North Carolina Parks and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF)

2011-12

Grant Application



North Carolina Parks and Recreation Authority



Division of Parks and Recreation Department of Environment and Natural Resources

#1 - Checklist to Submit a Complete PARTF Application

Please put a check mark in the appropriate box to show that you have included the designated number of copies for each document with your application. Use a paper clip to keep the copies of each type of document together. For example, keep all copies of the project costs clipped together. Keep a copy of the application for your files. Planning documents will be returned to you.

Applicant: City of Greenville Project's Title: Dream Park

| | All Applications | Page Reference | Number of Copies | Included? Y |
|------|--|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Checklist for Submitting a Complete Application | 6 | 2 | Y |
| 2. | Applicant's Basic Facts and Assurances | 7 | 2 | Y |
| 3. | Description and Justification for the Project | 8 | 25 | Y |
| 4. | Project Costs | 10 - 11 | 4 | Y |
| 5. | Sources of the Applicant's Matching Funds | 12 | 4 | Y |
| 6. | Site Plan (and floor plan if applicable) | 13 | 25 | Y |
| 7. | Site Location Map | 14 | 4 | Y |
| 8. | Scoring System | 21 - 26 | 4 | Y |
| Proj | ects to Construct or Renovate Facilities | 1 | | |
| | All Construction Projects | | | |
| 9. | Environmental Review | 19-20 | 2 | Y |
| | If the Applicant has Site Control | | | |
| 10. | Attorney's Certification of Site Control | 9 | 2 | Y |
| 11. | Proof of Site Control | 8 | 2 | Y |
| 12. | Local Government & School Joint-Use Agreement | 5 | If applicable, 2 | N/A |
| Proj | ects to Acquire Land | • | | |
| 13. | Acquisition Form | 17 | 2 | N/A |
| 14. | Appraisal or Statement of Value | 16 | 2 | N/A |
| 15. | Legal Description of the Land | 18 | 25 | N/A |
| 16. | Plan for Future Development (for acquisition only projects) | 15 | If applicable, 2 | N/A |
| 17. | History of Conveyance (for donated land) | 15 | If applicable, 2 | N/A |
| Doc | uments for the Scoring System | | | |
| 18. | Master Plan for the Park | 21 & 28 | lf available, 3 | Y |
| 19. | Parks and Recreation Systemwide Plan for the Jurisdiction | 22 & 29 | If available, 3 | Y |
| 20. | Capital Improvement Plan for Parks and Recreation | 22 & 30 | If available, 3 | Y |
| 21. | Documentation of Surveys or Public Involvement | 23 & 30 | If available, 3 | Y |
| 22. | Local Board Minutes or Resolution for Adoption/Acceptance of Planning Documents | 21, 22 & 23 | If available, 3 | Y |

N.C. Parks and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF) 2011-2012 Basic Facts and Assurances

| 2011-2012 Basic Fac | ts and Assurances |
|--|---|
| Local Government Name: City of Greenville | - County: Pitt County |
| Federal Employer I.D. Number: 56- 60000229 | |
| Local Government's Contact Person: | Local Government Manager: |
| Name: Mr. Gary Fenton | Name: Mr. Wayne Bowers |
| Title: Recreation & Parks Director | Title: City Manager |
| Address: PO Box 7207 | Address: PO Box 7207 |
| City/State/Zip: Greenville, NC 27835 | City/State/Zip: Greenville, NC 27835 |
| Telephone: 252-329-4567 | Telephone: 252-329-4432 |
| E-mail: gfenton@greenvillenc.gov | E-mail: wbowers@greenvillenc.gov |
| Chief Elected Official: | Type of project: |
| Name: Allen M. Thomas | |
| Title: Mayor | |
| Address: PO Box 7207 | Acquisition and Development |
| City/State/Zip: Greenville, NC 27835 | |
| Site Control: | Costs rounded to nearest dollar: |
| Owned by local government | PARTF funds requested: \$ <u>250,000</u> |
| Owned by school board | Local government's |
| Leased by applicant for 25 years or more | matching funds: \$ <u>534,900</u> |
| | Total cost of project \$ 784.900 |
| Easement | |
| Recreation Resources Service (RRS) regional consultant | |
| Short title of project: Dream Park Renovation | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | ration will provide the area with new recreational opportunities rpose field, a picnic shelter, a significant playground unit, and |
| Approval by local governing board: (The local go | |
| I hereby certify the information contained in the attached ap dollar matching funds will be availa | |
| Adopted this day of (give date): November 14, 2011 | |
| Contesto | |
| Chief Elected Official: | Allen M. Thomas, Mayor |
| (Signature) | (Print or Type Name and Title) |
| (For applications sponsored by two or more local government one copy of this form must be completed and signed by | |

identified as the primary sponsor in the "Applicant" section at the top of this page.)

#3- Description and Justification for the Dream Park Renovation - City of Greenville

Project Description

Dream Park is a 2.4 acre neighborhood park that directly serves the Higgs neighborhood and surrounding areas. It was originally conceived in the mid-1990's as a part of the "Weed and Seed" program. This original effort resulted in an area that was primarily open greenspace with only the most basic playground amenities. The site had limited recreational value resulting in little neighborhood use. The new Dream Park Master Plan creates a much more active recreation area with significant park amenities. These amenities include a sprayground, an improved multipurpose field, a picnic shelter with restrooms, a significant playground unit, and a discovery play area.

Project Justification

Dream Park is located in a low income, traditionally underserved neighborhood in Greenville. Through the concerted efforts of the Community Development Department and members of the neighborhood there have been significant improvements to this community generally. The improvements planned at Dream Park will become one more important factor in this ongoing neighborhood re-development, and contribute to the overall revitalization of the general area.

The surrounding neighborhood is characterized by a number of churches, single family dwellings with a large population of children, and a homeless shelter. The nearest park with amenities suitable for independent play by these children is two miles away across major roadways. This makes park access for neighborhood children impractical. The homeless shelter serves families with children who currently have nowhere to go or play during the summer months. The revitalization of Dream Park will greatly contribute to providing healthful and educational activities for these individuals.

The public meetings held to develop a Master Plan for Dream Park were well attended. Both the neighborhood and local ministers were very vocal around the need to provide adequate, safe, and accessible park amenities for the children in this neighborhood. The local churches were very interested in using these facilities to promote community gatherings and to extend their ministries to individuals from the homeless shelter.

There is also significant support for this project in the community at large. The Jack & Jill Foundation has expressed strong interest in being a project partner and providing a significant level of funding for this project. There is also support from Greenville's corporate community for funding project components. Because the exact amounts of this anticipate support has not been determined, and because this portion of the funding would be above the required match amount, these funds are not included on the "Source of Applicant's Matching Fund" sheet, but they will very likely become a part of the final project.

Dream Park can, and should, be much more than just a dream. The revitalization of Dream Park will be an important boost to the neighborhood, and for the first time it will serve the neighborhood in a positive, productive manner.

#4 - Project Costs Dream Park Renovation - City of Greenville December 2011

| Project Elements (Include specific units - sizes, numbers, lengths, etc for each item.) | Unit | Unit Cost | Total Item Cost |
|--|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Building and/or Renovating Costs | | | |
| Playground Area; Medium Sized Playground (35-50 children) with poured-in-place surfacing and Discovery Play Area | Lump Sum | \$105,000 | \$105,000 |
| Medium Shelter w/ Restroom | Lump Sum | \$124,000 | \$124,000 |
| Spray Ground; Medium sized custom sprayground with concrete pad and filtration vault | Lump Sum | \$350,000 | \$350,000 |
| Walking Trail; 8' Wide paved trail, 1,340 Ln. Ft. long | Sq. Ft. | \$5 | \$35,500 |
| Memorial Plaza | Sq. Ft. | \$12 | \$27,400 |
| New Perimeter Fencing; Vinyl coated, 5ft height | Ln. Ft. | \$12 | \$12,000 |
| Site Landscaping; Trees, shrubs, groundcover and sod | Lump Sum | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| Site Lighting and Security Cameras; Two security cameras | Lump Sum | \$12,000 | \$12,000 |
| Paved Parking Lot | Sq. Ft. | \$3 | \$68,000 |
| Costs | to Develop the Project | | \$738,900 |
| Contingency for the Cost of Building / Renovating | | | |
| Contingency (not to exceed 5% of the cost to develop the project) | 3% | \$22,167 | \$22,167 |
| Value of Land to be Purchased or Donated | | | |
| Land Purchased | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Planning and Incidental Land Acquisition Costs | | | |
| Construction management, site planning, preliminary design, survey and appraisals, or the cost of preparing the application (not to exceed 20% of the cost of the project) | 3% | \$23,833 | \$23,833 |
| | Total F | Project Cost | \$784,900 |
| Total | PARTF Gra | ant Request | \$250,000 |
| | Total I | _ocal Match | \$534,900 |

#5 - Sources of the Applicant's Matching Funds

Use the format below to show the sources of your matching funds. Please indicate if these funds are currently available or are the funds yet to be approved. If funds are yet to be approved, list the date for approval.

Applicant: <u>City of Greenville</u> Project's Title: <u>Dream Park Renovation</u>

| Type of Matching Funds | Amount of Funds | Funding Source | Availability |
|------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| Cash | \$ 534,900 | City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) | City's Approved CIP |
| Total Matching Funds | \$534,900 | | |

Sources of the Applicants Matching Funds (Example)

*PARTF allows other state and federal funding to be used as local match.

PARTF Greenville, Greenville real 19, N.C Site Plan 2011 Park Recreation Ren Qo

December





#7 - Site Location Map

Dream Park 1711 Chestnut St. Greenville, N.C. Latitude/Longitude: 35° 36'15"N/ 77° 23'19"W



#8 - PARTF Scoring System for Grants

The members of the N.C. Parks and Recreation Authority use the PARTF scoring system as one of several tools to select grant recipients. Please provide all of the information requested for each item. Attach a separate page if more space is needed to address any item. Before beginning, please refer to the "Definition of Terms" beginning on page 27. A team of PARTF staff and regional consultants will evaluate each application based on the scoring system and make the final decision about the applicant's score.

Preparing an application for a PARTF grant is more than simply completing the application form. Creating a proposal for a high quality park and recreation project requires adequate time to collect public input, review the results, and then properly plan for the project. You should also allow time to prepare the support documents that are vital in the evaluation of your application.

