-$74,999 ______ (7) $200,000 or more
   ______ (4) $75,000-$99,999

28. Which of the following BEST describes your current residence?
   ______ (1) Single Family ______ (3) High rise building (4 stories or more)
   ______ (2) Apartment or condominiums ______ (4) Other: ____________________

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your time.
Please Return Your Completed Survey in the Enclosed Return-Reply Envelope Addressed
to:  ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your response will remain Completely Confidential
The address information on the sticker to the right will
ONLY be used to help identify needs based on geographic locations.
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Overview of the Methodology

The City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks and Open Space conducted a Community Interest Survey during the fall of 2009 to establish priorities for the future improvement or parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the City of Norfolk. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the City of Norfolk. The survey was administered by a combination of mail and phone.

Leisure Vision worked extensively with City of Norfolk officials, as well members of the Glatting Jackson project team in the development of the survey questionnaire. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance to effectively plan the future system.

Leisure Vision mailed surveys to a random sample of 2,500 households in the City of Norfolk. Approximately three days after the surveys were mailed, each household that received a survey also received an electronic voice message encouraging them to complete the survey. In addition, about two weeks after the surveys were mailed, Leisure Vision began contacting households by phone. Those who indicated they had not returned the survey were given the option of completing it by phone.

The goal was to obtain a total of at least 500 completed surveys from City of Norfolk residents. This goal was far exceeded, with a total of 573 surveys having been completed. The results of the random sample of 573 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/- 4.1%.

The following pages summarize major survey findings:
Major Survey Findings

- **Visitation of City Parks or Recreation Centers.** Sixty-nine percent (69%) of households have visited City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year. Of the 69% of households that have visited City of Norfolk parks and recreation centers during the past year, 77% rated the physical condition of the parks/recreation centers as either excellent or good.

- **Participation in City Recreation Programs.** Twenty-seven percent (27%) of households have participated in recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks, and Open Space during the past 12 months. Of the 27% of households that have participated in City recreation programs during the past 12 months, 89% rated the overall quality of the programs as either excellent or good.

- **Reasons Preventing the Use of City Parks, Recreation Facilities or Programs More Often.** The most frequently mentioned reasons preventing households from using City parks, recreation facilities or programs more often are: I do not know what is being offered (27%), program times are not convenient (12%), and security is insufficient (12%).

- **Need for Parks and Recreation Facilities.** There are five parks and recreation facilities that over 50% of households have a need for: neighborhood parks (65%), walking and biking trails (61%), fitness and exercise facilities (56%), picnic areas and shelters (55%), and beaches (54%).

- **Most Important Parks and Recreation Facilities.** Based on the sum of their top four choices, the parks and recreation facilities that households rated as the most important are: walking and biking trails (32%), fitness and exercise facilities (25%), beaches (24%), neighborhood parks (20%), and indoor pools/aquatics facilities (19%).

- **Need for Recreation Programs.** The recreation programs that the highest percentage of households have a need for are: fitness/wellness (51%), special events/festivals (49%), swimming lessons (37%), adult continuing education/enrichment (35%), and nature/environmental (35%).

- **Most Important Recreation Programs.** Based on the sum of their top four choices, the recreation programs that households rated as the most important are: fitness/wellness (30%), special events/festivals (22%), swimming lessons (18%), and adult continuing education/enrichment (17%).
Ways Households Learn About Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Parks & Open Space Programs and Activities. The most frequently mentioned way respondents learn about Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Park and Open Space programs and activities are: from friends and neighbors (48%), newspaper articles (36%), newspaper advertisements (26%), and flyers/posters at parks and recreation facilities (24%).

Organizations Used for Indoor and Outdoor Recreation Activities. The organizations used by the highest percentage of households for indoor and outdoor recreation activities during the past 12 months are: City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks (39%), churches/synagogue/mosque (25%), parks and recreation facilities in other cities (23%), and State of Virginia parks (23%).

Distance Respondents Would Travel to Use a Neighborhood Park. Seventy-four percent (74%) of households would travel at least 1 mile to use a neighborhood park. This includes 24% who would travel 1 mile, 21% who would travel 2 miles, and 29% who would travel more than 2 miles.

Distance Respondents Would Travel to Use a Community Park. Ninety-one percent (91%) of households would travel at least 1 mile to use a community park. This includes 11% who would travel 1 mile, 22% who would travel 2 miles, and 58% who would travel more than 2 miles.

Actions to Improve Parks and Recreation That Households Would Be Most Willing to Fund with Tax Dollars. Based on the sum of their top four choices, the actions to improve the City of Norfolk Dept. of Recreation, Parks and Open Space that households would be most willing to fund with tax dollars are: develop walking and biking trails and parks along the waterfront (30%), fix-up park buildings and recreation facilities (23%), upgrade existing neighborhood and community parks (21%), and develop new indoor recreation centers (21%).
Q1. Demographics: Ages of People in Household

by percentage of respondents

- Under 5 years: 11%
- 5-9 years: 8%
- 10-14 years: 7%
- 15-19 years: 7%
- 20-24 years: 8%
- 25-34 years: 15%
- 35-44 years: 9%
- 45-54 years: 15%
- 55-64 years: 11%
- 65-74 years: 5%
- 75+ years: 4%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q2. Has Your Household Visited Any City of Norfolk Parks or Recreation Centers During the Past Year?

by percentage of respondents

- Yes: 69%
- No: 31%

Q2a. City Parks or Recreation Centers Visited Most Often

Northside Park
Lakewood Park
Lafayette Park

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q2. Has Your Household Visited Any City of Norfolk Parks or Recreation Centers During the Past Year?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 69%

No 31%

Q2b. How Would You Rate the Physical Condition of All the City Parks and Recreation Centers Your Household Has Visited?

Excellent 21%

Good 56%

Fair 21%

Poor 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q3. Has Your Household Participated in Any Recreation Programs Offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department During the Past 12 Months?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 27%

No 73%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q3. Has Your Household Participated in Any Recreation Programs Offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department During the Past 12 Months?

by percentage of respondents

- Yes: 27%
- No: 73%

Q3a. How Would You Rate the Overall Quality of the Programs Your Household Has Participated in?

- Excellent: 37%
- Good: 52%
- Fair: 9%
- Poor: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q4. Reasons That Prevent Respondent Households From Using City Parks, Recreation and Sports Facilities and Programs More Often

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- I do not know what is being offered: 27%
- Program times are not convenient: 12%
- Security is insufficient: 12%
- Desired program or facility not offered: 11%
- I do not know locations of facilities: 11%
- Facilities are not well maintained: 10%
- Fees are too high: 10%
- Too far from our residence: 9%
- Use services of other non City owned agencies: 9%
- Facilities lack the right equipment: 8%
- Lack of quality programs: 8%
- Poor customer service by staff: 8%
- Use facilities in other cities: 6%
- Facility operating hours not convenient: 6%
- Lack of parking by facilities and parks: 5%
- Registration for programs is difficult: 4%
- Class full: 3%
- Not accessible for people with disabilities: 3%
- Other: 0%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)
Walking and biking trails
Fitness and exercise facilities
Picnic areas and shelters
Beaches
Playground equipment
Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)
Indoor pools/aquatic facilities
Community centers (small neighborhood)
Walking and running tracks (indoor)
Open/green space
Community gardens
Nature/environmental centers
Fishing piers
Community centers (large regionalized)
Fishing piers with bait, tackle concessions
Outdoor pools/aquatic facilities
Tennis courts
Basketball courts
Baseball fields
Outdoor pools/aquatic facilities
Golf courses/driving ranges
Football and rugby fields
Soccer fields
Volleyball courts
Boat ramps/kayak & canoe launches

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q5. Respondent Households That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

Q5a. Estimated Number of Households in Norfolk That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities
by number of households based on 85,129 households in the City of Norfolk

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q5b. How Well Parks and Recreation Facilities in Norfolk Meet the Needs of Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents with a need for parks/facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football and rugby fields</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/green space</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q5c. Estimated Number of Households in the City of Norfolk Whose Needs for Parks and Recreation Facilities Are Only Being 50% Met or Less

by number of households based on 85,129 households in the City of Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>20,000</th>
<th>30,000</th>
<th>40,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q6. Parks and Recreation Facilities That Are Most Important to Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
<th>4th Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers with bait, tackle concessions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football and rugby fields</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q7. Respondent Households That Have a Need for Various Recreation Programs

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Program</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
<th>4th Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/wellness</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events/festivals</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult continuing education/enrichment</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking/walking groups</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance classes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/interpretive</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music instruction</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water safety</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (instructional classes)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school organized recreation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball leagues</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football leagues</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball leagues</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball leagues</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer leagues</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted programs for people with disabilities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama classes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard certification</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating lessons</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba diving/snorkeling</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
**Q7a. Estimated Number of Households in Norfolk That Have a Need for Various Recreation Programs**

by number of households based on 85,129 households in the City of Norfolk

- Fitness/wellness
- Special events/festivals
- Swimming lessons
- Adult continuing education/enrichment
- Nature/environmental
- Biking/walking groups
- Water fitness
- Dance classes
- Historical/interpretive
- Outdoor adventure
- Music instruction
- Water safety
- Sports (instructional classes)
- After-school organized recreation
- Baseball leagues
- Football leagues
- Basketball leagues
- Softball leagues
- Fishing programs
- Adapted programs for people with disabilities
- Drama classes
- Lifeguard certification
- Boating lessons
- Scuba diving/snorkeling

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

---

**Q7b. How Well Recreation Programs Meet the Needs of Respondent Households**

by percentage of respondents with a need for programs

- Football leagues
- Special events/festivals
- Baseball leagues
- Basketball leagues
- Softball leagues
- Soccer leagues
- Historical/interpretive
- Water fitness
- Water safety
- Swimming lessons
- Sports (instructional classes)
- Lifeguard certification
- Fitness/wellness
- Adapted programs for people with disabilities
- Dance classes
- Nature/environmental
- Adult continuing education/enrichment
- After-school organized recreation
- Outdoor adventure
- Drama classes
- Biking/walking groups
- Boating lessons
- Fishing programs
- Scuba diving/snorkeling

