Deerfield Township, Ohio

Parks Master Plan Update

Preferred Plan Workshop- 11 October 2018
Workshop #3 Agenda

- Introductions & Project Overview
- Findings to Date
- Planning Session #1: Community Park Needs
- Planning Session #2: County Community & Neighborhood Park Needs
- Planning Session #3: Open Space/Natural Area Needs
- Planning Session #4: Establishing a Vision for Kingswood Park
- Workshop Summary / Discussion
- Next Steps
Workshop #3 Desired Outcomes

- List of New Programs & Facilities at Each Park
- Priorities for Connectivity – System Wide
Parks Master Plan Schedule

- Project Start Up- April 2018
- Existing Conditions
  - Focus Group Interviews
  - Site Inventory & Assessment
  - Demographic & Trends Analysis
  - Benchmarking
- Public Engagement
  - Citizen Steering Committee Meetings
  - Statistically Valid Community Survey
  - Community Workshops (4)
- Draft Parks Master Plan- December 2018
- Final Parks Master Plan- February 2019
Findings to Date
Workshops #1 Summary

Positives:
- Parks are clean, well maintained and provide great ballfields, amenities and offerings
- Program offerings are great (Snyder House, 5K Runs, Butterfly Walk, Shakespeare in the Park, etc.)
- Carter Park and Kingswood Park present unique opportunities

Negatives:
- Parks are scattered, logistics problem
- Need more access to the Little Miami River
- There are not many rentable facilities / shelters
- Parking is lacking at some parks
- Biking/Hiking trails need better maintenance
Workshop #2 Summary

- Need connections between parks (Paths)
- Deerfield farmer’s market needs a permanent shelter
- How can the Fleckenstein Barn be used?
- Robert’s Park needs parking and triangle improvements, etc.
- Restrooms are important at every park
- Kingswood needs:
  - Fishing allowed
  - Plant life identity markers
  - Dog Park
  - Cyclocross Trails
  - Benches around ponds
  - Blocking of Innovation Way during special events, etc.
  - Kingswood indoor space rental facility
2018 Deerfield Township Community Interest and Opinion Survey

PRESENTED BY

OCTOBER 11, 2018
Purpose

- To objectively assess usage, satisfaction, and needs for a wide range of recreation facilities and programs
- To help determine priorities for the community as a part of the Township’s efforts to plan the future of parks and recreation opportunities
- To identify opportunities for Deerfield Township to better serve the leisure and recreation needs of the community
Methodology

- Survey Description
  - Seven-page survey
  - 1st survey conducted for the Township by ETC Institute

- Method of Administration
  - By mail, phone and online to randomly selected sample of households
  - Each survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete

- Sample Size Goal: 300
  - 458 actually completed – 158 above the goal
  - Margin of error: +/- 4.6% at the 95% level of confidence
Summary

- Overall satisfaction with recreation services is high (74%)
  - Maintenance and number of parks
  - Quality and number of fields
- Biggest obstacle to usage is not knowing what is offered
- Most respondents (58%) would be supportive of the Township exploring the feasibility of a multi-purpose community building
Summary

• **Amenity Priorities:**
  - (1) Walking Trails
  - (2) Biking Trails
  - (3) Greenspaces and Natural Areas
  - (4) Nature Center
  - (5) Sledding Hills
  - (6) Neighborhood Parks

• **Programming Priorities:**
  - (1) Nature Programs
  - (2) Adult Fitness and Wellness Programs
  - (3) Community Special Events
  - (4) Family Programs
  - (5) Senior Fitness and Wellness Programs
Topic 1:
Usage of Parks and Facilities
83% of Respondents have Used at Least One Facility During the Past 12 Months
Overall, the Condition of Parks and Facilities is Very Good
Topic 2: Program Participation
Famers Markets and Special Events are Programs that Nearly Every Household Could Use Regardless of Age or Ability
9 out of 10 Participants are Satisfied with Recreation Programs/Activities
Topic 3: Barriers to Usage
Q5. Reasons Preventing the Use of Parks, Recreation Facilities, and/or Programs