The planning and public involvement process has many benefits including:

- New recreational opportunities can be based on community preferences
- New parks can be located to respond to current deficiencies and future demands
- Recreational facilities can be built to meet the expectations of park visitors and minimize harm to the environment and
- PARTF funds can be used more efficiently.

| PARTF Scoring System for Grants | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Applicant: City of Greenville | | | | |
| Project: Dream Park Renovation | | | | |
| A. Planning: (20 possible points) | | | | |
| Master Plan for the park and/or greenway system (10 points) This item does not apply for applications proposing only land acquisition Please refer to pages 28-29 for the required components of the plan | | | | |
| a. X The applicant has a master plan created or revised within the past five years for the project site and the project conforms to the plan. | | | | |
| Date the plan was produced: <u>12/7/2011</u> (9 points) or | | | | |
| b. The applicant has a master plan created or revised within the past six years to ten years for the project site and the project conforms to the plan. | | | | |
| Date the plan was produced: (4 points) | | | | |
| c. \boxtimes The local governing board has adopted the master plan. | | | | |
| Date the plan was adopted/accepted : $1/9/2012$ (1 point) | | | | |
| Documentation Required: | | | | |
| 1. Three copies of the park master plan or greenway system plan. | | | | |
| Three copies of the local governing board's meeting minutes or resolution as documentation of the adoption or acceptance. | | | | |
| List the page number(s) and tab or highlight where the project is referenced in the plan. All of the master plan is in reference to this project. | | | | |

| | Comprehensive systemwide parks and recreation plan for the local government's jurisdiction (7 points) Please refer to page 29 for the required components of the plan |
|----|---|
| | a. X The applicant has a Comprehensive Systemwide Parks and Recreation Plan and the project conforms to the plan. |
| | Date the plan was produced: <u>9/2008</u> (6 points) |
| | b. 🛛 The local governing board has adopted the systemwide plan. |
| | Date the plan was adopted/accepted: <u>11/2008</u> (1 point) |
| | Documentation Required: Three copies of the comprehensive systemwide parks and recreation plan produced or revised in the past 10 years. Three copies of the local governing board's meeting minutes or resolution as documentation of the official adoption or acceptance. List the page number(s) and tab or highlight where the project is referenced in the plan. PROJECT IS REFERENCED ON PAGES: EX-2, 1-2, 1-18, 1-21, 1-28 & 4-8 |
| 3. | 3-5 year capital improvement plan for parks and recreation (3 points) Please refer to page 29 for the required components of the plan |
| | The applicant has a 3-5 year parks and recreation plan or a capital improvements plan for parks and recreation and the project is identified in the plan. |
| | Date the plan was adopted/accepted: <u>6/10/2010</u> (3 points) |
| | Documentation Required: Three copies of the capital improvement plan. Three copies of the local governing board's meeting minutes or resolution as documentation of their adoption or acceptance. List the page number(s) and tab or highlight where the project is referenced in the plan. PROJECT IS REFERENCED ON PAGES: RP SUM-1, RP-18, & 9 |
| в. | Level of public involvement in developing and supporting the project: (15 possible points) |
| | 1. Public meetings (5 points): |
| | The applicant conducted a public meeting(s) exclusively for discussing the project and obtaining comments. The public supported the project. |
| | Date of the meeting(s): 1 st Public Meeting: <u>8/16/2011</u> 2 nd Public Meeting: <u>10/20/2011</u> 3 rd Public Meeting: <u>12/13/2011</u> |
| | Documentation Required: 1. Provide a title page that gives the name of applicant, the name of the project and identifies the document as "Public Meetings." |
| | Three copies of the newspaper advertisement or a document describing the other means used to widely advertise the meeting. Three copies of the minutes, including the discussion of the project, who was present and public comments. |

| o Please fe | efer to page 30 for the | required compor | nents of the survey |
|---|--|--|---|
| applicant's juri | a survey to determine sdiction show that the as conducted during th | citizens support | the project. |
| Question Results of Describe number of there are governm | es of the following info naire of the survey how the survey was of surveys distributed. enough and that they ent's jurisdiction. | distributed. Give t Include a descrip / are representati | e survey he date(s) of distribution and the bition of the respondents to insure that we of the population in the local at the citizens support the project. |
| | page that gives the na "Survey of Recreation | | the name of the project and identifies th |
| 🛛 The applicat | ic (non-governmentant oups, neighborhood a pards, etc.) and receiv | ct to two or more associations, yout | local groups h organizations, |
| advisory bo | | ed support for the | e project. |
| Advisory bo Documentation Req 1. Include a title pa identifies the doo 2. Three (3) copies confirm the date | uired: ge that gives the appl cument as "Presentation of the agenda, minute | icant's name, the ons to Local Grou es or other docun the presentations | project's name and |
| Advisory bo Documentation Req 1. Include a title pa identifies the doo 2. Three (3) copies confirm the date | ge that gives the appl cument as "Presentation of the agenda, minute s of the meetings and a do not count as pre- | icant's name, the ons to Local Grou es or other docun the presentations | project's name and ups." nentation from the groups that s given by the applicant. Meeting agenda or letter from the organization included in the |
| Advisory bo Documentation Req 1. Include a title particle the doc 2. Three (3) copies confirm the date Note: support letter | uired: ge that gives the appl cument as "Presentation of the agenda, minute s of the meetings and rs do not count as pre- | icant's name, the ons to Local Grou es or other docun the presentations sentations. Date of the | project's name and ups." nentation from the groups that s given by the applicant. Meeting agenda or letter from |

4. Support from a parks and recreation board (2 points):

☑ The applicant presented the project to the parks and recreation advisory board or a similarly appointed group and received a motion of support for the project. Date of the meeting(s): <u>12/14/2011</u>___

Documentation Required:

- 1. Include a title page that gives the name of the applicant, the project and identifies the document as "Presentation to Advisory Board."
- 2. Three copies of the minutes from the meeting that include support for the project.

| C. Public recreational facilities provided by the project: (45 possible points) (Does not apply for applications proposing land acquisition only.) Please refer to page 27 for examples of recreational facilities |
|---|
| The local government will be building its first public park on property that it owns. (20 points) Yes No |
| Explain: |
| 2. The project will provide (check one): |
| a. X 3 or more types of new recreational facilities (20 points) b. 2 types of new recreational facilities (15 points) c. 1 type of new recreational facility (10 points) |
| List the new types of recreational facilities: Sports facility: Multi-purpose field w/ platform/stage Swimming facility: Spray ground Trail: ADA accessible walking trail Picnic facility: Medium sized picnic shelter w/ restrooms Playgrounds: Medium sized playground (35-50 children) with poured-in-place surfacing, Discovery play area |
| 3. The project will add recreational facilities at the park that are like the facilities that are present at the park. The project will add (check one): |
| a. 3 or more types of recreational facilities (12 points) b. 2 types of recreational facilities (8 points) c. 1 type of recreational facility (4 points) |
| List the types of recreational facilities: <u>N/A</u> |
| 4. The project will provide major renovation of (check one): |
| a. 3 or more types of recreational facilities (8 points) b. 2 types of recreational facilities (6 points) c. 1 type of recreational facility (4 points) |
| List the recreational facilities to be renovated and why each renovation is needed: The current playground will be replaced by a larger playground and a discovery play area. The current playground is not large enough to meet the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods, nor is it ADA compliant or up to ASTM standards. The proposed play areas will address ADA and playground safety standards as well as increase interest in the park. |
| The project will provide a trail or greenway (1/4 mile or longer) that links to existing recreation area(s), school(s), downtown businesses, and/or communities located outside of the park. (5 points) |
| 🗌 Yes 🖾 No |
| Site plan must show trail linkage. Also, please identify by name and location the existing trail and areas to be linked by the proposed trail: |

L

| D. | The | e Sui | tability of the Site for the Proposed Project. (5 possible points) |
|----|-----|------------------------------|--|
| | 1. | \boxtimes | The site is suited for the proposed development with minimal adverse impact to the environment. (1 point) |
| | 2. | | The location of the site enhances the park and the public's access to the park. Describe how the location of the site will enhance the park and the public's access to the park. (1 point) |
| | 3. | \boxtimes | The site is enhanced by the adjacent property uses. Describe the uses of the adjacent property and how they will enhance the park. (1 point) |
| | 4. | | The proposed site is large enough to adequately accommodate the proposed development. The proposed project will require minimal site preparation considering the geographic region where it is located. (1 point) |
| | 5. | | The site is free of restrictive easements, overhead power lines, or other intrusions that would limit the proposed development or cause a safety hazard for users. (1 point) |
| | | Betv | applicant must adequately address each of the five criteria: veen the 1940's through the 1960's the site has historically been a school ground in an urban neighborhood. As a result, there is no adverse impact to the |
| | | The The child child | site is located in a dense, urban environment with walk-in park access. site is adjacent to a residential neighborhood with a considerable number of dren. It is also near numerous churches and a homeless shelter that houses dren with their mothers. Considerable interest has been expressed from all ential users. |
| | | This deve com | park with be an "active" park with amenities designed for active recreation. While elopment will use a large portion of the site, there will be an undeveloped mon area that will serve as a multipurpose field. The site is flat and requires no removal for development. Site preparation will be minimal. |
| | | Thei as a | re are no easements or other restrictions on the site. It has historically been used school yard for what used to be an elementary school so it is ready for re- tion into an active park. |
| | | | |
| | | | licant's commitment to operating and maintaining the project. ible points) |
| | 1 | . 🛛 | The applicant has a full-time parks and recreation department that will manage the project site to provide programming and to ensure adequate operation and maintenance. (15 points) |
| | 2. | | The applicant has a full-time staff, such as a public works, who will manage the project site to ensure adequate operation and maintenance. (8 points) |
| | 3. | | The applicant will manage the project site with part-time staff or by contractual agreement to ensure adequate operation and maintenance. (4 points) |
| | 4. | | An organized volunteer group, such as a civic group or youth sports association, will operate and maintain the site. (2 points) |

Provide the name of the organization that will operate and maintain the site:

The Park Services Division of Greenville Recreation & Parks has a fully skilled maintenance staff, providing routine preventative maintenance and specialized maintenance services.