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q7c. Estimated Number of Households in the City of Norfolk Whose Needs for Recreation Programs Are Only Being 50% Met or Less

by number of households based on 85,129 households in the City of Norfolk

| Fitness/wellness | Biking/walking groups | Adult continuing education/enrichment | Nature/environmental | Special events/festivals | Swimming lessons | Dance classes | Outdoor adventure | Water fitness | Historical/interpretive | After-school organized recreation | Fishing programs | Water safety | Sports (instructional classes) | Drama classes | Softball leagues | Scuba diving/snorkeling | Soccer leagues | Baseball leagues | Boating lessons | Basketball leagues | Adapted programs for people with disabilities | Football leagues | Lifeguard certification |
|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 27,580           | 22,022                | 20,374                                | 19,894               | 19,308                   | 16,284           | 16,194        | 14,365           | 13,310       | 12,902                 | 11,795                     | 13,400        | 13,310      | 11,897                     | 10,994        | 8,513         | 5,807                     | 4,994         | 2,899         | 830            | 7,796                   | 8,540         | 7,815                     |

Q8. Recreation Programs That Are Most Important to Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness/wellness</th>
<th>Special events/festivals</th>
<th>Adult continuing education/enrichment</th>
<th>Biking/walking groups</th>
<th>Dance classes</th>
<th>Nature/environmental</th>
<th>After-school organized recreation</th>
<th>Water fitness</th>
<th>Music instruction</th>
<th>Football leagues</th>
<th>Adapted programs for people with disabilities</th>
<th>Basketball leagues</th>
<th>Historical/interpretive</th>
<th>Fishing programs</th>
<th>Outdoor adventure</th>
<th>Sports (instructional classes)</th>
<th>Softball leagues</th>
<th>Soccer leagues</th>
<th>Water safety</th>
<th>Boating lessons</th>
<th>Scuba diving/snorkeling</th>
<th>Drama classes</th>
<th>Lifeguard certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. Parks and Recreation Programs That Households Currently Participate in Most Often at City Facilities

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Most Often</th>
<th>2nd Most Often</th>
<th>3rd Most Often</th>
<th>4th Most Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special events/festivals</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/wellness</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking/walking groups</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance classes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environment</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/interpretive</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult continuing education/Enrichment</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school organized recreation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted programs for people with disabilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music instruction</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (instructional classes)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water safety</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba diving/snorkeling</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard certification</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama classes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating lessons</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q10. Ways Respondents Learn About City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department Programs and Activities

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Most Often</th>
<th>2nd Most Often</th>
<th>3rd Most Often</th>
<th>4th Most Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From friends and neighbors</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper advertisements</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Good Times” Magazine</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk Channel 48</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers distributed at school</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with Rec &amp; Parks staff</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q11. Organizations Respondent Households Have Used for Indoor and Outdoor Recreation and Sports Activities During the Past 12 Months

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- City of Norfolk Rec and Parks: 39%
- Churches/Synagogue/Mosque: 25%
- Parks and recreation facilities in other cities: 23%
- State of Virginia Parks: 23%
- School District facilities: 21%
- YMCA/YWCA: 14%
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center: 17%
- Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf): 14%
- Private youth sports leagues: 8%
- Homeowners associations/apartment complex: 7%
- JCC (Jewish Community Center): 5%
- Boys and Girls Clubs: 4%
- Other: 8%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q12a. Organizations That Respondent Household Members Ages 0 to 17 Use the Most for Recreation and Sports Activities

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices

- City of Norfolk Rec and Parks: 14%
- School District facilities: 9%
- YMCA/YWCA: 8%
- Churches/Synagogue/Mosque: 7%
- Private youth sports leagues: 5%
- Parks and recreation facilities in other cities: 4%
- State of Virginia Parks: 3%
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center: 3%
- Boys and Girls Clubs: 2%
- Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf): 2%
- JCC (Jewish Community Center): 1%
- Homeowners associations/apartment complex: 1%
- Other: 1%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q12a. Organizations That Respondent Household Members Ages 18+ Use the Most for Recreation and Sports Activities

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices

- City of Norfolk Rec and Parks: 19%
- Churches/Synagogue/Mosque: 14%
- Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center: 10%
- YMCA/YWCA: 10%
- Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf): 9%
- State of Virginia Parks: 9%
- Parks and recreation facilities in other cities: 8%
- School District facilities: 5%
- Homeowners associations/apartment complex: 3%
- JCC (Jewish Community Center): 2%
- Private youth sports leagues: 1%
- Boys and Girls Clubs: 1%
- Other: 5%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q13. Distance Willing to Travel to Visit a Neighborhood Park

by percentage of respondents

- 1/2 mile: 26%
- 1 mile: 24%
- 2 miles: 21%
- More than 2 miles: 29%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q14. Distance Willing to Travel to Visit a Community Park
by percentage of respondents

- 1/2 mile: 9%
- 1 mile: 11%
- 2 miles: 22%
- More than 2 miles: 58%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q15. If Cemetery Areas Were Made Open and Available for Walking and Bicycling, Would You Utilize Them?
by percentage of respondents

- Yes: 37%
- No: 63%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q16. Would You Be Interested in Walking Tours of City-Owned Cemeteries?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 31%

No 69%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q17. Level of Support for Various Actions the City of Norfolk Could Take to Improve the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space System

by percentage of respondents

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q18. Actions Respondents Would Be Most Willing to Fund with City Tax Dollars

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

- Develop walk/bike trails & parks along waterfront: 30%
- Fix-up park buildings & recreation facilities: 23%
- Upgrade existing neighborhood and community parks: 21%
- Develop new indoor recreation centers: 21%
- Fix-up existing playground areas: 19%
- Purchase land to develop neighborhood parks: 18%
- Purchase land for additional trails or bikeways: 16%
- Fix-up existing swimming pools: 15%
- Develop new specialized park features: 15%
- Use school facilities for City recreation programs: 14%
- Develop new trails and connect existing trails: 14%
- Upgrade existing youth/adult athletic fields: 13%
- Develop new outdoor family aquatic centers: 13%
- Develop programs/activities at existing facilities: 12%
- Develop nature trails, centers & programs: 11%
- Purchase land for athletic fields/larger rec areas: 10%
- Develop new outdoor swimming pools: 10%
- Develop new water splash pads: 8%
- Other: 6%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q19. Demographics: Number of People in Household

by percentage of respondents

- One: 17%
- Two: 28%
- Three: 20%
- Four: 21%
- Five+: 14%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
**Q20. Demographics: Age of Respondents**

by percentage of respondents

- Under 35: 29%
- 35 to 44: 13%
- 45 to 54: 23%
- 55 to 64: 19%
- 65+: 16%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

**Q21. Demographics: Gender**

by percentage of respondents

- Male: 45%
- Female: 55%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q23. Demographics: Number of Years Lived in the City of Norfolk
by percentage of respondents

- Under 1 year: 2%
- 1-5 years: 16%
- 6-10 years: 11%
- 11-19 years: 11%
- 20 or more years: 59%
- Not provided: 1%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q24. Demographics: Race/Ethnicity
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- White/Caucasian: 51%
- African American/Black: 46%
- Native American: 2%
- Hispanic/Latino: 2%
- Asian: 1%
- Other: 2%
- Not provided: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q25. Demographics: Are You a Military Family?
by percentage of respondents

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)

Q26. Demographics: Household Income
by percentage of respondents

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Q27. Demographics: Which of the Following Best Describes Your Current Residence?
by percentage of respondents

- Single family: 73%
- Apartment or condominium: 19%
- Other: 5%
- High rise building: 1%
- Not provided: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (October 2009)
Benchmarking Comparisons
National Benchmarking

Since 1998, Leisure Vision (a division of ETC Institute) has conducted household surveys for needs assessments, feasibility studies, customer satisfaction, fees and charges comparisons, and other parks and recreation issues in more than 400 communities in over 40 states across the country.

The results of these surveys has provided an unparalleled data base of information to compare responses from household residents in client communities to “National Averages” and therefore provide a unique tool to “assist organizations in better decision making.”

Communities within the data base include a full-range of municipal and county governments from 20,000 in population through over 1 million in population. They include communities in warm weather climates and cold weather climates, mature communities and some of the fastest growing cities and counties in the country.

Communities within the following states are included within the National Benchmarking data base.

- Arizona
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Florida
- Georgia
- Kansas
- Kentucky
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- Montana
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- South Dakota
- Texas
- Utah
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Washington
- Wyoming
“National Averages” have been developed for numerous strategically important parks and recreation planning and management issues including: customer satisfaction and usage of parks and programs; methods for receiving marketing information; reasons that prevent members of households from using parks and recreation facilities more often; priority recreation programs, parks, facilities and trails to improve or develop; priority programming spaces to have in planned community centers and aquatic facilities; potential attendance for planned indoor community centers and outdoor aquatic centers; etc.

Results from household responses for the City of Norfolk were compared to National Benchmarks to gain further strategic information. A summary of all tabular comparisons are shown on pages 3-7.