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- I do not know what is being offered: 36%
- We are too busy: 25%
- No safe route to walk/bike to the facility: 21%
- Too far from our residence: 19%
- I do not know locations of facilities: 19%
- Use services of others (school, private club, etc): 18%
- Use facilities in other communities: 13%
- Lack of adequate facilities: 9%
- Program not offered: 7%
- We are not interested: 7%
- Facilities are not well maintained: 6%
- Lack of quality programs: 5%
- Lack of parking: 5%
- Program times are not convenient: 4%
- Fees are too high: 3%
- Security is insufficient: 2%
- Registration for programs is difficult: 2%
- Class full: 1%
- Poor customer service by staff: 1%
- Operating hours not convenient: 1%
- Other: 13%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

Number One Barrier to Usage is Not Knowing What is Offered (36%)
Q11. Sources Households Use to Learn About Parks & Recreation Programs and Activities

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Friends & neighbors: 34%
- Deerfield Township website: 33%
- Parks sign boards: 28%
- Activity guide program catalog: 26%
- Facebook: 23%
- Flyers in community: 21%
- Newspaper articles/advertisements: 17%
- Community calendars: 14%
- e-Newsletter: 12%
- School website: 7%
- Twitter: 4%
- Conversations with Parks/Rec staff: 1%
- Instagram: 1%
- Other: 5%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

Word of Mouth and the Website are Primary Sources of Information
Q12. Most Preferred Sources to Learn About Parks & Recreation Programs and Activities

by percentage of respondents who selected the items as one of their top three choices

- Deerfield Township website: 35%
- Activity guide program catalog: 31%
- e-Newsletter: 25%
- Facebook: 25%
- Parks sign boards: 20%
- Flyers in community: 18%
- Friends & neighbors: 18%
- Community calendars: 14%
- Newspaper articles/advertisements: 13%
- School website: 6%
- Twitter: 3%
- Instagram: 2%
- Conversations with Parks/Rec staff: 1%
- Other: 3%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

Current Sources and Preferred Sources are Closely Aligned – Availability of Information May be a Problem
Topic 4: Unmet Needs and Priorities for Programs
Q13. Programs Respondent Households Have a Need For
by percentage of respondents

- Community special events: 44%
- Nature programs: 43%
- Adult fitness & wellness programs: 42%
- Family programs: 31%
- Youth sports programs: 25%
- Senior fitness & wellness programs: 25%
- Adult sports programs: 24%
- Trips to special attractions & events: 23%
- Outdoor challenge programs: 21%
- Youth summer camp programs: 20%
- Youth fitness & wellness programs: 18%
- Youth art, dance, performing arts: 16%
- Adult art, dance, performing arts: 16%
- Senior sports programs: 15%
- Senior art, dance, performing arts: 14%
- Tennis lessons & leagues: 13%
- Preschool programs/early childhood: 11%
- Gymnastics & tumbling programs: 10%
- Programs for people with disabilities: 5%
- Other: 2%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q13. Estimated Number of Households Whose Needs for Programs Are Being 50% Met or Less

by number of households based on approximately 15,000 households in Deerfield Township, Ohio

- Nature programs: 5,374
- Adult fitness & wellness programs: 5,305
- Community special events: 4,359
- Family programs: 3,094
- Adult sports programs: 3,062
- Trips to special attractions & events: 3,056
- Senior fitness & wellness programs: 2,964
- Outdoor challenge programs: 2,798
- Youth fitness & wellness programs: 2,303
- Adult art, dance, performing arts: 2,042
- Youth sports programs: 1,950
- Tennis lessons & leagues: 1,855
- Youth summer camp programs: 1,854
- Senior art, dance, performing arts: 1,667
- Youth art, dance, performing arts: 1,611
- Senior sports programs: 1,583
- Gymnastics & tumbling programs: 1,103
- Preschool programs/early childhood: 891
- Programs for people with disabilities: 635
- Other: 255

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q14. Programs That Are Most Important to Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the items as one of their top four choices

- Nature programs: 30%
- Community special events: 27%
- Family programs: 25%
- Adult fitness & wellness programs: 25%
- Youth sports programs: 19%
- Senior fitness & wellness programs: 19%
- Youth summer camp programs: 12%
- Trips to special attractions & events: 11%
- Adult sports programs: 11%
- Adult art, dance, performing arts: 8%
- Youth fitness & wellness programs: 8%
- Senior sports programs: 8%
- Outdoor challenge programs: 8%
- Preschool programs/early childhood: 7%
- Youth art, dance, performing arts: 7%
- Senior art, dance, performing arts: 6%
- Tennis lessons & leagues: 6%
- Gymnastics & tumbling programs: 3%
- Programs for people with disabilities: 3%
- Other: 1%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Importance Rating for Recreation Programs

The rating for the item rated as the most important is 100. The rating of all other items reflects the relative level of importance for each item compared to the item rated as the most important.