If the applicant is not going to operate the site with full-time staff, (see # 3 & #4), describe how and when the site will be open to the general public.

| F. Land Acquisition (if applicable) (15 possible points) | |
|---|--|
| If not purchased at this time, a significant natural, cultural, recreational, scenic or highly-threatened resource will be used for other purposes. (15 points) | |
| The site is an excellent natural and/or recreational resource. (10 points) | |
| 3. The site is an average natural and/or recreational resource. (5 points) | |
| Describe in detail why the site's resources should receive 5, 10, or 15 points: N/A | |
| | |
| | |

#9 - Environmental Review

Project Name Dream Park Renovation Local Government City of Greenville

<u>All applicants</u> who are proposing to develop any facilities with a PARTF grant must provide the following information to help determine the proposed project's impact on the environment. Project design should minimize adverse impacts on the environmentally sensitive features of the site. Each item must be accurately and adequately addressed to allow the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to determine if the proposed project will comply with the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

1. **Site Description:** Describe in detail the existing or proposed park property including the park acreage (for land and water), topography, streams, lakes and any significant natural resources that are on or adjacent to the site. Attach a separate page if needed.

Dream park is a 2.4 acre mini park that directly serves the Higgs neighborhood and surrounding areas. The park has a flat topography with no streams, lakes or significant natural resources. The Dream Park Renovation will be an important factor in the ongoing neighborhood re-development in West Greenville. The renovation will include a sprayground, improved multipurpose field, picnic shelter, significant playground unit, and a discovery play area. These amenities will make the park more "active" and assist with filling the need for more equitable parks in West Greenville. This project will also satisfy the demand for a sprayground in Greenville.

2. **Past/Current Property Use:** What are the past/current uses of the property? Examples: Urban/developed, forest, agricultural, industrial site, landfill, water, or wetland. Attach a separate page if needed.

Also, if the property has been contaminated (examples: brownfield sites), all clean up actions must be completed before a PARTF project can begin. Use this space to describe any clean up actions that are needed.

The property was originally urban/developed. The City purchased the property from the Higgs Brothers in 1941, to be used as the site for a sub-fire station in West Greenville. The fire station occupied the property until the 1980's. Then in the late 1990's minimal playground equipment was installed on the property as a part of the Weed and Seed program. Since then there has been no new development to the property or park.

3. **Wetlands:** Describe any wetland areas on the site including the acreage (see "Resources" on page 5 for help in identifying wetlands). Describe any disturbance of wetlands needed to develop the proposed project. Please state if no wetlands exist on the site. Attach a separate page if additional space is needed as well as a wetlands delineation map.

There are no existing wetlands on the site.

4. **Floodplains:** Describe any floodplain areas within or adjacent to the site and delineate floodways. See the "Resources" section on page 5 for help in identifying floodplains. Please state if none exist. Attach a separate page if needed, especially for delineating 100 year floodways and floodplains.

There are no existing floodplains on the site.

5. **Tree and wildlife species:** Describe the predominant tree and wildlife species on or adjacent to the site. Attach a separate page if needed.

There are a number of mature willow oaks bordering the property but other than that there are no significant species of flora or fauna.

6. **Archaeological or historical sites:** List any known archaeological or historical sites within the project site or in the vicinity of the site. Has the area been surveyed by an archaeologist? If so, when and by whom? (See "Resources" on page 5 for help in identifying cultural resources). Attach a separate page if needed.

There are no known archaeological or designated historical sites within the project site.

7. **Existing Structures**: List all existing recreational facilities and other structures on the site, regardless of their age. Indicate if any structure is more than 50 years old. Provide a photograph and pertinent historical information about the structure(s) which are 50 years or greater. Indicate whether any existing structure(s), regardless of age, will either be demolished or renovated for recreational use by the proposed project? Attach a separate page if needed.

There are two existing structures located on the site, a building and a fire training tower. The building is leased to the American Legion by the City. Neither of these buildings are part of this project, and neither of these will be affected by this development.

8. **Utilities:** Describe any existing utility easements within the site; including the width and length. Also, describe the existing water, sewer, and road systems at the site. Describe any water, sewer, or road systems included in the proposed project. Attach a separate page if needed.

There are no existing utility easements with the park site. The Dream Park site does have existing utilities including sewer, water and electric. However, the existing utilities will need to be upgraded to adequately service the proposed park elements in the master plan. A new water meter, water main and electrical meter will be needed to service the proposed sprayground. In addition, electrical service will need to be provided for site lighting and security cameras. Sewer upgrades will be needed to service the proposed outdoor restroom facilities.

9. **Ground Disturbance / Site Clearing:** How many acres are to be disturbed and/or cleared

for the proposed development?

<u>2.4</u> acres

10. **New Facilities:** If a new indoor facility is proposed, how large is the facility's footprint or square feet of ground covered? <u>N/A</u> square feet. Also, if a greenway or trail is proposed, include its approximate length <u>1,340</u> feet, width <u>8</u> feet and surface <u>Paved</u> (such as natural, gravel, paved, etc.)

11. **Permits:** List all permits that have been or will be applied for or received, such as erosion control, CAMA or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits. Attach a separate page if needed. Include a brief discussion and documentation of your interactions with permitting agencies.

A building permit will be applied for as well as a county environmental health permit for the spray ground.

Some projects will require an additional evaluation called an "environmental assessment" if they are selected for funding. A project will usually need an environmental assessment if any of the following are proposed in the project:

- Construction of a new building with a footprint of over 10,000 square feet.
- Demolition or renovation of a structure more than 50 years old or listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Ground disturbance involving a listed archaeological site or area around buildings over 50 years old.
- Ground disturbance in or near significant natural communities or rare species.
- Ground disturbance of a site with current or past contamination problems.

The PARTF program will notify the applicant if an environmental assessment or additional information is needed. The grantee must complete the environmental assessment before signing the PARTF contract and beginning the project.

#\0- Attorney's Certification of Site Control (For Development Projects Only)

Applicant: <u>City of Greenville</u> Project's Title: <u>Dream Park Renovation</u>

The applicant must demonstrate adequate control of the site to be developed in order for the application to be eligible for PARTF assistance.

1. TYPE OF SITE CONTROL: Indicate the type of control the applicant has for the project site. Please provide a **separate form** for each deed, lease, or easement within the project site. Include a copy of each deed, lease or easement for each parcel included in the project site. Also provide one map that shows the park boundary and identifies the location of all parcels, leases or easements within the project site. Please label all documents.

| TYPE OF CONTROL | PORTION OF SITE | DOCUMENTATION ATTACHED |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 🛛 Fee Simple Title | Entire Site. For that portion labeled on the site map: | Copy of deed |
| | Parcel Identification (such as Parcel A, Parcel B, etc.) | |
| Lease | Entire Site. For that portion labeled on the site map: Parcel Identification (such as Lease A, Lease B, etc.) | Signed copy of the current lease with a written description of the applicant's authority to provide public recreation for at least 25 years. |
| Easement | Entire Site For that portion labeled on the site map: Parcel Identification | Signed copy of the current easement with a written description of the applicant's authority to provide public recreation for at least 25 years. |

2. LIMITATIONS, CONDITIONS OR ENCUMBRANCES:

a) For property owned or to be owned by the applicant, describe all easements or encumbrances.

b) For property to be controlled through other methods, describe any conditions or limitations in current or proposed leases, easements or use agreements, including restrictions on the applicant's use of the site or the rights to be reserved by the landowner, that may in any way impact the applicant's ability to complete the project in a timely manner and provide for public recreational use for at least 25 years: N/A

A portion of the park property (not included in the project site) is subject to an unrecorded lease agreement described in Schedule A.

No limitations, conditions or encumbrances on the project site.

| 3. | CERTIFICATION: (This form must be signed by the applicant's attorney or chief administrative |
|----|--|
| | officer capable of certifying that the information provided is accurate). |

I hereby certify that the information provided above and attached is accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the site control is an application eligibility requirement.

| NAME (Printed/ | Typed) David A. Holec | <u></u> |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| TITLE | City Attorney | |
| SIGNATURE | 2007the | |
| Date | January 4, 2012 | ······································ |

915605

1

Higgs (SEAL)

State of North Carolina, Pill County

| g8 |
|----|
| |
| |
| 1 |
| |
| |
| |
| .• |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| j |

have bargained and sold, and by these presents, do bargain, sell and convey to said

and in Gity of Greenville, assigns Beginning at the corner of Watauge Avenue and thestnut Street and the Southeast corner of Block 9 and running Northerly on west side of Watauge Avenue along east line of said Block 330 feet to the Mortheast corner of Said Block 9 and the corner of Watauge Avenue and Myrtle Street. Then in a westerly course along the South side of Myrtle Street to the Northwest corner of said Block 9 and the ourse of Myrtle Street in the Northwest corner of said Block 9 and the oorner of Myrtle Street in the Northwest corner of said Block 9 and the oorner of Myrtle Street and Washington Avenue. Then in a southerly course along the east side of Washington Avenue 330 feet to the Southwest corner of said Block 9 and to the corner of Washington Avenue and Ohestnut Street. Then in an easterly course along the North side of Ohestnut Street 350 feet to the Southeast corner of said Block 9 and the oorner of Ohestnut Street and Washington Avenue along the North side of Ohestnut Street 350 feet to the Southeast corner of said in North side of Ohestnut Street 350 feet to the Southeast corner of said single being the oorner of Ohestnut Street and Watauge Avenue and to the hestining For further description of Block 9 see Maplet Hiers Brothers

corner of Chestnut Street and Watauga Avenue and to the beginnings. For further description of Block 9 see Map of Higgs Erchers property by H.L.Rivers recorded in Pitt County Court House in 1924. The intent and purpose of this dead is to convey to the City of Greenville the entire Block 9. Mearnors hep Book No. 9 hep-190. To HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid fract of land and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging to the said. City of Greenville

and _______ folies and sasigns, to ______ then ______ and ______ their only behoof. And the folies and wife, Sadie Higgs; A.B.Higgs, and Wife, Annies, Higgs; and J.S.Higgs and ______ covenant that they are seized of said ______ premises in fee, and have the right to convey the same in fee simple, that the same is free from all incumbrances, and that they ______ will warrant and defend the said title to the same against the claims of all persons whatever.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the said J.W.Higgs and wife, Sadie Higgs; E.B.Higgs and wife, Annie Higgs; and J.S.Higgs