Note: The benchmarking data contained in this report is protected intellectual property. Any reproduction of the benchmarking information in this report by persons or organizations not directly affiliated with the City of Norfolk is not authorized without written consent from Leisure Vision/ETC Institute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you or members of your household visited any City/County/Park District parks over the past year?</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the quality of all the parks you've visited?</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you or members of your household participated in City/County/Park District recreation programs during the past year?</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the quality of all the recreation programs you've participated in?</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ways respondents learn about recreation programs and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From friends and neighbors</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper advertisements</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Good Times” Magazine</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk Channel 48</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers distributed at school</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with Rec &amp; Parks staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizations used for parks and recreation programs and facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk Rec and Parks</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches/Synagogue/Mosque</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation facilities in other cities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Virginia Parks</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District facilities</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA/YWCA</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Fitness &amp; Wellness Center</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private youth sports leagues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners associations/apartment complex</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC (Jewish Community Center)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls Clubs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons preventing the use of parks and recreation facilities and programs more often</td>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know what is being offered</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program times are not convenient</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security is insufficient</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired program or facility not offered</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know locations of facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are not well maintained</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees are too high</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far from our residence</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use services of other non City owned agencies</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities lack the right equipment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of quality programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor customer service by staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use facilities in other cities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility operating hours not convenient</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking by facilities and parks</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration for programs is difficult</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class full</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not accessible for people with disabilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation facilities that respondent households have a need for</td>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/green space</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers with bait, tackle concessions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football and rugby fields</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important parks and recreation facilities (sum of top choices)</td>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/green space</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing piers with bait, tackle concessions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football and rugby fields</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance-Unmet Needs Matrix
The Importance-Unmet Needs Matrix is a tool for assessing the priority that should be placed on parks and recreation facilities and recreation programs in the City of Norfolk. Each of the facilities and programs that were assessed on the survey were placed in one of the following four quadrants:

- **Top Priorities** (higher unmet need and higher importance). Items in this quadrant should be given the highest priority for improvement. Respondents placed a high level of importance on these items, and the unmet need rating is high. Improvements to items in this quadrant will have positive benefits for the highest number of City of Norfolk residents.

- **Opportunities for Improvement** (higher unmet need and lower importance). Respondents placed a lower level of importance on these items, but the unmet need rating is relatively high. Items in this quadrant should be given secondary priority for improvement.

- **Special Needs** (lower unmet need and higher importance). This quadrant shows where improvements may be needed to serve the needs of specialized populations. Respondents placed a high level of importance on these items, but the unmet need rating is relatively low.

- **Less Important** (lower unmet need and lower importance). Items in this quadrant should receive the lowest priority for improvement. Respondents placed a lower level of importance on these items, and the unmet need rating is relatively low.
Importance-Unmet Need Assessment Matrix for City of Norfolk Parks and Recreation Facilities

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and unmet need ratings given by respondents to the survey)

**Top Priorities**
- Walking and hiking trails
- Fitness and exercise facilities
- Walking & running tracks (indoor)
- Neighborhood parks
- Open/green space
- Indoor pools/aquatic facilities
- Playground equipment

**Less Important**
- Baseball fields
- Soccer fields
- Golf courses/driving ranges
- Fishing piers
- Community gardens
- Beaches

**Opportunities for Improvement**
- Lower importance/high unmet need
  - Community centers (large regionalized)
  - Outdoor swimming pools
  - Fishing piers/wall, tackle concessions
  - Volleyball courts
- Nature/environmental centers
- Large community/regional parks
- Picnic areas/shelters
- Tennis courts
- Basketball courts
- Boat ramps/kayak & canoe launches

**Special Needs**
- Higher importance/low unmet need
  - Community centers (small neighborhood)

**Importance Ratings**
- Lower Importance
- Higher Importance

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (November 2009)
Importance-Unmet Need Assessment Matrix for City of Norfolk Recreation Programs
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and unmet need ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (November 2009)
Survey Instrument
Dear City of Norfolk Resident:

Your response to the enclosed survey is important.
The City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space is conducting a Community Interest Survey to establish priorities for the future improvement of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the City of Norfolk. Your household was one of a limited number selected at random to receive this survey. Therefore, it is very important that you participate.

We value your time.
This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete, and each question is important. The time you invest in completing this survey will aid the City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space in taking a resident-driven approach to making decisions that will enrich the future of our community and positively affect the lives of residents.

Please complete and return your survey within the next two weeks.
We have selected Leisure Vision/ETC Institute, an independent consulting company, as our partner to administer this survey. They will compile the data received and present the results to the City. Your responses will remain confidential. Return your completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid, addressed envelope.

To thank you for your time, 50 respondents will be selected at random to receive a prize of tickets to an attraction or event in our city. Prizes were generously donated by Chrysler Museum of Art, Fest Events, Norfolk Botanical Garden, Norfolk Convention & Visitors Bureau, Nauticus The National Maritime Center, Seven Venues, Virginia Opera, Virginia Stage Company, Virginia Symphony and Virginia Zoo. Be sure to include your mailing address to be eligible to receive your prize.

If you have any questions, contact Chad Morris of the Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space at 757-441-2400 ext 228.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your time is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Darrell R. Crittendon
Director – Recreation, Parks & Open Space
Community Interest and Opinion Survey: Let your voice be heard today!

The City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department would like your input to help determine priorities for parks, greenways, open space and recreation for our community. This survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. We greatly appreciate your time.

1. Counting yourself, how many people in your household are?
   Under age 5 ____  Ages 15-19 ____  Ages 35-44 ____  Ages 65-74 ____
   Ages 5-9 ____  Ages 20-24 ____  Ages 45-54 ____  Ages 75+ ____
   Ages 10-14 ____  Ages 25-34 ____  Ages 55-64 ____

2. Have you or members of your household visited any City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers during the past year?
   ____(1) Yes [Please answer Question #2a & #2b.]
   ____(2) No [Please go to Question #3.]

2a. Which three parks or recreation centers in the City of Norfolk do you visit most often?
   Most Often: ______________________________________
   2nd Most Often: _____________________________
   3rd Most Often: _____________________________

2b. Based on your knowledge and experience, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL City of Norfolk parks or recreation centers you have visited?
   ____(1) Excellent  ____(2) Good  ____(3) Fair  ____(4) Poor

3. Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department during the past 12 months?
   ____(1) Yes [Please answer Questions #3a.]
   ____(2) No [Please go to Question #4.]

3a. How would you rate the overall quality of programs in which you and members of your household have participated?
   ____(1) Excellent  ____(2) Good  ____ (3) Fair  ____ (4) Poor

4. Please CHECK ALL the reasons that prevent you or other members of your household from using parks, recreation and sports facilities or programs of the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department more often.
   ____(01) Facilities are not well maintained  ____(11) Poor customer service by staff
   ____(02) Desired program or facility not offered  ____(12) I do not know locations of facilities
   ____(03) Facilities lack the right equipment  ____ (13) Use services of other non City owned agencies
   ____ (04) Security is insufficient  ____ (14) Not accessible for people with disabilities
   ____ (05) Lack of quality programs  ____ (15) I do not know what is being offered
   ____ (06) Too far from our residence  ____ (16) Facility operating hours not convenient
   ____ (07) Class full  ____ (17) Registration for programs is difficult
   ____ (08) Program times are not convenient  ____ (18) Lack of parking by facilities and parks
   ____ (09) Use facilities in other cities  ____ (19) Other: _____________________________
   ____ (10) Fees are too high
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5. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has a need for each of the parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the park/facility.

If YES, please rate ALL the following parks and recreation FACILITIES of this type in Norfolk on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Facility?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>100% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Beaches</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Indoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Outdoor pools/aquatics facilities</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Boat ramps/kayak &amp; canoe launches</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Fishing piers</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fishing piers with bait, tackle concessions</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Community gardens</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Open/green space</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Nature/environmental centers</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Neighborhood parks (1-10 acres)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Large community/regional parks (10+ acres)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Playground equipment</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Community centers (small neighborhood)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Community centers (large regionalized)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Walking and running tracks (indoor)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Soccer fields</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Baseball fields</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Football and rugby fields</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Volleyball courts</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Basketball courts</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Tennis courts</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Golf courses/driving ranges</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other: ________________________________________</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Which FOUR of the facilities from the list in Question #5 are most important to your household? [Using the letters or numbers in the left hand column of Question #5 above, please write in the letters or numbers below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st ________ 2nd ________ 3rd ________ 4th ________  NONE
7. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has a need for each of the recreation programs listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the recreation program.

If YES, please rate the following recreation PROGRAMS on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Program?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Adapted programs for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adult continuing education/enrichment</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. After-school organized recreation</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Boating lessons</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fishing programs</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lifeguard certification</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Scuba diving/snorkeling</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Swimming lessons</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Water fitness</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Water safety</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Biking/walking groups</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Fitness/wellness</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Historical/interpretive</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Nature/environmental</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Outdoor adventure</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Dance classes</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Drama classes</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Music instruction</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Special events/festivals</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sports (instructional classes)</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Baseball leagues</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Basketball leagues</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Football leagues</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Softball leagues</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Soccer leagues</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>100% Met 75% Met 50% Met 25% Met 0% Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Which FOUR of the programs from the list in Question #7 are most important to your household? [Using the letters in Question #7 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st ___________ 2nd ___________ 3rd ___________ 4th ___________ NONE

9. Which FOUR of the programs from the list in Question #7 do you currently participate in MOST OFTEN at City of Norfolk Recreation and Parks facilities? [Using the letters in Question #7 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st ___________ 2nd ___________ 3rd ___________ 4th ___________ NONE
10. Please check ALL the ways you learn about Norfolk Recreation and Parks Department programs and activities.

____(01) “Good Times” Magazine  ____ (07) From friends and neighbors
____(02) Web site  ____ (08) Flyers distributed at school
____(03) Newspaper articles  ____ (09) Conversations with Rec & Parks staff
____(04) Radio  ____ (10) Newspaper advertisements
____(05) City of Norfolk Channel 48  ____ (11) Other: ___________________________
____(06) Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities

11. From the following list, please check ALL the organizations that you or members of your household have used for indoor and outdoor recreation and sports activities during the last 12 months.