- Nature programs: 100.0
- Community special events: 87.5
- Family programs: 83.2
- Adult fitness & wellness programs: 82.6
- Youth sports programs: 61.2
- Senior fitness & wellness programs: 61.2
- Youth summer camp programs: 53.2
- Trips to special attractions & events: 34.9
- Adult sports programs: 27.3
- Adult art, dance, performing arts: 26.3
- Youth fitness & wellness programs: 25.3
- Senior sports programs: 25.0
- Outdoor challenge programs: 22.4
- Preschool programs/early childhood: 22.0
- Youth art, dance, performing arts: 20.7
- Senior art, dance, performing arts: 18.8
- Tennis lessons & leagues: 9.9
- Gymnastics & tumbling programs: 8.2
- Programs for people with disabilities: 8.2
- Other: 4.3

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Top Priorities for Investment for Recreation Programs Based on the Priority Investment Rating

Nature programs: 200
Adult fitness & wellness programs: 181
Community special events: 169
Family programs: 141
Senior fitness & wellness programs: 116
Youth sports programs: 97
Trips to special attractions & events: 92
Adult sports programs: 92
Outdoor challenge programs: 77
Youth summer camp programs: 73
Youth fitness & wellness programs: 69
Adult art, dance, performing arts: 65
Senior sports programs: 55
Tennis lessons & leagues: 53
Youth art, dance, performing arts: 52
Senior art, dance, performing arts: 52
Preschool programs/early childhood: 39
Gymnastics & tumbling programs: 30
Programs for people with disabilities: 20
Other: 9

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Topic 5: Unmet Needs and Priorities for Amenities
Q6. How Well Parks and Recreation Amenities Meet the Needs of Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents with a need for amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>100% Met</th>
<th>75% Met</th>
<th>50% Met</th>
<th>25%/0% Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball &amp; softball fields</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parks (2-10 acres)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community parks (11+ acres)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer/football/lacrosse fields</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shelters &amp; picnic areas</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking trails</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace &amp; natural areas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard surface tennis courts</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiking trails</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural playscapes/play areas</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior activity space</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard parks</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledging hills</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor meeting/gathering spaces</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pad</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q6. Estimated Number of Households Whose Needs for Amenities Are Being 50% Met or Less

by number of households based on approximately 15,000 households in Deerfield Township, Ohio

Nature center: 5,312
Walking trails: 5,088
Sledging hills: 4,661
Biking trails: 4,619
Greenspace & natural areas: 4,149
Natural playscapes/play areas: 3,797
Community gardens: 3,637
Splash pad: 3,498
Park shelters & picnic areas: 3,140
Indoor meeting/gathering spaces: 2,988
Neighborhood parks (2-10 acres): 2,691
Community parks (11+ acres): 2,647
Senior activity space: 2,555
Playgrounds: 2,102
Outdoor basketball courts: 1,474
Soccer/football/lacrosse fields: 1,308
Hard surface tennis courts: 1,243
Pickleball courts: 996
Baseball & softball fields: 719
Skateboard parks: 569
Other: 595

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q7. Amenities That Are Most Important to Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the items as one of their top four choices

- Walking trails: 60%
- Neighborhood parks (2-10 acres): 32%
- Biking trails: 29%
- Greenspace & natural areas: 29%
- Community parks (11+ acres): 27%
- Playgrounds: 24%
- Park shelters & picnic areas: 18%
- Natural playscapes/play areas: 14%
- Splash pad: 12%
- Nature center: 11%
- Senior activity space: 11%
- Sledding hills: 11%
- Soccer/football/lacrosse fields: 10%
- Indoor meeting/gathering spaces: 9%
- Community gardens: 7%
- Baseball & softball fields: 6%
- Hard surface tennis courts: 6%
- Outdoor basketball courts: 5%
- Pickleball courts: 3%
- Skateboard parks: 1%
- Other: 4%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Importance Rating for Recreation Amenities

The rating for the item rated as the most important is 100.
The rating of all other items reflects the relative level of importance for each item compared to the item rated as the most important.