his wife have hersunto set the 1r hand. and seal. s. the day and year written.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA-PITT COUNTYA nothers Fubico in and for Pitt Soundy I. Claure Berne Supervise County do hereby certify apart from her said husband, touching her voluntary execution of the same, doth state that she signed, the same freely and voluntarily, without fear or compulsion of her said husband on any other person, and that she doth still voluntarily assent thereto. Betrimsamerylar this opplication issexed WIFNESS my hand and official scal A. D. 1941 day of wills CORNECSHIELDER COUNTR by count spion expires q t da ∭eta∋kê nase di hî STATE OF NORTH OAROLINA-PITT COUNTY. The execution of the foregoing instrument was this day proven before me by the oath and thereto. Let the same, with examination, of. this certificate be registered. This_____day of ... 化化试验 化氟 医基化 法财产权 化 10 (B) (B) STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA-PUT COUNTY , Wakley The foregoing certificate of A and The County is adjudged to be correct. Let the instrument with the certificate be registered. Macy ____ 1984 64___ day of Je Mallee gloss - Clerk Superior Court. Makel Down In Brannan Bassill All and at that W. Caller (d. 199 7.5 2 $S_{\rm eff}$ 1000 - 21990 24 C - 1.27 18 4 19 ma an an Winstanziele 영 a Bener Lancel ie #1 12 11 ASPA tions in a の日の日本とは「トロイドは 化异心酸 原因 в. 1.1 All and a stand of the stand of e Trivered 1449 B M.L. 1 18 Vice , s5, 21411-26 ß 201101 bright and addiese has been 1623 in the second him induction deal additional field and The most part of some - is took about to interfett group of that out the word last to be a such as anter sections a construction of the south landah page heighting. The Landah heife distributed international in the south the and the second second second second street ester alle allerer e die en anderdage enterstatet de . the other and the source of the second to from form of the party on the analysis and had also als :"你还没的 647933 10.686)

Schedule A

The attached unrecorded lease agreement between the City of Greenville and the American Legion Post 160 covers "a building known as the Old West End Fire Station located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Chestnut and N. Skinner Street, and a specific tract of land upon which the building is located and immediately abutting the building being bounded on the south by the northern right-of-way of Chestnut Street, on the west by the eastern right-of-way of N. Skinner Street, on the north by a line parallel with Chestnut Street forty (40) feet north of the backline of the building, and on the east by a line parallel with N. Skinner Street twenty (20) feet east of the east side of the building at the bottom of the swale."

NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF PITT

LEASE AGREEMENT

Į

THIS LEASE AGREEMENT, made and entered into this the 12th day of February, 2010, by and between the City of Greenville, a North Carolina municipal corporation, Party of the First Part and hereinafter referred to as LESSOR, and American Legion Post 160, Party of the Second Part and hereinafter referred to as LESSEE;

Subject to the terms and conditions of this Lease Agreement, LESSOR does hereby let and lease unto the LESSEE, and LESSEE does hereby lease from the LESSOR, the following described premises located in Greenville, North Carolina:

A building known as the old West End Fire Station located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Chestnut Street and N. Skinner Street, and a specific tract of land upon which the building is located and immediately abutting the building being bounded on the south by the northern right-of-way of Chestnut Street, on the west by the eastern right-of-way of N. Skinner Street, on the north by a line parallel with Chestnut Street forty (40) feet north of the backline of the building, and on the east by a line parallel with N. Skinner Street twenty (20) feet east of the east side of the building at the bottom of the swale.

The terms and conditions of this Lease Agreement are as follows:

Term.

The term of this Lease Agreement is for five (5) years, commencing on the 1st day of March, 2010, and expiring on the 28th day of February, 2015.

2. Rent.

1.

The annual rent shall be ONE DOLLAR, and shall be paid by the first day of March of each year. Rent payments shall be delivered to the Director of Financial Services of the City of Greenville, P.O. Box 7207, Greenville, NC 27835.

3. <u>Use of Leased Premises.</u>

During the term of this Lease Agreement, LESSEE shall use the leased premises for meetings and sponsored functions of the LESSEE and for other meetings and functions specifically approved by the LESSEE. Additionally, LESSEE may allow the leased premises to be used as a food distribution site for persons in need by Brown's New Living, Inc. LESSEE shall make no other use of the leased premises without the prior written consent of the LESSOR.

4. Additional Limits and Conditions.

In addition to the restrictions on the use of the leased premises set forth in paragraph 3, the LESSEE agrees to the following limits and conditions governing the use of the leased premises:

- a. The possession of and use of alcoholic beverages is prohibited on the leased premises, except for scheduled social functions of the LESSEE held exclusively for the members and guests of the LESSEE.
- b. All use of the leased premises must cease by 9:00 PM, except for scheduled social functions of the LESSEE held exclusively for members and guests of the LESSEE and scheduled meetings of the LESSEE held exclusively for members and guests of the LESSEE.
- c. There shall be no music or sound at the leased premises which violates the
 provisions of the Noise Control Ordinance contained in Chapter 5 of Title 12 of the Greenville City Code.
- d. Persons not participating in scheduled meetings or functions or activities at the leased premises will not be allowed to loiter on the premises and will be considered as trespassers.

5. <u>Trespass Agreement.</u>

LESSEE shall complete and file with the Greenville Police Department a Trespass Agreement which authorizes Greenville Police Department officers to remove and/or arrest trespassers upon the leased premises. LESSEE shall ensure that the Trespass Agreement is kept current and effective during the term of this Lease Agreement.

6. <u>Use as Polling Site.</u>

LESSOR specifically reserves the right to use the leased premises as a voting polling place when needed.

7. <u>Activities Report.</u>

Within thirty (30) days of a request by the LESSOR, the LESSEE shall provide a written report to the LESSOR on the meetings, functions, and activities occurring on the leased premises during the term of this Lease Agreement.

8. Signage.

No signs shall be erected on the leased premises without the prior written approval of the LESSOR. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is understood and agreed that LESSEE shall be permitted to install a sign, subject to the approval of the LESSOR, to identify the building as American Legion Post 160.

9. Acceptance of Leased Premises.

The LESSEE agrees to accept the leased premises in its present physical condition.

10. Repairs and Maintenance.

The LESSEE shall, at its expense, be responsible for all maintenance and repairs, both major and minor, of the leased premises. The responsibility of the LESSEE includes, but is not limited to, the following maintenance of the leased premises:

(a) Routine, periodic maintenance for heating and air conditioning systems including, but not limited to, the replacement of filter pads.

(b) Maintenance of lawns.

(c) Fire extinguisher servicing, pest control, and outside trash disposal.

The LESSEE shall, at its expense, be responsible for the maintenance and repairs to the leased premises so that the leased premises are kept in a habitable and usable condition. The LESSEE shall, at its sole expense, keep the leased premises, in good condition, reasonable wear and tear excepted. The LESSEE shall give the LESSOR notice of any repairs made.

The LESSEE shall, at its expense, be responsible for keeping the leased premises in a good, clean, neat, attractive, pleasant and sanitary condition at all times. The LESSEE shall be responsible for providing and paying for all charges for housekeeping, cleaning, and janitorial services at the leased premises.

11. ANNUAL INSPECTION:

During the term of this Lease Agreement, the LESSEE and LESSOR shall make an annual inspection of the leased premises to determine the state of maintenance and repair and to discuss any mutual concerns regarding the upkeep and maintenance of the leased premises. The Chief Building Inspector, the Building and Grounds Superintendent of the Public Works Department, and Risk Manager or their designees shall represent the LESSEE in the annual inspection. The Post Commander or his designee shall represent the LESSEE in the annual inspection. Other employees of the LESSOR or members of the LESSEE may participate in the inspection.

12. <u>Alterations and Improvements.</u>

No alterations, additions, improvements, or renovations shall be made to the leased premises without the prior written consent of the LESSOR.

13. Utilities.

The LESSEE shall be responsible for providing and paying for all charges for electricity, lighting, heating, water, air conditioning, and sewer used by LESSEE in connection with the occupancy of the leased premises. The LESSEE shall be responsible, at its expense, for the telephone charges, network connection charges, and all charges for utilities used by LESSEE in connection with the occupancy of the leased premises.

3

14. Insurance.

The LESSEE will at all times during the term of this Lease Agreement, at its expense, insure and keep in effect insurance on the leased premises against claims for personal injury or property damage under a policy of general liability insurance with a combined single limit of not less than \$1,000,000 with the LESSOR named as an additional named insured, written by an insurance company or companies authorized to do business in the State of North Carolina. The LESSEE shall provide the LESSOR with a certificate of insurance evidencing said coverage.

15. Damage or Destruction by Fire or Other Casualty.

In the event that the building located on the leased premises is destroyed by fire or other casualty or act of God, then this Lease Agreement shall terminate as of the time of such destruction without action on the part of either the LESSOR or the LESSEE. In the event that the building located on the leased premises is so damaged by fire, other casualty, or act of God that more than fifty percent (50%) of the floor space of the building cannot reasonably be used by LESSEE in the conduct of its activities, or the building is so damaged by fire or other casualty or act of God that it cannot, in the LESSOR's opinion, be economically repaired, then either party shall have the option to terminate this Lease Agreement by the provision of written notice to the other party.

16. Assignment and Subletting.

LESSEE may not assign or transfer this Lease Agreement or sublet the leased premises or any part of the leased premises without the prior written consent of the LESSOR. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is understood and agreed that the LESSEE may allow Brown's New Living, Inc. to use the leased premises only as a food or clothing distribution site for persons in need provided that LESSEE shall not charge Brown's New Living, Inc. any fee for the use of the leased premises

17. Indemnity.

The LESSEE agrees to indemnify and save harmless the LESSOR and its officers and employees from and against any and all claims and demands whether from injury to person, loss of life, or damage to property, associated with the programs, functions, and activities conducted or approved by the LESSEE on or within the demised premises.

18. <u>Surrender on Termination.</u>

Upon the termination of this Lease Agreement for any reason, the LESSEE shall yield and deliver peaceably to the LESSOR possession of the leased premises and any alterations, additions, and improvements made by LESSEE thereto, promptly and in good condition, order, and repair, except for reasonable wear and tear and acts of God.