____(01) School District facilities  ____ (08) Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf)
____(02) Churches/Synagogue/Mosque  ____ (09) State of Virginia Parks
____(03) Private youth sports leagues  ____ (10) Parks and recreation facilities in other cities
____(04) City of Norfolk Rec and Parks  ____ (11) Homeowners associations/apartment complex
____(05) YMCA/YWCA  ____ (12) Boys and Girls Clubs
____(06) Norfolk Fitness & Wellness Center  ____ (13) Other: ___________________________
____(07) JCC (Jewish Community Center)  ____ (14) None. Do not use any organizations.

12. For each of the age groups shown below, please indicate which TWO organizations listed in Question #11 you and your household USE THE MOST for sports and recreation programs and services. [Use the number by each organization in Question #11. If there is no-one in your household ages 0 to 17, write the word NONE in the space provided below for ages 0 to 17.]

Agency Use Most  Agency Use 2nd Most

Ages 0 to 17 years  
Ages 18 years and older

13. In the City of Norfolk, a Neighborhood Park is a smaller park which may have a play area, a picnic area, and a small outdoor open area. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?

_____ (1) 1/2 mile  _____ (2) 1 mile  _____ (3) 2 miles  _____ (4) More than 2 miles

14. In the City of Norfolk, a Community Park is a larger park which may have a larger outdoor open area, play areas, athletic fields/game courts, a community building/gym, a childcare center or senior center. How far would you travel to visit a park like this?

_____ (1) 1/2 mile  _____ (2) 1 mile  _____ (3) 2 miles  _____ (4) More than 2 miles

15. If cemetery areas were made open and available for walking and bicycling, would you utilize them?

_____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No

16. Would you be interested in walking tours of city-owned cemeteries?

_____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No
17. Following are actions that the City of Norfolk Recreation, Parks and Open Space Department could take to improve the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space system. Please indicate whether you would be very supportive, somewhat supportive, or not supportive of each action by circling the number next to the action.

**How supportive are you of having Norfolk:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Purchase land to develop neighborhood parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Purchase land for additional athletic fields &amp; larger recreational areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Purchase land for additional trails or bikeways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Upgrade existing youth/adult athletic fields</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Upgrade existing neighborhood and community parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Fix-up/repair existing park buildings/recreation facilities and centers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Fix-up/repair existing swimming pools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Fix-up/repair existing playground areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Develop walking &amp; biking trails and parks along the waterfront</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Develop new trails and connect existing trails</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) Develop new indoor recreation centers with gymnasiums, fitness facilities, indoor walking/running tracks, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Develop new outdoor family aquatic centers with slides, sprays, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Develop new water splash pads (i.e. Shoop Park)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Utilize school facilities for City recreation programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Develop new nature trails, nature centers, and nature programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Develop new outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q) Develop new specialized park features (e.g. skate parks, off-leash dog parks, board game areas, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Develop new programs/activities at existing facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Other: __________________________________________________________</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Which FOUR of the actions from the list in Question #17 would you be most willing to fund with your City dollars? [Using the letters in the left hand column of Question #17 above, please write in the letters below for your 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1\textsuperscript{st} ___________________ 2\textsuperscript{nd} ___________________ 3\textsuperscript{rd} ___________________ 4\textsuperscript{th} ___________________ NONE

19. How many people live in your household? ______

20. What is your age? ______

21. Your gender:

   _____ (1) Male
   _____ (2) Female

22. What is the zip code of where you live? ___________
23. How long have you lived in the City of Norfolk?
   ____ (1) Under 1 year   ____ (4) 11-19 years
   ____ (2) 1-5 years     ____ (5) 20 years or more
   ____ (3) 6-10 years

24. Check ALL of the following that describes your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply.)
   ____ (1) African American/Black   ____ (5) White/Caucasian
   ____ (2) Asian   ____ (6) Native American
   ____ (3) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander   ____ (7) Other: ____________________
   ____ (4) Hispanic/Latino

25. Are you a military family?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No

26. What is your household income?
   ____ (1) Under $25,000   ____ (5) $100,000-$149,999
   ____ (2) $25,000-$49,999   ____ (6) $150,000-$199,999
   ____ (3) $50,000-$74,999   ____ (7) $200,000 or more
   ____ (4) $75,000-$99,999

27. Which of the following BEST describes your current residence?
   ____ (1) Single Family   ____ (3) High rise building (4 stories or more)
   ____ (2) Apartment or condominiums   ____ (4) Other: ____________________

To thank you for your time, we will select 50 respondents at random to receive a prize of tickets to an attraction or event in our city. Please provide the following information to be eligible to receive a prize:

Name: _______________________________ Phone: ____________________________

Street Address: ________________________________

City: _______________________________ Zip: _______________________________

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your time.

Please return your completed survey in the enclosed return-reply envelope addressed to:
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your response will remain Completely Confidential
The address information on the sticker to the right will
ONLY be used to help identify needs based on geographic locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Master List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festival Parks (2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Beach Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrata Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Hall Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrallon Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic Parks (37)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Street Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th Street Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Street Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Acres Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Little League Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluestone Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Street Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diggs Town Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergis Reid Tennis Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Court Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage Museum Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Robertson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboom Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Residence Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Ave Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello Village Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey Bottom Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Rd Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Foxhall Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard Street Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Lake Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Anne Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Avenue Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redgate Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservor Avenue Mini Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverpoint Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland Park Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopp Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main Street Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westover Memorial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Passive Parks (27)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechwood Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Creek Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Avenue Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Huett Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glineagle Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Mococ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Fountian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Memorial Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney Road Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Constance Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockley Garden-South Blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Bridge Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Fever Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Sites with Active Park Amenities (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Garden Middle School 7721 Azalea Garden Rd 18 y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballentine School 2415 Ballantine Ave 10 y - y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley Campostella Early Childhood Ctr. 1530 Cypress Ave 4 y - y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blair Middle School 730 Spotwood Ave 4 y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker T. Washington High School 23 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bowling Park Elementary School 2561 E. Princess Anne Rd 10 - y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Allen Elementary School 501 C Street ? y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campostella Elementary School 1106 Campostella Rd 16 - y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman Place Elementary School 2445 Palmyra St 9 y - y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado School 1025 Widgeon Rd 2 - y - y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreamkeepers Academy 2600 E. Princess Anne Rd 4 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton Pre-School 6045 Curlew Dr 9 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghent Elementary School 200 Shirley Ave 12 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby Elementary School 7101 Newport Ave 2 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby High School 18 y y - y y - y y - y y - y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacox Elementary School 1300 Marshall Ave 9 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Early Childhood Center 446 Virginia Ave 2 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Wasena Middle School 1701 Alcace Ave 6 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Taylor Middle &amp; High School 1380 Kempsville Rd 105 y y y y y y y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larrymore Elementary School 7600 Halprin Dr 15 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindenwood Elementary School 2700 Ludlow St 7 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Creek Elementary &amp; Primary School 7900 Tarpon Pl 14 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Career Center 1091 W. 37th St 2 - y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury High School 300 Shirley Ave y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowbrook Elementary School 7620 Shirland Ave 4 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Elementary School 900 Ashbury Ave 15 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norview Middle School 6325 Sewells Point Rd 15 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norview High School 6501 Chesapeake Blvd 27 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanair Elementary School 600 Dudley Ave 18 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Elementary School 9501 Mason Creek Rd 25 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Hall Elementary School 5523 Pebble Lane 2 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Middle School 1330 Branch Rd 22 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffner Middle School 610 May Ave 8 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewells Point Elementary School 7508 Hampton Blvd 7 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Park Elementary School 310 Thole St 9 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners Creek Elementary School 1335 Longdale Dr 7 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Taylor Elementary School 1122 W. Princess Anne Rd 4 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Park Elementary School 1045 E. Brambleton Ave 7 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker School 2300 Berkeley Avenue Ext 10 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard Model School 1511 Willow Wood Dr 14 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby Elementary School 9500 Fourth View St 7 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.B. Young, Sr. Elementary School 543 E. Olney Rd 6 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campostella Center 1130 Leake St 5 y y y y y y - y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain's Quarters 800 Little Bay Ave 3 y y y y y y - y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ocean View Community Center 9520 E. 20th Bay St 12 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntersville Community Center 830 Golf St 13 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Fitness and Wellness Center 7300 Newport Ave 15 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Community Center 600 E. Ocean View Ave 12 y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Town Visual Arts Center 7545 Diven St 7 y y y y y y - y y y y y y - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; City Shared Sites with Active Park Amenities (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Elementary &amp; Bayview Recreation Center 1434 E Bayview Blvd y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Elementary &amp; Chesterfield Pool 2915 Westminster Ave y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads Elementary &amp; Crossroads Recreation Center 7920 Tidewater Dr y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairlawn Elementary &amp; Fairlawn Recreation Center 1132 Wade St y y y y y y - y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleside Elementary &amp; Ingleside Recreation Center 976 Ingleside Road y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Monroe Elementary School &amp; Park Place Community Center - y y y y y y - y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larchmont Elementary &amp; Larchmont Recreation Center 1167 Bolling Ave y y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northington Middle School, Mary Calcott ES &amp; Norfolk Therapeutic Recreation Center 180 E. Evans St y y y y y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norview Elementary &amp; Norview Community Center 6401 Chesapeake Blvd y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Elementary School &amp; Berkley Community Center 903 S. Main St y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Forest Elementary School &amp; Sherwood Forest Community Center 3035 Sherwood Forest Lane y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrallton Elementary School &amp; Tarrallton Community Center 208 Tarrallton Dr y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center (included with Tarrallton Park) y y y y y y y y y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Wright Golf Course 6286 Northampton Blvd 173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lamberts Point Golf Course 4321 Powhatan Ave 56
Ocean View Golf Course 9548 Norfolk Ave 108
Norfolk Botanical Garden 6700 Azalea Garden Road 175
Virginia Zoological Park 3500 Granby St 60