- Walking trails: 52.6
- Neighborhood parks (2-10 acres): 48.1
- Biking trails: 48.1
- Greenspace & natural areas: 44.6
- Community parks (11+ acres): 40.7
- Playgrounds: 29.5
- Park shelters & picnic areas: 23.5
- Natural playscapes/play areas: 20.4
- Splash pad: 18.0
- Nature center: 18.9
- Senior activity space: 17.5
- Sledding hills: 16.4
- Soccer/football/lacrosse fields: 14.7
- Indoor meeting/gathering spaces: 11.7
- Community gardens: 10.7
- Baseball & softball fields: 9.8
- Hard surface tennis courts: 8.2
- Outdoor basketball courts: 5.3
- Pickleball courts: 5.3
- Skateboard parks: 2.2
- Other: 7.0

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Top Priorities for Investment for Recreation Amenities Based on the Priority Investment Rating

- Walking trails: 196
- Biking trails: 136
- Greenspace & natural areas: 126
- Nature center: 119
- Sledding hills: 105
- Neighborhood parks (2-10 acres): 103
- Natural playscapes/play areas: 94
- Community parks (11+ acres): 89
- Park shelters & picnic areas: 86
- Splash pad: 80
- Playgrounds: 80
- Community gardens: 71
- Indoor meeting/gathering spaces: 67
- Senior activity space: 41
- Soccer football/lacrosse fields: 36
- Outdoor basketball courts: 33
- Hard surface tennis courts: 24
- Baseball & softball fields: 24
- Pickleball courts: 24
- Skateboard parks: 13
- Other: 18

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Topic 6: Improvement Priorities
### Q8. Actions Deerfield Township Could Take to Improve the Parks and Recreation System

by percentage of respondents with a need for facilities (excluding “not provided” responses)

<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>Protect open &amp; green space</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased connectivity to hiking/biking trails &amp; parks</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated park facilities (playgrounds, shelters, restrooms, trails, fields, etc.)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire/preserve property to redevelop into parks for additional shaded areas, trails, picnicking, etc.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentable shelters/pavilions</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase events &amp; programming</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light ball fields</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q9. Most Important Actions that Deerfield Township Could Take to Improve the Parks and Recreation System

by percentage of respondents who selected the items as one of their top three choices

- Increased connectivity to hiking/biking trails & parks: 48%
- Acquire/preserve property to redevelop into parks for additional shaded areas, trails, picnicking, etc.: 42%
- Protect open & green space: 42%
- Upgrade existing parks: 37%
- Updated park facilities (playgrounds, shelters, restrooms, trails, fields, etc.): 33%
- Increase events & programming: 17%
- Rentable shelters/pavilions: 10%
- Light ball fields: 7%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

Most Important Actions are Aligned with Actions Respondents Would Most Support
Topic 6: Kingswood
Q18. Level of Support for Potential Options for Kingswood

by percentage of respondents

- Improve Kingswood as a passive public park: 44% Very supportive, 25% Somewhat supportive, 22% Not sure, 10% Not supportive
- Create a permanent farmers market facility in Kingswood Park: 42% Very supportive, 25% Somewhat supportive, 22% Not sure, 11% Not supportive
- Turn Kingswood into an active park, similar to Cottell Park: 32% Very supportive, 26% Somewhat supportive, 21% Not sure, 20% Not supportive
- Building a new community building for public use & activity on 3-4-acres in Kingswood that could house new Township administrative offices, a sheriff’s office, public gathering spaces, etc.: 23% Very supportive, 21% Somewhat supportive, 31% Not sure, 25% Not supportive
- Do not make any improvements to Kingswood Park & leave it as an open passive green space for use by the community: 15% Very supportive, 18% Somewhat supportive, 34% Not sure, 34% Not supportive

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q19. Level of Support for Actions Taken at Kingswood that Would Generate Revenue

by percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat supportive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rentals in parks</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Deerfield classes or programs using parks</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting large events that have exclusive use of a park &amp; may charge entrance fees</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; beverage vendors in parks</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of additional facilities to support large youth/adult sports tournaments for out-of-town teams</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q20. Should a portion of the debt-free Kingswood property be sold or leased for commercial development, which of the following commercial development options would you most favor?