19. Default.

If LESSEE shall neglect to pay any annual installment of rent when due, or shall neglect to do and perform any other matter agreed to be done, and shall remain in default for a period of

4

thirty (30) days after receiving written notice from LESSOR calling attention to the non-payment or default, LESSOR may declare this Lease Agreement terminated and take possession of the leased premises without prejudice to any other legal remedy it may have on account of such default. If LESSOR neglects to do or perform any matter agreed to be done in this Lease Agreement and shall remain in default for a period of thirty (30) days after written notice from the LESSEE calling attention to such default, the LESSEE may declare this Lease Agreement terminated without prejudice to any other legal remedy it may have on account of such default.

20. Liens.

٩,

The LESSEE agrees that it will not permit the claim of any contractor, sub-contractor, mechanic, laborer or materialmen to become and remain a lien on the leased premises or upon the right, title or interest of the LESSEE created by this Lease Agreement after the indebtedness secured by such lien shall become due unless the same is in the process of actually being contested in good faith on the part of the LESSEE and in any event the LESSEE will protect, indemnify and save harmless the LESSOR from and in respect of any and all such claims.

21. Access.

LESSEE will be able to secure and restrict access to the leased premises when not in use for its activities. Notwithstanding the foregoing, LESSOR and LESSOR's officers and employees shall have full access to enter the leased premises anytime to examine the condition thereof or make repairs, additions or alterations as may be necessary for the safety, preservation or improvement of the property which the LESSOR, in its sole discretion, determines to make or for any other purpose which the LESSOR deems appropriate as it relates to the physical facility and equipment.

22. Quiet Enjoyment.

LESSOR agrees that LESSEE, upon payment of rent and performing the agreements in this Lease Agreement may peacefully and quietly have, hold and enjoy the said leased premises in accordance with all the terms of this Lease Agreement.

23. Notices.

Any notice provided for herein shall be deemed to have been served sufficiently when presented personally or sent by first class mail addressed as follows:

If to LESSOR: City Manager City of Greenville P.O. Box 7207 Greenville, NC 27835

If to LESSEE: Post Commander American Legion Post 160 P.O. Box 7251 Greenville, NC 27835

5

Addresses for the purpose of this section can be changed by written notice to the other party by certified mail with returned receipt requested.

24. Legal and Regulatory Duties.

The LESSEE shall observe all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations as they pertain to LESSEE's use and occupation of the leased premises. LESSEE shall indemnify and hold harmless the LESSOR from and against any liability arising from such laws or regulations caused by LESSEE's use or occupation of the leased premises.

25. Amendment.

This Lease Agreement shall not be altered, amended or modified except by an agreement in writing executed by the duly authorized officials of the LESSOR and LESSEE.

26. Entire Agreement.

This Lease Agreement is the only agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter hereof and contains all of the terms agreed upon, and there are no other agreements, oral or written, between the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Lease Agreement to be executed in duplicate originals as of the day and year first above written.

CITY OF GREENVILLE

Wayne Bowers, City Manager

AMERICAN LEGION POST 160

BY: M 6 Cam

DANI 2/1 Printed Name: Jor C

Title: Post Commander

NORTH CAROLINA PITT COUNTY

I, Donna H. Kaynor, Notary Public in and for the aforesaid County and State, do hereby certify that Wayne Bowers, City Manager for the City of Greenville, personally appeared before me on this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein expressed.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this the $\frac{16^{4h}}{16^{4h}}$ day of February, 2010.

Daevia JI Raynon Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 12/25/2010

NORTH CAROLINA PITT COUNTY

I, <u>Khand B.W.IK-rso</u> Notary Public in and for the aforesaid County and State, do hereby certify that <u>Joe C. Lane (S</u>, Post Commander of American Legion, Post 160, personally appeared before me on this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein expressed.

WITNESS my hand and official seal, this the 16 day of February, 2010.

Notary Public Pitt County, North Carolina

B.W. Ike so W. Ike so Notary Public

7

My Commission Expires: 5/21/12

PARTF Greenville, Greenville real 19, N.C Site Plan 2011 Park Recreation Ren Qo

December





#18 - Dream Park Master Plan

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

Dream Park is a located in west Greenville in the Higgs Brothers Neighborhood, which is an established mixed use development The Higgs Brothers Neighborhood has an established mixed use residential development; the neighborhood houses an array of zoned land uses including residential (both single and multi-family), light industrial, commercial and institutional. The park site sits on 2.4 acres, which by National Recreation and Parks Association standards, is considered a mini-park. Dream Park is bordered by three tertiary streets that include Myrtle Street to the north, Chestnut Street to the south, and North Skinner Street to the west; the campus of Greenville Community Shelters, Inc. boarders the east side of the park.

The park site is land locked and there are no plans for land acquisition as part of the park improvements. However, there are plans to expand the park to undeveloped portions on the existing 2.4 acre site.

SITE ANALYSIS:

Natural Features – The topography at Dream Park is not significant, it having only two feet of grade change across the 2.4 acre site; the flat topography lends itself to potential park elements that require flat terrain e.g. multi-purpose field, playground and sprayground area, and an ADA walking trail.

The park is bordered by sixteen mature Willow Oaks that were planted in the early 1920's. Every effort will be made to preserve this mature alley of trees as they provide natural shade and add value to the parks aesthetic appeal.

Historic Features: There are no registered historic features on the park site.

Man-made Features:

Dream Park consists of two significant vertical structures which includes a 4,000 square foot building that is currently being leased by the American Legion, and a 5 story fire tower that is currently inactive. There also exists a playground unit, two swing sets, a picnic table, and two asphalt pads.

RECREATIONAL NEEDS:

In terms of size and acreage, Dream Park is classified as a "Mini Park" by National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) standards (1-4 acres). However, it does not meet the minimum that criteria of in terms of facilities, nor does it address many park needs for the surrounding west Greenville community. Dream Park needs improvements to create a functional park, provide amenities for users, and address deficiencies that have been highlighted in previous District 1 & 2 public input meetings.

In 2011, Parks staff conducted a Capital Needs Assessment of the park to identify specific community needs. Simultaneously, staff began the master planning by holding a kickoff meeting on August 16, 2011 to gain further input from stakeholders. Stakeholders set specific goals and defined preferred park elements as follows:

Stakeholder Project Goals

- Maximize programming space by exploring shared land use with Greenville Community Shelters;
- Partner with grass roots organization to run community programs with strong emphasis on involvement from men;
- Keep the community involved with the design process and do more outreach;
- Explore grant opportunities from local, State and Federal agencies, and
- Get input from middle school aged children

Stakeholder Desired Program Elements

- New Playground
- Spray ground / splash pad
- Multi-purpose Field
- Extreme Park
- Community garden
- Picnic Shelter
- Outdoor Restrooms
- Memorial Plaza / Walk
- Sand Volleyball
- Outdoor Performance Space
- Shared Program space w/ GCS & American Legion
- Improve / expand City Pool
- Miniature Golf

Though several requested park elements were related to programming, the majority of the comments for stakeholders were related to park upgrades and additional park needs. In fact, all of the requested park elements are not reflected in the final park master plan due to limited space. City staff developed the final master plan based on stakeholder consensus on the preferred park elements.

Master Plan relationship to existing facilities and services:

There is no current structured programming or services offered at the park currently, only because the park has not been developed. However, the implementation of the PARTF project provides a viable park that would provide programming and recreational service to the leased American Legion building, and provide a park in the immediate neighborhood where the currently exist a deficit in a heavily populated area.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

Dream Park serves park users in the immediate Higgs Brothers Neighborhood area. The park is not adequate to sufficiently serve the users, but given the planned improvements, the park will serve a variety of users with main emphasis on unstructured youth play and activities for area seniors. With the

proposed playground structure, discovery play area and sprayground, Dream Park will be a destination of day camps, church outings, and family gatherings. The community garden, and ADA walking trail will serve the neighborhoods growing senior population. The multi-purpose field has a variety of programming potential such as intramural sports, outdoor performances and educational programs.

PHYSICAL NEEDS:

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) systematically reviewed all park facilities in the park system to identify deficiencies and capital improvement requirements. Currently, the park receives very little use because of the lack of amenities to attract users; improvements are imperative in creating a functional neighborhood park. The specific physical needs identified in the CNA and master planning process is listed below under "Project Costs."

No land acquisition is possible as the park site is land locked on all sides, it being in an urban area. Only renovations to existing park facilities are planned.

DREAM PARK





Ź







ity Council Meeting

Agenda Greenville City Council Agenda

Monday, January 9, 2012 6:00 PM City Council Chambers

Assistive listening devices are available upon request for meetings held in the Council Chambers. If aninterpreter is needed for deaf or hearing impaired citizens, please call 252-329-4422 (voice) or 252-329-4060(TDD) no later than two business days prior to the meeting.

- I. Call Meeting to Order
- II. Invocation Council Member Mercer
- III. Pledge of Allegiance
- IV. Roll Call
- V. Approval of Agenda

Public Comment Period

Public Comment Period is a period reserved for comments by the public. Items that were or are scheduled to be the subject of public hearings conducted at the same meeting or another meeting during the same week shall not be discussed. A total of 30 minutes is allocated with each individual being allowed no more than 3 minutes. Individuals who registered with the City Clerk to speak will speak in the order registered until the allocated 30 minutes expires. If time remains after all persons who registered have spoken, individuals who did not register will have an opportunity to speak until the allocated 30 minutes expires.