**Medians Used as Open Space (7)**

Botetourt Gardens-South Blocks 600-800 Block 2.75
Botetourt Gardens-North Blocks 1200-1300 Block 2.1
Graydon Ave 500-700 Block 1.25
Graydon Place 1400 Block 7 -  -  -  -  -
Poplar Halls 5400-5600 Block 2.45
Stockley Garden-North Blocks 1200-1400 Block 1.7 (0.6 is for a dogpark in the middle median)
Virginia Park 5801 Upper Brandon Place 0.4

**Dog Parks (9/12 listed-3 listed as passive)**

Berkley Dog Park 400 Blk. Culpepper St incl. above
Brambleton Dog Park 1306 Corprow Ave across street for 3.75
Cambridge Crescent Dog Park 6125 Carroll Place also listed as passive incl. above
Colonial Greenway Dog Park 405 Delaware Ave 5 -  -  -  -  -
Dune Street Dog Park 400 Blk. Dune St 1
Gleneagle Dog Park 1201 Daniel Ave also listed as passive incl. above
Hague Dog Park 700 Brambleton Ave also listed as passive incl. above
Maple Avenue Dog Park 176 Maple Avenue 1.25
Stockley Garden Dog Park 1300 Blk Stockley Gardens incl. above
Winona Dog Park 3400 Norway Place 1.7
Lafayette Dog Park 1270 Lafayette Blvd 0.3
Tall Terrace Dog Park 2717 Tall Terrace 0.4

**Cemeteries**

Calvary Cemetery 1600 St. Julian Ave 63
Cedar Grove Cemetery 239 E. Princess Anne Rd 13
Elmwood Cemetery 238 E. Princess Anne Rd 43
Forest Lawn Cemetery 8100 Granby St 210
Hebrew Cemetery 1200 Tidewater Drive 2.6
Magnolia Cemetery 500 Lancaster St 7
Riverside Cemetery 1000 Indian River Road 36.5
West Point Cemetery 238 E. Princess Anne Rd 6.5

**Known Future/Potential Sites**

Campstella Landfill 60 -  -  -  -  -
3rd-8th Bay Property 22
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Executive Summary

On June 18th and 19th, 2009, Moffatt & Nichol (M&N) performed boat ramp assessments of the five boating facilities identified below.

- Willoughby Boat Ramp
- Haven Creek Boat Ramp
- 45th Street Boat Ramp
- Harbor Park Boat Ramp
- Lafayette City Park Boat Ramp

These services were provided to contribute to the City of Norfolk Recreation Master Plan being prepared by Glatting, Jackson, Kecher, and Anglin, Inc. for the City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space. A general site assessment was performed to establish the overall condition of each facility and identify repairs or improvements necessary to maintain or improve the functionality of the facility. Recommendations and an opinion of probable costs were developed for each site. The recommendations provided are based on the assumption that each facility will remain a boat launching location. The assessments and recommendations may be used by the City of Norfolk for budgeting future facility repairs and upgrades, but are not suitable for preparation of detailed repair plans and should not be considered detailed construction estimates.

In order to evaluate the condition of the boat ramps, M&N conducted a site visit at each location. During this visit, the condition of the existing boat ramp was assessed and major deficiencies noted. Observations of the adjacent shoreline condition, water depth, and shoreline protection and configuration were recorded. A cursory inspection of the remaining boat launching facilities including number of trash cans, restrooms, and site lighting was also completed to determine if any additional site improvements are needed. General photographs and condition photographs were taken during the site visit and are included in the body of the report for each facility. The following table summarizes items that were inventoried or evaluated during the site visits. The table includes features that are in our opinion necessary for a fully functional boat launch facility.
Findings:

Overall, the Willoughby and Haven Creek Boat Ramps were found to be in good general condition with launching facilities that provide ample parking, queuing space and sufficient water depth for boating activities. The Harbor Park Boat Ramp facility has sufficient water depth for boating activity and the kayak launch was noted in good condition. However, the boat ramp at this facility is excessively steep and requires reconstruction for the facility to be fully functional.

The 45th Street Boat Ramp appears to be in fair condition with sufficient water depth for boating activities but lacks adequate amenities such as parking. The Lafayette Park boat ramp was found to be in fair condition but overall the facility is rated poor due to the insufficient water depth for larger boats and the lack of amenities including parking.

Recommendations:

Based on the condition assessment, M&N’s recommendations for repairs and improvements to each facility along with an associated opinion of probable costs are provided below. A breakdown of each opinion of probable cost is included in the main body of the report.
Willoughby Boat Ramp

Based on our assessment, only minor repairs are recommended for this facility. The boating facility is currently fully functional; however, the surrounding shoreline is eroding resulting in damage to the parking lot pavement. We recommend that additional riprap be placed along the southeast side of the facility and the damaged asphalt pavement be repaired. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $14,000.

Haven Creek Boat Ramp

Our assessment found this facility is currently fully functional and no repairs to the facility are needed at this time.

45th Street Boat Ramp

Based on our assessment, the boating facility is operational; however, several items can be completed to make this a better functioning ramp given the existing conditions of the facility. It is recommended that a new concrete ramp with an adjacent fixed timber pier be installed in place of the existing asphalt ramp that is eroding. In addition to the ramp and pier, shore stabilization is recommended on both sides of the ramp. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $231,000. Even with these recommendations, this facility will be functionally limited until adequate parking can be provided through land acquisition or a remote parking location established in the vicinity of the ramp.

Harbor Park Boat Ramp

Based on our assessment, the boating facility is operational; however, several items can be completed to make this a better functioning ramp given the existing conditions of the facility. It is recommended that a portion of the ramp be removed and a new section constructed to flatten the ramp slope for improved boat launching and retrieval. In addition, shoreline stabilization and a fixed pier for mooring are also recommended. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $320,000.

Lafayette Park Boat Ramp

Based on our assessment, the boating facility is not functional for larger motorized boats. To accommodate deeper draft vessels, an area from the ramp to the channel must be dredged and the concrete boat ramp reconstructed. We also recommend that a fixed timber pier be constructed adjacent to the ramp and the existing pier be demolished. Along with the ramp work, M&N recommends, at a minimum, the area around the perimeter of the facility be paved to provide parking for vehicles and trailer. Our estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $430,000. Even with these recommendations, this limited parking is available at this facility.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared under the direction of Glatting, Jackson, Kercher, and Anglin, Inc. in accordance with Moffatt & Nichol proposal dated September 27, 2008. The services provided under this task order are part of a planning effort for The City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space.

This report presents the observations and repair recommendations with associated opinion of probable costs for site assessments performed at five boating facilities throughout the Norfolk area. The purpose of these assessments was to determine the overall condition of the boat ramps and surrounding facilities.

This report is based on the following Scope of Services:

- Determining the condition of the existing boat ramp and noting any major deficiencies;
- Recording observations of the adjacent shoreline, shoreline protection and configurations;
- Measuring water depth around the boat ramp to determine if dredging of channel will be required;
- Completing a cursory inspection of the remaining boat launching facilities to determine if any additional items need to be noted and addressed such as lack of parking facilities and access to the ramps;
- Provide repair recommendations and an opinion of probable costs for each facility to make each of them a functional boating facility; and
- Providing general photographs and sufficient condition photographs taken during the site visit.

A site visit was conducted by Moffatt & Nichol on June 18th and 19th, 2009.

Exhibit 1 on the following page identifies the locations of the five boat ramps in the City of Norfolk. Photos documenting overall conditions and specific deficiencies at each location are included in the body of this report following the facility narrative.
An assessment of each facility is included below. This assessment provides a general description of what is provided at each boating area in addition to its current condition. A general layout of each facility is also included in the evaluation section which indicates where the ramps and kayak launching areas are in addition to water depth and the location and type of shoreline present at the facility. The water depth presented in the figures below and referenced in the drawings is based on soundings taken with a sounding rod during the inspection. These measurements were then interpolated to represent the current condition at the site based on tidal conversions from the Sewells Point Tide Gauge. In addition to the evaluation, repair recommendations for each facility and associated opinion of probable cost are also included in each section. A breakdown of each opinion of probable cost is also provided herein.
2.0 BOAT RAMP EVALUATIONS

2.1 Willoughby Boat Ramp

2.1.1 Structural Description

The boat launching area consists of two boat ramps located on the east end of the facility. The northern boat ramp is constructed of a concrete slab with a 14% slope and is approximately 24 feet wide and 65 feet long. The ramp is stationed between two timber fixed finger piers which extend outward approximately 60 feet into the water. Both piers have four cleats providing temporary mooring for boaters. In addition to the mooring hardware, the northern finger pier has a ladder at the end which allows boaters/jet skiers to ingress/egress from the water. (See Photos 1 and 2)

The southern boat ramp is also constructed of a concrete slab sloping into the water at a 13% grade. The ramp is 60 feet in length and is 30 feet in width. It is located between two larger timber fixed piers supported by piles. The pier north of the ramp is shorter at 74 feet, with 4 cleats, and has a ladder at the end. The longer pier, south of the ramp, extends out approximately 91 feet, and with 5 cleats. This pier also has a vinyl sheet pile wall adjacent to the piles of the structure which acts as a wave attenuator to dissipate wave action from the bay. (See Photos 3 and 4)

Between the two ramps, a narrow concrete walkway slopes down into the beach and terminates well above the water line. Both ramps and their associated piers appear to be in good condition showing minimal wear.

2.1.2 Shoreline Description

Directly adjacent to the ramps and piers, the asphalt parking lot is lined with riprap down to the shoreline. In addition to the riprap at the east end, a timber bulkhead extends around the perimeter of the facility. (See Photo 5) A timber groin is also located at the southeast end of the complex and extends out into the bay to dissipate wave action and sediment migration. (See Photo 6) Typically, the surrounding shoreline and bulkheads showed light weathering with some sections of the bulkhead’s planking being loose around the timber cap. Riprap was intact with very little erosion noted; however, the inspection identified isolated areas where the shoreline had sloughed from erosion and had resulted in the asphalt being damaged around the perimeter of the parking lot. A typical view of the damaged pavement can be seen in Photo 7.