by percentage of respondents

- Commercially develop 0% of Kingswood: 51%
- Commercially develop 20% of Kingswood: 15%
- Commercially develop 40% of Kingswood: 9%
- Commercially develop 60% of Kingswood: 3%
- Commercially develop 80% of Kingswood: 4%
- None of above: 17%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Additional Findings
Q21. How supportive you would be of changing the current renewable parks tax levy to a permanent parks tax levy?

by percentage of respondents

- Very supportive: 30%
- Not supportive at all: 12%
- Not supportive: 15%
- Neutral: 19%
- Somewhat supportive: 24%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q21a. Reason Why Household is Not Supportive of Changing the Parks Tax Levy

by percentage of respondents that are not in support of a change in the parks tax levy

- I need more information before I can answer: 39%
- I do not support any increase or continuation of taxes: 37%
- I believe Township currently has sufficient recreation opportunities & does not need secured funding: 22%
- I do not use any Deerfield Township parks, amenities, programs, or facilities: 16%
- I believe those who plan on using parks, amenities, programs, or facilities should bear the burden of paying for them: 16%
- Other: 12%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Questions?
## Benchmark Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Jurisdiction Size (Sq. Mi.)</th>
<th>Population per Sq. Mi.</th>
<th>NRPA Gold Medal Winner (Year)</th>
<th>CAPRA Accredited (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>Finalist (2018)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Park Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Park Sites</th>
<th>Total Acres Owned or Managed</th>
<th>Acres of Ballfield Managed</th>
<th>Ballfield Acres as % of Total</th>
<th>Total Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = 9.6 Acres per 1,000 Residents
## Indoor Recreation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft. Indoor Rec Facilities</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>36,300</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*National Best Practice = 1.5-2.0 Square Feet of Indoor Space per Resident*

Note: Orange Twp indoor recreation square footage was not available at time of study.
## Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>FTEs per 10,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = 8.9 FTEs per 10,000 Residents*
### Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Operating Budget</th>
<th>Personnel as % of Budget</th>
<th>Contracted Maint Services as % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>$5,931,683</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>$4,527,393</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>$3,563,036</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>$1,199,619</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>$758,456</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = Personnel is 54.8% of Operating Budget*
# Operating Expense per Resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operating Expense per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>$4,527,393</td>
<td>$106.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>$5,931,683</td>
<td>$101.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>$3,563,036</td>
<td>$81.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>$1,199,619</td>
<td>$30.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>$758,456</td>
<td>$29.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = $86.60 Operating Expense per Resident
## Non-Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Non-Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>42,647</td>
<td>$2,161,815</td>
<td>$50.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>$1,466,580</td>
<td>$33.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>$1,847,370</td>
<td>$31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>$371,226</td>
<td>$14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>39,312</td>
<td>$79,559</td>
<td>$2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = $24.36 Revenue per Resident
## Cost Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Non-Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operational Cost Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange Twp</td>
<td>$371,226</td>
<td>$758,456</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>$2,161,815</td>
<td>$4,527,393</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>$1,466,580</td>
<td>$3,563,036</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville - Washington Twp</td>
<td>$1,847,370</td>
<td>$5,931,683</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Twp</td>
<td>$79,559</td>
<td>$1,199,619</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NRPA Median for Agencies Serving 20K-50K Residents = 30% Cost Recovery*
Summary of Preliminary Findings

Positive Takeaways:

- Highest population density among peers
- Strong acres per 1,000 residents
- Personnel costs as % of budget is inline with best practice
- Areas for improvement
- Lack of indoor rec space
- FTEs per 10,000 residents suggests we are understaffed
- Low spending on parks and rec per capita
- Earned income is very low which is limiting revenue per resident and cost recovery level

Next Steps: follow up with peer agencies on missing figures (i.e. participation, budget breakdowns, programs, etc.)
Planning Session #1
Individual Community Park Needs
Planning Session #2
County Community & Neighborhood Park Needs
Planning Session #3
Individual Open Space / Natural Area Needs
Planning Session #4
Establishing a Vision for Kingswood Park
Thank you for your time!

www.plandeerfieldparks.com
Schedule
## Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Award</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Signed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Start-Up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Engagement Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Master Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft and Final Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Milestones

- Community Workshop #1 – June 27
- **Community Workshop #2 – September 5**
- Community Workshop #3 – October 11
- Community Workshop #4 – November 28
- Presentation to Board of Trustees – January 15