- VI. Consent Agenda
 - 1. Minutes of the November 14, November 21, and December 5, 2011 City Council meetings Approved
 - 2. Resolution accepting dedication of rights-of-way and easements for Bostic and Burns Drives - Adopted

Lity Council Meeting

Resolution No. 001-12

- 3. Municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the design and construction of the South Tar River Greenway Phase 3 Pitt Street to Moye Boulevard Continued until the Thursday, January 12, 2012 City Council Meeting
- 4. Contract for on-call civil engineering services Approved
- 5. Agreement for professional engineering services to serve as owner's representative for energy performance contracting **Approved**
- Resolution approving a lease agreement with the Greenville Industrial-Eppes High School Alumni Heritage Society for a portion of the C. M. Eppes Recreation Center
 - Adopted

Resolution No. 002-12

7. Ordinance and reimbursement resolution for Greenville Utilities Commission?s Water Treatment Plant Facilities Master Plan - Adopted

Ordinance No 12-001

Resolution 003-12

8. Ordinance amending the capital project budget for Greenville Utilites Commission's Water Treatment Plant Riverbank Stabilization & Raw Water Pumping Station Improvements Project - Adopted

Ordinance 12-002

VII. New Business

- 9. Presentations by Boards and Commissions
 - a. Community Appearance Commission
 - b. Environmental Advisory Commission

ity Council Meeting

- 10. Clark Street debris pile
- 11. PAL Program
- 12. Dream Park Master Plan Adopted
- 13. Resolution authorizing the sale of 806 Fleming Street to Adrian Barnhill Adopted

Resolution 004-12

14. Budget ordinance amendment #6 to the 2011-2012 City of Greenville budget (Ordinance #11-038) - Adopted

Ordinance No. 12-003

- 10. Clark Street debris pile
- VIII. Review of January 12, 2012 City Council Agenda
- IX. Comments from Mayor and City Council
- X. City Manager's Report
- XI. Closed Session To prevent the disclosure of information that is privileged or confidential pursuant to the law of this State or of the United States, or not considered a public record within the meaning of Chapter 132 of the General Statutes, said laws rendering the information as privileged or confidential being the Personnel Privacy Statute and the Open Meetings Law

To consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, conditions of appointment, or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee; or to hear or investigate a complaint, charge, or grievance by or against an individual public officer or employee
 To consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the attorney and the public body
 Continued until the Thursday, January 12, 2012 City Council Meeting

XII. Adjournment


New Business

Dream Park Master Plan

Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton gave a short presentation on the Dream Park Master Plan during which he explained the Park Master Plan process, which included three public meetings with the local community. Parks Planner Lamarco Morrison led these planning sessions, and subsequently refined the park plan to reflect comments received during the planning process.

As explained by Director Fenton, the components of the park master plan include a sprayground, a multipurpose field, a formal playground area and a discovery playground, a walking trail, and a picnic shelter.

Mr. Fenton stated that the Dream Park Master Plan was presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission at their December 14, 2011 meeting. At that meeting the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the plan.

A motion to adopt the Dream Park Master Plan was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Blackburn. The motion was then approved by unanimous vote.



CITY OF GREENVILLE NORTH CAROLINA

CERTIFICATION OF THE CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that I am the duly appointed and acting City Clerk of the City of Greenville, North Carolina, and as such I am the legal custodian of the Official Minutes and Records of the City of Greenville, North Carolina. I further attest and certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the proposed minutes (or an excerpt thereof) for the January 9, 2012 meeting of the Greenville City Council. Official Minutes can be provided once they have been approved by the City Council.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the City of Greenville, North Carolina on this the 20th day of January , 2012.

anual

Carol L. Barwick, CMC City Clerk



Page 1 of 1

Lity Council Meeting

Resolution No. 001-12

- 3. Municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the design and construction of the South Tar River Greenway Phase 3 Pitt Street to Moye Boulevard Continued until the Thursday, January 12, 2012 City Council Meeting
- 4. Contract for on-call civil engineering services Approved
- 5. Agreement for professional engineering services to serve as owner's representative for energy performance contracting **Approved**
- Resolution approving a lease agreement with the Greenville Industrial-Eppes High School Alumni Heritage Society for a portion of the C. M. Eppes Recreation Center
 - Adopted

Resolution No. 002-12

7. Ordinance and reimbursement resolution for Greenville Utilities Commission?s Water Treatment Plant Facilities Master Plan - Adopted

Ordinance No 12-001

Resolution 003-12

8. Ordinance amending the capital project budget for Greenville Utilites Commission's Water Treatment Plant Riverbank Stabilization & Raw Water Pumping Station Improvements Project - Adopted

Ordinance 12-002

VII. New Business

- 9. Presentations by Boards and Commissions
 - a. Community Appearance Commission
 - b. Environmental Advisory Commission

ity Council Meeting

- 10. Clark Street debris pile
- 11. PAL Program
- 12. Dream Park Master Plan Adopted
- 13. Resolution authorizing the sale of 806 Fleming Street to Adrian Barnhill Adopted

Resolution 004-12

14. Budget ordinance amendment #6 to the 2011-2012 City of Greenville budget (Ordinance #11-038) - Adopted

Ordinance No. 12-003

- 10. Clark Street debris pile
- VIII. Review of January 12, 2012 City Council Agenda
- IX. Comments from Mayor and City Council
- X. City Manager's Report
- XI. Closed Session To prevent the disclosure of information that is privileged or confidential pursuant to the law of this State or of the United States, or not considered a public record within the meaning of Chapter 132 of the General Statutes, said laws rendering the information as privileged or confidential being the Personnel Privacy Statute and the Open Meetings Law

To consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, conditions of appointment, or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee; or to hear or investigate a complaint, charge, or grievance by or against an individual public officer or employee
To consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege between the attorney and the public body
Continued until the Thursday, January 12, 2012 City Council Meeting

XII. Adjournment



New Business

Dream Park Master Plan

Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton gave a short presentation on the Dream Park Master Plan during which he explained the Park Master Plan process, which included three public meetings with the local community. Parks Planner Lamarco Morrison led these planning sessions, and subsequently refined the park plan to reflect comments received during the planning process.

As explained by Director Fenton, the components of the park master plan include a sprayground, a multipurpose field, a formal playground area and a discovery playground, a walking trail, and a picnic shelter.

Mr. Fenton stated that the Dream Park Master Plan was presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission at their December 14, 2011 meeting. At that meeting the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the plan.

A motion to adopt the Dream Park Master Plan was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Blackburn. The motion was then approved by unanimous vote.



CITY OF GREENVILLE NORTH CAROLINA

CERTIFICATION OF THE CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that I am the duly appointed and acting City Clerk of the City of Greenville, North Carolina, and as such I am the legal custodian of the Official Minutes and Records of the City of Greenville, North Carolina. I further attest and certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the proposed minutes (or an excerpt thereof) for the January 9, 2012 meeting of the Greenville City Council. Official Minutes can be provided once they have been approved by the City Council.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the City of Greenville, North Carolina on this the 20th day of January , 2012.

anual

Carol L. Barwick, CMC City Clerk



Page 1 of 1

MINUTES ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL

Greenville, NC November 6, 2008

The Greenville City Council met in a regular meeting on the above date at 7:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, third floor of City Hall, with Mayor Patricia C. Dunn presiding. The meeting was called to order, followed by a lighting of a candle for Alzheimer's Awareness Month and Alzheimer's Caregiver Month, prayer by Council Member Kittrell and the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The following were present.

Mayor Patricia C. Dunn Mayor Pro-Tem Mildred A. Council Council Member Rose H. Glover Council Member Max Joyner, Jr. Council Member Bryant Kittrell Council Member Calvin Mercer Council Member Larry Spell Wayne Bowers, City Manager Wanda T. Elks, City Clerk Dave Holec, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Council Member Joyner to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

The graduates of the second annual Greenville Citizens Academy were presented graduation certificates.

Mr. Phillip Worthington of the Greenville Police Department was presented a retirement plaque for 30 years of service.

Messrs. Eric Griffin and Brian Harrell were presented certificates of appreciation for a successful City of Greenville United Way campaign in which over \$83,000 was raised.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE BICYCLE FRIENDLY TASK FORCE

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to appoint Phillip Rogers to replace Karen Stokes and to appoint Bill Bagnell as the at-large member on the Bicycle Friendly Task Force. Motion carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Community Appearance Commission

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to appoint Myron Casper to the Community Appearance Commission to fill an unexpired term that expires April 2010. Motion carried unanimously.

Pitt-Greenville Convention and Visitors Authority

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Spell to recommend to the County that Misbah Hashmi be appointed to the Pitt-Greenville Convention and Visitors Authority for the "owner/operator of hotel/motel" slot that expires July 2011, replacing Dawn Cribari. Motion carried unanimously.

Police Community Relations Committee

Council Member Spell announced the appointment of Patrick Pertalion to the Police Community Relations Committee for a first two-year term to expire October 2010, replacing Michael McCammon, who is ineligible for reappointment.

Recreation and Parks Commission

Council Member Larry Spell asked that the appointment to the Recreation and Parks Commission be continued until the December 11, 2008 meeting.

Redevelopment Commission

It was asked that this item be continued until the December 11, 2008 meeting.

Sheppard Memorial Library Board

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to appoint Sanjay Saha to the Sheppard Memorial Library Board for a first three-year term to expire October 2011, replacing Don Marr, who is ineligible for reappointment. Motion carried unanimously.

Youth Council

Mayor Pro-Tem Council asked that the appointments to the Youth Council be continued until December.

NOMINATIONS FOR THE PITT-GREENVILLE CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY CHAIRMAN – CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 2008

Mayor Pro-Tem Council asked that the nominations for the Pitt-Greenville Convention and Visitors Authority Chairman be continued until the December 11, 2008 meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Joyner to approve all the items under the consent agenda. Motion carried unanimously. Those items are listed below.

- 1. Minutes of the September 30, October 6, October 9 and October 20, 2008 City Council meetings
- Resolution accepting dedication of rights-of-way and easements for Emerald Park, Phase 1, Section 1; Davencroft, Phase 2, Section 1 and Phase 3; and Westpointe, Section 4, Phase 3 (Resolution No. 08-55)
- 3. Design services contract for the Convention Center Business District Project
- 4. Resolution for a grant application to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant funds to update the City of Greenville 2002 Bicycle Master Plan (Resolution No. 08-56)
- 5. Resolution designating applicant's agent for the All Hazards Mitigation Plan Grant (Resolution No. 08-57)
- 6. Authorization for Mayor to execute North Carolina Rural Center Grant Agreement for Aquifer Storage & Recovery Wellhead Facilities Project on behalf of Greenville Utilities Commission (Contract No. 1732)
- 7. Budget ordinance amendment #5 to the 2008-2009 City of Greenville budget (Ordinance No. 08-111)
- 8. Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Budget Schedule
- 9. Report on bids awarded

RESOLUTION CONSENTING TO THE REINTERMENT OF GRAVES FROM THE FORBES FAMILY CEMETERY TO HOMESTEAD MEMORIAL GARDENS - ADOPTED