2.1.3 Water Depth Observations

The average water depth at the toe of the northern and southern boat ramps were noted at -2.13’ feet MLLW and -3.93 feet MLLW respectfully. During the inspection no shoaling was noted around the launching facility. The field inspection soundings identified during the assessment
can be seen in the attached exhibit and are also provided in MLLW. The water depth should be sufficient for recreational boating activities.

2.1.4 Other Noted Observations

The site is easily accessible around the perimeter with 28 parking spaces for vehicles with boat trailers, 27 Personal Occupancy Vehicle (POV) parking spaces, and 3 handicap spaces. In addition to these spaces around the perimeter of the facility, ample parking space in the center of the lot can be used. Several street lights border the parking lot and adjacent to the launching area and provide sufficient lighting for recreational activities. The site has trash receptacles and one portable restroom but lacks sitting areas, wash areas, or a potable water supply. In addition to the portable restroom, an existing restroom facility is located on site; however this facility is severely deteriorated and has been closed. Adequate signage identifies the site, issues parking restrictions, and addresses safety. (See Photos 8 thru 10)

2.1.5 Overall Condition Assessment

The Willoughby Boat Ramp is in good overall condition. The conditions and amenities of this site are summarized in Table 1 below. A general layout of the facility can also be seen in Figure 1 below.
Table 1 – General Site Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willoughby Boat Ramp</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ramps</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Boat Ramp</td>
<td>24' &amp; 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Boat Ramp</td>
<td>65' &amp; 60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Ramp</td>
<td>14% &amp; 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayak Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Launches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Platform</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Platform</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Shoreline</td>
<td>riprap &amp; timber bulkhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Depth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Water @ MLLW</td>
<td>-2.13' &amp; -3.93'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Trailer Parking</td>
<td>28 + Open Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Parking</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Lighting</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Recepticals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Down Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooring Hardware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Piers/Accessways</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingress/Egress Ladders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.6 Recommendation and Opinion of Probable Costs

Based on the inspection, only minor repairs are recommended for this facility. The boating facility is currently fully functional; however, the surrounding shoreline is eroding resulting in pavement damage. It is recommended that an additional riprap be placed along the southeast side of the facility and the damaged asphalt be repaired. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $14,000 and a breakdown is provided below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY AND LOCATION</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT NO.</th>
<th>IDENTIFICATION NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk - Department of Recreation, Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT TITLE**

Boat Ramp Evaluation

**WILLoughby Boat Ramp**

**STATUS OF DESIGN**

Conceptual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition &amp; Excavation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawcut</td>
<td>44 LF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Asphalt</td>
<td>2 CY</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>15 CY</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap</td>
<td>45 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedding Stone (VDOT #2 Size)</td>
<td>8 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotextile Fabric</td>
<td>22 SY</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>$56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>10 TONS</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>$1,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,198.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead and Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$839.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal with Mark-ups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,038.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,011.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,049.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAY $14,000.00
2.1.7 General Photographs and Condition Photographs

Photo 1: View of northern boat ramp looking east.

Photo 2: View of northern boat ramp looking west from northern finger pier.
Photo 3: View of southern boat ramp looking east.

Photo 4: View of southern boat ramp looking west from pile supported pier.
Photo 5: Timber bulkhead northeast of the boat ramps.

Photo 6: Timber groin south of boat ramps.
Photo 7: Asphalt parking lot is washed out above riprap.

Photo 8: Parking lot west of boat ramps.
Photo 9: Portable restroom and closed facility located north of boat ramps.

Photo 10: Entry sign for Willoughby Boat Ramp.
FIGURE 1 – WILLOUGHBY BOAT RAMP
2.2 Haven Creek Boat Ramp

2.2.1 Structural Description

The Haven Creek boat ramp is constructed of precast concrete panels on a 9% slope and is approximately 26 feet wide and 107 feet long. The ramp is constructed between two timber fixed piers supported by timber piles. The piers are approximately 114 feet long and have timber ladders on the boat ramp side for ingress/egress and cleats for temporary mooring. A timber boardwalk approximately 310 feet long runs between the road and the western pier with a railing on each side.

Adjacent to the eastern pier, a concrete bulkhead supports a metal gangway sloping down to a dock. The floating dock is 12 feet wide by 40 feet long, with cleats on the east and west side of the dock, and with four timber piles keeping it in place. The dock appears to be used to launch non-motorized equipment such as kayaks, canoes and small john boats along with allowing boaters to temporarily tie off and load/unload boats. The boat ramp, adjacent pier, and wooden float all appear to be in good condition and displayed minimal wear. A general view of the boat ramp and fix piers can be seen in Photo 11 thru 18 below.

2.2.2 Shoreline Description

The shoreline around the boat ramp and floating dock consists of a sheet pile wall on the west side, a timber bulkhead on the east side, and a steel sheet pile wall with concrete cap between the boat ramp and timber bulkhead. The sheet pile wall is held in place by the inboard plumb piles of the timber boardwalk in addition to 12” diameter battered piles. This wall and associated piles appeared to be in good condition. The timber bulkhead shows moderate weathering but appears structurally sound. Hand railing has been installed on the concrete cap of the steel sheet pile bulkhead to restrict access to water from this location. The hand railing and steel sheet pile bulkhead and cap appear to be in good condition with no notable deficiencies and can be seen in Photo 18.

2.2.3 Water Depth Observations

The observed water depth at the toe of the ramp was noted as -4.19 feet MLLW. During the inspection, soundings were taken around the boat ramp and floating dock extending out passed the inlet. The field inspection soundings identified during the assessment can be seen in the attached Figures and are also provided in MLLW. The water depth should be sufficient for recreational boating activities.

2.2.4 Other Noted Observations

The site has a fair amount of accessibility with 14 parking spaces for trucks and trailers, 12 POV parking spaces, and one handicap spot. However, the truck/trailer parking is narrow and not long
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enough to support vessels over 24 feet long. The current queuing layout observed during assessment is adequate; however during high periods of activity the facility will be limited to queuing space due to the traffic flow constriction from the existing land space. The site had no lighting and minimal signage. There were two trash receptacles, one on each side of the parking lot and no restrooms facilities, sitting areas, or wash areas.

2.2.5 Overall Condition Assessment

The Haven Creek Boat Ramp is in good overall condition. The conditions and amenities of this site are summarized in Table 2 below. A general layout of the facility including water depth can be seen in Figures 2 & 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 – General Site Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haven Creek</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kayak Launch Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Depth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Water @ MLLW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Trailer Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Recepticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Down Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooring Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Piers/Accessways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingress/Egress Ladders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.6 Recommendation and Opinion of Probable Costs

Based on the inspection, the boating facility is currently fully functional and there are no repair recommendations for this facility.
2.2.7 General Photographs and Condition Photographs

Photo 11: Approaching boat ramp from water. Kayak launch to left, boat ramp center, boardwalk to right.

Photo 12: General condition of facilities. Kayak launch to left, boat ramp to right, parking in background.
Photo 13: Concrete boat ramp looking east.

Photo 14: Facing west from eastern pier. Adjacent roadway and building in background.
Photo 15: Looking east from boardwalk.

Photo 16: View of eastern pier from concrete bulkhead.
Photo 17: Facing north from gangway down to kayak launch.

Photo 18: Concrete bulkhead adjacent to kayak launch. Weathered timber bulkhead with vegetation.
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FIGURE 2 – HAVEN CREEK BOAT RAMP
FIGURE 3 — HAVEN CREEK BOAT RAMP
2.3 45th Street Boat Ramp

2.3.1 Structural Description

The 45th Street Boat Ramp consisted of an asphalt roadway 35 feet wide and 60 feet long sloping into the water at a 10% grade. The inspection noted that the ramp had deteriorated at the tidal zone and the existing asphalt had broken down resulting in a gravel base at the toe of the ramp. In addition to the noted deterioration, several cracks were noted in the roadway and can be seen in Photo19 and 20.

2.3.2 Shoreline Description

The shoreline adjacent to the ramp consisted of asphalt and riprap on the north side of the ramp and vegetation/wetlands on the south side of the ramp. (Photo 21) The shoreline only extends approximately 10 to 15 feet from the ramp and then transitions into private timber bulkheads.

2.3.3 Water Depth Observations

The observed water depth at the toe of the ramp was noted as -1.2 feet MLLW. During the inspection, soundings were taken around the boat ramp extending out to the channel marker of the creek. The field inspection soundings identified during the assessment can be seen in the attached exhibit and are also provided in MLLW. The water depth should be sufficient for recreational boating activities.

2.3.4 Other Noted Observations

Due to the limited amount of land around the boat ramp facility, the site has no parking, lighting, sitting areas, restrooms, or wash areas. Minimal signage was noted along with one trash receptacle. The property to the north appears to be operated by a private marina which contains approximately 20 boat slips and the property to the south contains approximately 10 boat slips. During the inspection, no boats were utilizing the ramp; however, it could be assumed that these properties use this ramp to remove boats from the water for dry storage and other miscellaneous purposes.

2.3.5 Overall Condition Assessment

The 45th Street Boat Ramp structurally is in fair condition. Even though the facility has no amenities, the overall facility assessment is considered fair since it is used by the local marina community. The conditions and amenities of this site are summarized in Table 3 below. A general layout of the facility can be seen in Exhibit 3.
Table 3 – General Site Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kayak Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Depth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Water @ MLLW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Trailer Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Recepticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Down Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooring Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Piers/Accessways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingress/Egress Ladders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.6 Recommendation and Opinion of Probable Costs

Based on the inspection, the boating facility is operational; however, several items can be completed to make this a better functioning ramp given the existing conditions of the facility. It is recommended that a new concrete ramp with an adjacent fixed timber pier be installed in place of the existing asphalt ramp that is eroding. In addition to the ramp and pier, shore stabilization is recommended on both sides of the ramp. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $231,000 and a breakdown is provided below. Even with these recommendations, this facility will be limited to its functionality to the public until adequate parking can be provided through land acquisition or a remote parking location within the vicinity of the ramp.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY AND LOCATION</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk - Department of Recreation, Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Title

Boat Ramp Evaluation

45th Street Boat Ramp

#### Status of Design

Conceptual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demolition &amp; Excavation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawcut</td>
<td>85 LF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Asphalt</td>
<td>30 CY</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>59 SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$531.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Excavation</td>
<td>145 CY</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$2,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Cofferdam</td>
<td>2300 SF</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$55,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (#3 Stone)</td>
<td>121 CY</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>$2,662.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Deck</td>
<td>55 CY</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>$35,750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippel around Ramp &amp; Toe</td>
<td>31 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Pier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Piles (10&quot;Ø Butts - 25'-0&quot;)</td>
<td>20 EA</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Pile Caps (10x10x8'-10&quot; Southern Pine)</td>
<td>10 EA</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>$261.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Joists (2x8x8'-10&quot;)</td>
<td>72 EA</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>$1,061.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trex© Decking (5/4x6x16'-0&quot;)</td>
<td>294 SF</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>$423.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware (10% of total)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shore Stabilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap</td>
<td>30 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedding Stone (VDOT #2 Size)</td>
<td>8 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotextile Fabric</td>
<td>22 SY</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>$56.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$118,888.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead and Profit</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,777.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal with Mark-ups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$177,666.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$53,299.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$230,965.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAY $231,000.00
2.3.7 General Photographs and Condition Photographs

Photo 19: Approaching 45th Street Boat Ramp from water.

Photo 20: General condition of the 45th Street Boat Ramp. Limited to on-street parking.
Photo 21: Adjacent shoreline conditions. Mud with light vegetation on one side and riprap/weathered asphalt on the opposite side of the ramp.
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FIGURE 4 - 45TH STREET BOAT RAMP
2.4 Harbor Park Boat Ramp

2.4.1 Structural Description

The Harbor Park Boat Ramp is constructed of concrete at a broken slope of 30% at the toe of the boat ramp. It is approximately 12 feet wide, 60 feet long. It appears that the existing toe of the boat ramp has settled which has increased the slope from the original design parameters. The concrete ramp also shows isolated signs of weather with scaling and settlement cracks noted within the tidal range. (See Photo 22 and 23)

In addition to the boat ramp, a kayak launch is located at this facility and seen in Photos 24 thru 26. The kayak launch consists of a timber walkway connected to a floating dock with a metal gangway. The floating dock is 15 feet wide by 22 feet long and is held in place by four timber piles. Kayakers may launch kayaks from the center of the dock while hand railings are provided to assist with ingress/egress.

2.4.2 Shoreline Description

The shoreline adjacent to the boat ramp has concrete rubble riprap behind a timber bulkhead extending approximately 60 feet north of the ramp and 20 feet south to land parallel to the ramp. The bulkhead extends the full length of the shoreline; however, it is severely deteriorated with 100% section loss of over 90% of the structure. Thick vegetation and brush separates the shore from a maintained grass lawn and the parking lot. Approximately 65 feet north of the ramp, an existing timber dock extends beyond the bulkhead and riprap shoreline. This dock is severely deteriorated but appears to be used as a mooring location for boaters to load and unload equipment from the parking lot. (See Photos 27 thru 29) The shoreline by the kayak dock is also supported by rubble riprap overgrown with thick vegetation.

2.4.3 Water Depth Observations

The average water depth at the toe of the boat ramp and at the launching area of the kayak dock was noted at -2.96’ feet MLLW and -5.56 feet MLLW respectfully. During the inspection no shoaling was noted around the launching facility. The field inspection soundings identified during the assessment can be seen in the attached exhibit and are also provided in MLLW. The water depth should be sufficient for recreational boating activities.

2.4.4 Other Noted Observations

The site is easily accessible with plenty of parking and 19 Handicap spaces; however, the parking coincides with Harbor Park Stadium and there is no specified truck/trailer parking. Lighting is limited to the parking lot and does not cover the boat ramp and kayak launch. Signage only denotes handicap parking. There are no restrooms, sitting areas, wash areas, or trash receptacles. (See Photo 30)
2.4.4 Overall Condition Assessment

Since the slope of the ramp’s toe is extremely steep, most boaters are only able to utilize the ramp for egress/ingress during higher tides. The steepness of the toe becomes an issue for ingress because water can exceed the gunnels’ height before the boat has adequate draft to be removed from the trailer. During egress, the excess slope will develop high loads on the boat and becomes unstable during haul-out. Due to these issues, the boat ramp is considered to be in poor condition and needs to be addressed so this facility can become fully functional rather than being utilized only during higher tide ranges. Overall the facility is in poor condition (boat ramp and shoreline) and its assessment and amenities of this site are summarized in Table 4 below. A general layout of the facility can be seen in Figure 5 and soundings can be seen in Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 – General Site Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Boat Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Kayak Condition** |
| Number of Launches | 1 |
| Construction Material | Timber |
| Width of Platform | 15 |
| Length of Platform | 22 |
| General Condition | Good |

| **Shoreline** |
| Type of Shoreline | riprap & timber bulkhead |
| General Condition | Poor/Fair |

| **Water Depth** |
| Depth of Water @ MLLW | -2.96’ & -5.56’ |

| **Other Amenities** |
| Truck/Trailer Parking | Open Lot |
| POV Parking | Open Lot |
| Handicap Parking | 19 |
| Facility Lighting | Poor |
| Restroom Facility | 0 |
| Sitting Areas | 0 |
| Trash Recepticals | 0 |
| Wash Down Facility | 0 |
| Potable Water Supply | 0 |
| Mooring Hardware | No |
| Fixed Piers/Accessways | 1 (Deteriorated) |
| Ingress/Egress Ladders | 0 |

2.4.6 Recommendation and Opinion of Probable Costs

Based on the inspection, the boating facility is operational; however, several items can be completed to make this a better functioning ramp given the existing conditions of the facility. It is recommended that a portion of the ramp be removed and a new section be constructed to provide adequate slope for ingress and egress of boats. In addition, shoreline stabilization and a fixed pier for mooring are also recommended. The estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $320,000 and a breakdown is provided below.
# Boat Ramp Evaluations

**City of Norfolk - Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space**

**ACTIVITY AND LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Park Boat Ramp</td>
<td>Temporary Cofferdam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Item Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition &amp; Excavation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Concrete</td>
<td>360 CF</td>
<td>$8,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>74 SY</td>
<td>$666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Excavation</td>
<td>98 CY</td>
<td>$1,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of existing concrete rubble</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## New Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Cofferdam</td>
<td>2440 SF</td>
<td>$58,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (#3 Stone)</td>
<td>82 CY</td>
<td>$1,804.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Deck</td>
<td>37 CY</td>
<td>$24,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap around Ramp &amp; Toe</td>
<td>21 TONS</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Item Description | Unit | Cost |
| Fixed Pier | | |
| Timber Piles (10"Ø Butts - 25'-0") | 20 EA | $14,400.00 |
| Timber Pile Caps (10x10x8'-10" Southern Pine) | 10 EA | $261.60 |
| Timber Joists (2x8x8'-10") | 72 EA | $1,061.28 |
| Trex© Decking (5/4x6x16'-0") | 294 SF | $423.36 |
| Hardware (10% of total) | 1 LS | $1,700.00 |
| Gangway | 1 LS | $7,500.00 |

| Item Description | Unit | Cost |
| Shore Stabilization | | |
| Riprap | 144 TONS | $7,200.00 |
| Bedding Stone (VDOT #2 Size) | 8 TONS | $400.00 |
| Geotextile Fabric | 67 SY | $170.00 |

## Subtotal

$154,846.24

## Overhead and Profit

20.00% $30,969.25

## Mobilization

1 LS $60,000.00

## Subtotal with Mark-ups

$245,815.49

## Contingency

30.00% $73,744.65

## TOTAL

$319,560.13

SAY $320,000.00
2.4.7 General Photographs and Condition Photographs

Photo 22: Approaching boat ramp from water.

Photo 23: Overall condition of Harbor Park Boat Ramp. Parking and stadium in background.
Photo 24: General condition of kayak launch. One timber pile missing a cap.

Photo 25: Looking north from kayak launch toward gangway ramp and walkway.
Photo 26: Facing south from kayak launch.

Photo 27: Adjacent shoreline looking east.
Photo 28: Adjacent shoreline looking west. Scaling on boat ramp (right).

Photo 29: Severely deteriorated timber bulkhead. Abandoned building in background.
Photo 30: Facing east from tree line looking over parking lot. Boat ramp is to the right.
FIGURE 5 — HARBOR PARK BOAT RAMP
* SOUNDINGS ARE ShOWN IN REFERENCE TO MLLW

**FIGURE 6 - HARBOR PARK BOAT RAMP**
2.5 Lafayette City Park Boat Ramp

2.5.1 Structural Description

The Lafayette City Park Boat Ramp is approximately 29 feet wide and 61 feet long, at a 10% slope and is constructed of concrete. The ramp has noted sections of deterioration with in the tidal zone which consist of cracks and scaling around the construction joints of the ramp and were noted to be approximately $\frac{1}{2}$" deep. General site photos of ramp can be seen in Photos 31 thru 33.

2.5.2 Shoreline Description

The adjacent shoreline consists of light vegetation and tidal wetlands. On the western side of the boat ramp a stone retaining wall separates the vegetative shoreline from a grassy strip and the asphalt paved loop of the park. Near the ramp, a pile supported timber fixed pier is severely deteriorated and has been marked with no trespassing signs. General site photos of shoreline and pier can be seen in Photos 34 thru 36.

2.5.3 Water Depth Observations

The average water depth at the toe of the boat ramp is +0.23 feet MLLW. During the inspection no shoaling was noted around the launching facility. The field inspection soundings identified during the assessment can be seen in the attached exhibit and are also provided in MLLW. The water depth should be sufficient for smaller boats and other recreational boating activities.