Mr. Scott Buck, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance for Business Services at East Carolina University, reminded the Council that while planning for the East Carolina University Dental School site, the property survey indicated about 11 graves off of McGregor Downs Road between NC Highway 43 North and Arlington Boulevard. Upon further investigation, only two broken grave markers were found on site. East Carolina University contracted with R. Ward Sutton Cemetery Services in Rocky Mount for professional assistance. Another site visit with a local individual who grew up in close proximity indicated that there were more graves on both sides of McGregor Down Road. East Carolina University removed all trees and undergrowth from the gravesite as it had become overgrown. Once the trees were removed, Mr. Sutton subcontracted with John W. Clauser, Jr. of Grave Concerns Inc., who is a retired state archaeologist for the NC Office of State Archaeology with 35 years of experience. Due to the lack of grave markers, it was determined that ground-penetrating radar would be a

valuable tool to identify any unmarked graves and 43 potential graves on site. With help from City staff, they were able to identify seven individuals whose remains were likely buried on the property; however, none of those were linked to an individual gravesite as the two broken markers appeared to have been moved from their original location. All local funeral homes in the County that operated from the early 1900s to the 1970s were contacted, and only one additional lead was discovered. East Carolina University then ran an ad for a full week in The Daily Drum, Carolina Today, The Minority Voice, and The Daily Reflector, along with the previous legal ad that was required by the North Carolina General Statutes. The only descendant to contact him was Marion Barnes, whose grandparents are buried at the site. Mr. Barnes and his father, Mr. William Barnes, assisted in identifying six individuals buried somewhere on the site. They recently discovered the death certificate of a stillborn infant, and no other leads have developed. Fourteen individuals have been identified to be buried at the site. East Carolina University has exhausted all avenues for identifying the graves. It is impossible to contact family members of those buried in unmarked graves, as the deceased identities are unknown. Other than Mr. Barnes, no additional input was received from the community outreach and advertisements. Due to these circumstances, the University intends to place a replicate marker for the two broken grave markers found on site for Mary Forbes and Jacob Forbes. At the request of Marion Barnes, a marker shall also be placed on site to identify the general resting place for his grandparents, Penny Gray Barnes and James Barnes. For the other deceased remains, East Carolina University will install a marker at Homestead Memorial Gardens to identify those known and unknown at the site with a brief description of the original site and the reason for relocation. Space will be available on the marker if additional remains are identified at a later date out of respect and for historical purposes. Homestead Memorial Gardens is a perpetual care facility and is well maintained. The University has made every effort to meet the recommendations of the City Council in a sensitive and respectful manner. Mr. Buck concluded by asking that the City Council grant approval of East Carolina University's request to reinter approximately 43 graves from the Forbes/May/Barnes Cemetery to Homestead Memorial Gardens in accordance with State Statutes and City ordinance.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Council and seconded by Council Member Kittrell to adopt the resolution consenting to the reinterment of graves from the Forbes Family Cemetery to Homestead Memorial Gardens. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 08-58)

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY WRS, INCORPORATED TO AMEND THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN MAP FOR THE AREA DESCRIBED AS BEING LOCATED ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF EAST TENTH STREET (NC 33) AND THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF PORT TERMINAL ROAD, CONTAINING 52+ ACRES, FROM "OFFICE/INSTITUTIONAL/MULTI-FAMILY", "MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL", AND "CONSERVATION/OPEN SPACE" CATEGORIES TO A "COMMERCIAL" CATEGORY - DENIED

Planner Chantae Gooby delineated the area on a map and provided details of the request. She stated that if the Land Use Plan is amended and the property developed in accordance with the amendment, 5,796 more trips per day could be generated, which would be a 100% increase, increasing the congestion level of the people that live there. The current zoning of the property is in general compliance with the current Land Use Plan. She stated that there is a potential for

wetlands in this particular area, as it is a low spot. The proposed amendment has commercial zoning radiating from the corner, some office, multi-family and residential as a transition to River Hill subdivision. In 2004, the Comprehensive Plan Committee did an update of the Comprehensive Plan that was in existence at that time. Over 200 sites were looked at, several being in this area (specifically the commercial area where Cliffs used to be and where Lowes is currently located). The property was commercial and had been zoned that way since the 1980s. The properties were not in compliance with the 1997 Plan. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Committee also looked at Oakhurst subdivision, which had no transition between it and commercial property, and at the rear portion of the Mann Farm. The Committee took into account everything there at the time and those uses that were anticipated. Based on the information gathered, it made changes, proposing the addition of commercial at the corner of Port Terminal Road and NC 33, the Lowes site, and having transitional zoning between that and the Oakhurst subdivision. Based on the changes, they have the current Land Use Plan Map, which allows for a sustainable environment and reasonable use of the subject and adjacent properties, while allowing a variety of uses to provide for services for the area. There are other locations zoned commercial that would serve the same area. There are also other locations identified for commercial on the current Land Use Plan Map that would allow the development being proposed (Wal-Mart). The scale of the request is out of character with the area, as there is inadequate access because of the lack of a north/south connection.

Ms. Gooby illustrated a typical traffic pattern that might develop, with a stoplight at Portertown Road and Oakdowne Way on NC 33. Because of the proximity, it is highly unlikely that there will be any more stoplights between those two areas. It is likely that with the increase in traffic, people at River Hill will be competing with traffic at the two lights. There is no other way to get to this property except via Tenth Street (NC 33). Port Terminal Road is a dead-end road. An overlay was done of the current Wal-Mart property with the property being considered in this request, and the current Wal-Mart fit within the boundaries of this property. Ms. Gooby stated that there are alternate vacant sites that are already zoned commercial, such as 20 acres at the intersection of Firetower Road and Arlington Boulevard, the old Evans Mobile Home Park on Firetower Road which was zoned commercial over a year ago (24 acres), and approximately 20 acres of property on NC 43 near Bells Fork as Signature Drive coming off of NC 43. Ms. Gooby concluded by showing a zoning map of the City showing that the intent has been to concentrate commercial property in the urban core. The proposed request would bring that type of development to the periphery of the City. In staff's opinion, a service area of the proposed size is not appropriate for the proposed location. All traffic would come to Tenth Street. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the request.

The Council Members discussed the request, expressing concerns over such issues as conservation areas that were being proposed, the impact a commercial development of this magnitude would have on the area, whether the current Land Use Plan is set-in-stone or whether it is a time to change it since it was done in 2004, whether River Hill will have interconnectivity with this development, the traveling capacity of NC 33, the change in population and the development in the area since the 2004 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gooby stated that the Land Use Plan does get reviewed periodically, and a periodic update will begin within a year. There will be public hearings and meetings during the process. The

makeup of the committee will be about the same as that of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Committee, which consisted of about 25 people with a cross section of interests (developers, engineers, real estate agents, etc.).

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Phil Dixon, representing the petitioner, appeared before the Council and explained how WRS, Incorporated is proposing a \$65 million investment in this area, which will generate 750 jobs and \$100 million in revenue to the City each year. He explained the plan being proposed and that half of the project will be green. The Planning and Zoning Commission voted 6:2 in favor of this request. The project will involve 144 multi-family units, and single-family residential zoning adjacent to River Hill subdivision as a buffer. Mr. Dixon stated that with the development of Lowes, the character of the area has changed. The proposed development is preferable to a strip development. The gateway corridor has a carrying capacity of 33,500, and there are 19,000 trips per day now. Sixty percent of the traffic is east/west traffic because people have to come into town to shop. This would allow for fewer people to have to do so. Mr. Dixon concluded by asking the Council if it wants a unified commercial district or a sporadic piecemeal development. He stated that the Town Center concept will provide lots of green space, will be an 85-acre site with 26 being reserved for conservation easement. The economic impact to the City and to the area will be incredible. WRS, Incorporated has been following this for three years and thinks this is an ideal location. The petitioners are willing to make the area pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood.

City Attorney Holec, at this point and at several other points during the public hearing, reminded the Council that it cannot rely on any representation on the manner it is going to be developed, as it can be developed for any use that is permitted in the zoning classification which applies to the property and the development may occur so long as it complies with the development guidelines established by the City's ordinances.

Mr. Jason Hamilton, a traffic engineer from Raleigh, stated that he is conducting a traffic impact analysis specific to the site that will identify improvements that will be recommended to intersections. He stated that the 100% increase in traffic is not of existing traffic but of traffic that would be added.

Mr. Jeff Billier, a civil engineer, informed the Council that during the preliminary research, no wetlands have been identified in the proposed building area, as they are designing around them. He stated that a stormwater management pond will be developed behind the Wal-Mart portion of the project, which will be designed up to a 100-year storm. They will have more than 50% green space, which will help alleviate a significant amount of runoff.

Ms. Sandy Gorham, representing Wal-Mart, stated that she is the developer of the exterior of the 150,000 square foot building. She explained the sustainable features that would be provided, such as use of recycled products, shutters on skylights, methods of voice abatement, etc. This building was designed specifically for Greenville.

Mr. Jon Day, representing Bridget and Jill Harrington, stated that 1 ½ to 2 years of research and work has been done by Jim Price for a major retailer, and this research showed that there had been a significant amount of residential growth in the area under consideration. Locating in close proximity to customers makes them more successful. Some residents of the eastern side of town travel to Washington to shop. Mr. Day cited several reasons to amend the Land Use Plan—the explosive residential growth and need for commercial development in the area, the need for an equal amount of commercial property on the north side of NC 33 to balance the 25 acres of commercial property on the south side of the road, the recent development of Lowes that was not there when the current Comprehensive Plan was written, the major retailers moving into the area, and the existing five-lane road system with a potential for 33,500 cars per day. This development will improve the quality of life of the persons in the area.

Mr. Jim Price, representing WRS Incorporated, indicated that of the 85-acre tract, 26 acres will be R6A (conservation easement), 5.9 will be single-family residential (R6S), 13.32 will be multi-family (OR) and 40.28 will be general commercial (CG). There will be a great deal of green space. There has been explosive growth in the area, creating a need for goods and services there. This is not an intrusive development, and WRS, Incorporated will be cognizant of the neighborhood.

Mr. Scott Smith, Principal and President of WRS, Incorporated, stated that he does know of the other locations that may seem to be suitable; however, the business would not be successful at those locations. They have tried to take the development off the highway and put it back further on the lot to make it look natural. WRS, Incorporated is willing to provide a developer's agreement, banking references or other documentation to demonstrate its good intentions.

Ms. Amy Edwards, who stated that she lives close to this area, informed the Council that she and many of her neighbors go to Washington to shop, as it is quicker to get there. The location under consideration is a terrific location for a Wal-Mart. She submitted a petition signed by about 442 citizens in favor of amending the Land Use Plan and asked people in favor of the request to stand. Approximately 25 people stood.