2.5.4 Other Noted Observations

The current queuing layout observed during assessment is adequate; however during high periods of activity the facility will be limited to queuing space due to the traffic flow constriction from the existing land space. The site is limited to the number of trucks and trailer spaces available and did not have marked or paved parking spaces near the ramp. (Photos 37 & 38)

Based on the available space, potentially two trucks with trailers could be parked around the perimeter of the facility along with maybe five POVs. There is one streetlight located at the west end of the park above two benches; however, the light was not functioning during the inspection. There was one trash receptacle but no wash areas or restrooms. Signage addressed safety only. (Photo 39)

2.5.5 Overall Condition Assessment

The ramp is in fair condition given the amount of scaling noted during the inspection. The overall condition of the facility is poor because there is inadequate room for trailer storage and other amenities. The conditions and amenities of this site are summarized in Table 5 below. A general layout of the facility can be seen in Exhibit 5.
Table 5 – General Site Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lafayette Park</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ramps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Boat Ramp</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Boat Ramp</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of Ramp</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kayak Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Launches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Material</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Platform</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Platform</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Shoreline</td>
<td>vegetation and retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Depth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Water @ MLLW</td>
<td>+0.23'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Trailer Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POV Parking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Lighting</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Areas</td>
<td>2 Benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Recepticals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Down Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooring Hardware</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Piers/Accessways</td>
<td>1 (Deteriorated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingress/Egress Ladders</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.6 Recommendation and Opinion of Probable Costs

Based on our assessment, the boating facility is not functional for larger motorized boats. To accommodate deeper draft vessels, an area from the ramp to the channel must be dredged and the concrete boat ramp reconstructed. We also recommend that a fixed timber pier be constructed adjacent to the ramp and the existing pier be demolished. Along with the ramp work, M&N recommends, at a minimum, the area around the perimeter of the facility be paved to provide parking for vehicles and trailer. Our estimated opinion of probable cost for this work is $430,000. Even with these recommendations, this limited parking is available at this facility.
The City of Norfolk Department of Recreation, Parks & Open Space

Opinion of Probable Cost

DATE PREPARED: 17-Aug-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY AND LOCATION</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk - Department of Recreation, Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED BY</th>
<th>CATEGORY CODE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Evaluation</td>
<td>J. Hill</td>
<td>6790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS OF DESIGN</th>
<th>JOB ORDER NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition &amp; Excavation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Concrete</td>
<td>1800 CF</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$43,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>200 SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Excavation</td>
<td>267 CY</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$5,340.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredging</td>
<td>445 LS</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$10,680.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Existing Pier</td>
<td>300 SF</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>$7,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>434 SY</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>$3,906.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Cofferdam</td>
<td>1800 SF</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$43,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (#3 Stone)</td>
<td>136 CY</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>$2,992.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Deck</td>
<td>100 CY</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap around Ramp &amp; Toe</td>
<td>45 TONS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Piles (10&quot;Ø Butts - 25'-0&quot;)</td>
<td>20 EA</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Pile Caps (10x10x8'-10&quot; Southern Pine)</td>
<td>10 EA</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>$261.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Joists (2x8x8'-10&quot;)</td>
<td>72 EA</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>$1,061.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trex® Decking (5/4x6x16'-0&quot;)</td>
<td>294 SF</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>$423.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware (10% of total)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangway</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>95 TONS</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>$10,830.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone #21A</td>
<td>108 TONS</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>$3,132.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Marking</td>
<td>300 LF</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>$141.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,617.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead and Profit</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,123.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal with Mark-ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$330,740.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,222.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$429,962.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAY $430,000.00
2.5.7 General Photographs and Condition Photographs

Photo 31: Approaching boat ramp from water. Stone wall and severely deteriorated pier to the right.

Photo 32: Overall conditions of boat ramp. Heavy scaling at waterline. Wetlands throughout.
Photo 33: Close-up view of scaling on boat ramp.

Photo 34: Adjacent shoreline with stone wall separating wetlands from vegetation and roadway.
Photo 35: Opposite shoreline of wetlands and thick vegetation.

Photo 36: Severely deteriorated pier adjacent to boat ramp.
Photo 37: Looking east from sitting area. Limited parking to the right.

Photo 38: Facing west toward sitting area overlooking boat ramp.
Photo 39: Signage at site.
Appendix E | Order of Magnitude Estimate of Costs
# Recreation, Parks, and Open Space Master Plan

## 1. REFRESH PARKS

### Improvements to Existing Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Barraud Park Renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>upgrade all facilities at park; rebuild community center; general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Airport Gateway Park Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>develop into neighborhood park, upgrade gateway signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jeff Robertson Park Renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>multi-purpose green spaces; playground; general site enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Monkey Bottom Park Renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements - small gravel parking, small playground, picnic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Monticello Village Park Renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Oakmont North Playground Renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tanners Creek Park Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>develop into neighborhood park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Other Park Improvements</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements to other parks in the system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School/Park Upgrades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Chesterfield Elementary Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Crossroads Elementary Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>James Monroe Elementary Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Northside Middle School / Mary Calcott Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>St Helena Elementary School Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sherwood Forest Elementary School Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other School/Park Improvements</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>general site enhancements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Develop new neighborhood parks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$10,140,000</td>
<td>.5 acres - 10 acres, average of 2 acres. Playground, picnic areas, open space. Does not include acquisition costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refresh Parks Sub-total** $26,465,000

## 2. REFRESH ATHLETIC FIELDS

### Proposed Parks and Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Upgrade Multi-Purpose Fields</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>new field, lighting, goals, bleachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Upgrade Baseball Fields</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>new field, fencing, backstop, lighting, bleachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Upgrade Softball Fields</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$2,640,000</td>
<td>new field, fencing, backstop, lighting, bleachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refresh Athletic Fields Sub-total** $11,780,000

## 3. REFRESH COMMUNITY CHARACTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Enhance Heritage * Culture hubs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>allowance for signage, public art, environmental art, exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Develop 4 heritage and culture themes in parks</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>allowance signage, public art, environmental art, exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Develop self-guided trail materials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>allowance for research, development of brochures, website, printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Enhancement of Elizabeth River Trail</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>allowance for signage, public art, environmental art, exhibits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ocean View Avenue Promenade</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$12,187,500</td>
<td>bike lane rennovation, new walks, gateways, bus shelters, site furn., lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fort Norfolk Access Improvements</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>acquisition of land around Ft Norfolk, development into urban open space; improved access to site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refresh Community Character Sub-total** $15,677,500
### 4. RECONNECT BIKEWAYS AND TRAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Super Trails</th>
<th>19.5 Miles</th>
<th>$1,440,000</th>
<th>$7,020,000</th>
<th>10-12' multi-purpose asphalt paved path, tree plantings, art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>7.5 MI</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military Highway</td>
<td>3 MI</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>8 MI</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$2,880,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton Boulevard</td>
<td>1 MI</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Arterial Trails</td>
<td>73.5 Miles</td>
<td>$3,610,000</td>
<td>$12,730,000</td>
<td>on-street bicycle facilities, 5' width, full painted bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkley Avenue</td>
<td>2.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Beach Boulevard</td>
<td>7 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princess Anne Road</td>
<td>7 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th/27th/Lafayette</td>
<td>5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34th Street</td>
<td>1 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Wood Drive/Nonview</td>
<td>4 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Creek Drive</td>
<td>6.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean View Avenue</td>
<td>6.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Avenue</td>
<td>1 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campostella Road</td>
<td>2 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newtown Road</td>
<td>2 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kempsville Road</td>
<td>3 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azalea Garden Road</td>
<td>4.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shore Drive</td>
<td>2 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewells Point Road</td>
<td>1.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chesapeake Boulevard</td>
<td>6.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>2.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granby Street</td>
<td>5.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$1,045,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colley Avenue</td>
<td>3 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bowdens Ferry Road</td>
<td>0.5 MI</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Neighborhood Loops</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>bike sharing road symbol on roadway, wayfinding post signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconnect Bikeways and Trails Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,770,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. RECONNECT - WATER ACCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Lafayette River Trail allowance</th>
<th>$3,180,000</th>
<th>12 sites, 1 lookout, 1 hub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>12 EA</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lookout</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ocean View Trail allowance</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>12 sites, 1 lookout, 1 hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>5 EA</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Urban River Trail allowance</td>
<td>$3,510,000</td>
<td>9 sites, 2 lookouts, 2 hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>2 EA</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>9 EA</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lookout</td>
<td>2 EA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reservoir Trail allowance</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
<td>1 site, 1 hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hub</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconnect Water Access Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,230,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. REFOCUS - COMMUNITY CENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Large Community Centers $25,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarallton 50000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk Fitness and Wellness 50000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KROC Center 1 allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - not a City facility, privately developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Medium Community Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$5,000,000 20,000 SF addition to existing center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$5,000,000 upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairlawn</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$5,000,000 upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norview</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$5,000,000 upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert's Point</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0 no upgrades needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Use Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>LS/allowance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Center</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 under construction - no further funding recommended at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Rec Center</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000 upgrades and does not include aquatics component/facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics and Dance Center</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing Center</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titustown Visual Arts</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Adventure Center</td>
<td>1 allowance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 included as hub development under water access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refocus Community Centers Sub-total** $33,500,000

**Grand Total** $138,422,500

---

AECOM Technical Services, Inc. has no control over the cost of labor, materials, or equipment, the Contractor's method of determining prices or competitive bidding or market conditions. Therefore, our opinions of probable construction costs provided for herein are made on the basis of experience and represent our best judgment as Landscape Architects familiar with the construction industry. The firm cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids or the construction cost will not vary from our opinions of probable costs. If the Owner wishes greater assurances as to the construction cost, we recommend the employment of an independent cost estimator.