Ms. Marian Blackburn, Co-President of the River Hill Homeowners Association, questioned whether it is a good idea for there to be a regional shopping center in a location that was found not to be suitable by the planning staff and Comprehensive Plan Committee. The Council is being asked to make a monumental decision that will affect the citizens forever, not just in the short-term. The Land Use Plan, which was thoroughly thought out by the Committee is more than a vision of growth for the City; it is a promise and pledge of how the City will grow. She asked the Council to uphold its promise to the citizens. She encouraged WRS, Incorporated to look at some of the areas suggested to them so that this could be a win-win situation for everyone and not undermine the City's vision for growth. Ms. Blackburn cited concerns with additional traffic problems, wetlands issues, and a cut-through street through a highly residential area. She referenced a petition of 173 names requesting that the request be denied. Ms. Blackburn concluded by stating that citizens are not clamoring to have commercial at this location and by encouraging the Council to act with wisdom and compassion and deny the amendment.

Mr. Charles Desilva, Co-President of the River Hill Homeowners Association, expressed concern about the developers' lack of flexibility to look at other sites. He also expressed concern about whether the original Wal-Mart on Greenville Boulevard would remain open if the new one is constructed. Traffic concerns were also brought up, with his stating that a Wal-Mart at this location would max out the capacity of Highway 33 and the traffic jams that would occur in the area. Mr. Desilva concluded by stating that based on what has been presented by the petitioner, he doesn't feel that they have shown a compelling reason to have a Wal-Mart at this site and they have been directed to other sites.

Ms. Rebecca Powers, who lives in the neighborhood behind Lowes, expressed concern about the huge changes in the area that are inconsistent with the Land Use Plan that was carefully crafted. There are sufficient commercial areas in the vicinity to address the needs of the citizens. She referenced a petition of people in opposition to changing the Land Use Plan as requested. Ms. Powers concluded by stating that the citizens desire preservation of this Plan and the neighborhoods.

Ms. Heather Jacobs, the Pamlico-Tar Riverkeeper, explained how a big box development in this area will cause water quality degradation. The type of retention pond that would be used are oftentimes not designed or implemented correctly, which creates problems.

Mr. Roy Spell expressed his concerns with the safety issues that would be created by the traffic to and from the proposed development. Things have changed as far as traffic in the area, and it is getting worse. The American Dream is to be safe, and he would like for the citizens to remain safe. Mr. Spell concluded by stating that what has been proposed for the area is not safe.

Mr. Kevin Dunaway, a resident of River Hill, stated that one of the things that sold him on taking an assignment with the Army for the Homeland Security initiative was homesteading, which is where the person can set down roots and stay there. He chose to stay in River Hill because of the cultural diversity of the neighborhood, and that is the type of neighborhood he wants his children to be raised in. Changing the surrounding property to commercial will ruin the subdivision.

Mr. Don Higley, Attorney representing the River Hill Neighborhood Association, stated that the Council did not have a compelling reason to ignore the 24 people that sat on the Comprehensive Plan Committee. The decision before the Council is not about Wal-Mart; it is about whether to change the Comprehensive Plan that took a couple of years of careful study to develop. The people on the Committee that created the plan are from all walks of life. The decisions made in the Plan were a result of a unanimous decision by the Committee members. The request before the Council tonight is a radical change from what the Committee came up with.

Mr. Barney Kane, who lives in Stratford Subdivision, spoke about the importance of a City having a Land Use Plan and how it should be used as a guide in making decisions on development in Greenville.

The one hour dedicated to the public hearing was over, and the public hearing was closed.

The WRS, Incorporated representatives were asked if they would consider looking at other locations, and Mr. Price explained what would be done at the location to make it attractive and unobtrusive.

After discussion among the Council Members, motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Council Member Mercer to deny the ordinance requested by WRS, Incorporated to amend the Future Land Use Plan Map for the area described as being located along the northern right-of-way of East 10th Street and the eastern right-of-way of Port Terminal Road, containing 52+ acres, from "Office/Institutional/Multi-family", "Medium Density Residential", and "Conservation/Open Space" categories to a "Commercial" category.

Further discussion among the Council Members occurred.

Motion was then made by Council Member Kittrell and seconded by Council Member Spell to call the question. Motion carried unanimously.

The Council then voted on the motion originally made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Council Member Mercer to deny the ordinance requested by WRS, Incorporated to amend the Future Land Use Plan Map for the area described as being located along the northern right-ofway of East 10th Street and the eastern right-of-way of Port Terminal Road, containing 52+ acres, from "Office/Institutional/Multi-family", "Medium Density Residential", and "Conservation/Open Space" categories to a "Commercial" category. Motion carried with a vote of 4:2. Mayor Pro-Tem Council and Council Members Spell, Mercer and Kittrell voted in favor of the motion. Council Members Joyner and Glover voted in opposition to the motion.

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY THE COVENGTON GROUP, LTD TO REZONE 4.882 ACRES LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF WEST FIFTH STREET, WEST OF ITS INTERSECTION WITH B'S BARBEQUE ROAD, FROM MR (MEDICAL-RESIDENTIAL [HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY]) AND MRS (MEDICAL-RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY [LOW DENSITY]) TO MO(MEDICAL-OFFICE) -ADOPTED

Planner Seth Laughlin delineated the property on a map and explained the rezoning request, which is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the request at its October 21, 2008 meeting.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Mike Baldwin, representing the petitioner, stated that this is the last of four steps in getting the property to this point of rezoning.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to adopt the ordinance requested by The Covengton Group, LTD to rezone 4.882 acres located along the southern right-of-way of West Fifth Street, west of its intersection with B\'s Barbeque Road,

from MR (Medical-Residential [High Density Multi-family]) and MRS (Medical-Residential Single-Family [Low Density]) to MO (Medical-Office). Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-112).

ORDINANCE TO ANNEX LANGSTON FARMS, PHASE 10, CONTAINING 4.2594 ACRES LOCATED AT THE TERMINUS OF STONEBEND DRIVE AND STONEWOOD DRIVE -ADOPTED

Planner Seth Laughin informed the Council that Langston Farms, Phase 10, contains 4.2594 acres and is located at the terminus of Stonebend Drive and Stonewood Drive. It was advertised in <u>The Daily Reflector</u> on October 27, 2008. If adopted, the effective date of annexation will be December 31, 2008. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the request. The property is contiguous to the existing City limits and is located in Voting District 5. It is currently vacant, and the anticipated use is 17 single-family homes. The population is currently 0, and the anticipated population at full development is 40, with 17 estimated to be minority and 23 estimated to be white. The property is serviced by Fire Station #5, which is 2.48 miles away.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Kittrell to adopt the ordinance annexing Langston Farms, Phase 10, containing 4.2594 acres located at the terminus of Stonebend Drive and Stonewood Drive. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-113)

ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE REPAIR OR THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF THE DWELLING LOCATED AT 1115 WEST FOURTH STREET - ADOPTED

Code Enforcement Coordinator Rhonda Jordan informed the Council that the ordinance to be considered requires the owner of a dwelling which has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months pursuant to the enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1115 West Fourth Street. The ordinance provides that the owner has 90 days to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling and if the owner fails to accomplish this within 90 days, then the City will proceed with repairing or demolishing and removing the dwelling. The initial notice of violation was sent by certified mail on August 2, 2001, informing the property owner of the minimum housing violations cited by the Code Enforcement Officer and of the remedies necessary to bring the dwelling into compliance. Since that date, there have been three certified notices mailed to the property owner regarding minimum housing violations of the dwelling. Staff has attempted to work with the owner, but no repairs have been made. The most recent notice sent to the owner was mailed on August 12, 2008, and it provided notice to the owner that the dwelling was considered an abandoned structure. There have been no calls for service to the property by the Greenville Police Department. The dwelling has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months, and the utilities to the dwelling have been disconnected since November 14, 2001. There are no back taxes due for this property. The October 20, 2008 Pitt County Tax Assessors report valued the

property at \$14,884 (the building value is \$10,974 and the land value is \$3,910). The estimated cost to repair the dwelling is \$50,000.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Kittrell to adopt the ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1115 West Fourth Street. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-114)

ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE REPAIR OR THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF THE DWELLING LOCATED AT 1311 WEST FOURTH STREET - ADOPTED

Code Enforcement Coordinator Rhonda Jordan informed the Council that the ordinance to be considered requires the owner of a dwelling which has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months pursuant to the enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1311 West Fourth Street. The ordinance provides that the owner has 90 days to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling and if the owner fails to accomplish this within 90 days, then the City will proceed with repairing or demolishing and removing the dwelling. The initial notice of violation was sent by certified mail on June 9, 2008, informing the property owner of the minimum housing violations cited by the Code Enforcement Officer and of the remedies necessary to bring the dwelling into compliance. Since that date, there have been two certified notices mailed to the property owner regarding minimum housing violations of the dwelling. On June 24, 2008, a hearing was held concerning the property; the listed owner did not appear. Staff has attempted to work with the owner, but no repairs have been made. The most recent notice sent to the owner was mailed on October 8, 2008, and it provided notice to the owner that the dwelling was considered an abandoned structure. There have been no calls for service to the property by the Greenville Police Department. The dwelling has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months. The utilities to the dwelling have been disconnected since June 2005. There are no back taxes due for this property, and the September 19, 2008 Pitt County Tax Assessor's report valued the property at \$47,101 (the building value is \$32,810 and the land value is \$2,545). The estimated cost to repair the dwelling is \$25,835.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1311 West Fourth Street. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-115)

ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE REPAIR OR THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF THE DWELLING LOCATED AT 613 FORD STREET - ADOPTED

Code Enforcement Coordinator Rhonda Jordan informed the Council that the ordinance to be considered requires the owner of a dwelling which has been vacated and closed for a period of at

least six months pursuant to the enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 613 Ford Street. The ordinance provides that the owner has 90 days to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling and if the owner fails to accomplish this within 90 days, then the City will proceed with repairing or demolishing and removing the dwelling. The initial notice of violation was sent by certified mail on May 20, 2008, informing the property owner of the minimum housing violations cited by the Code Enforcement Officer and of the remedies necessary to bring the dwelling into compliance. Since that date, there have been two certified notices mailed to the property owner regarding minimum housing violations of the dwelling. Staff has attempted to work with the owner, but no repairs have been made. The most recent notice sent to the owner was mailed on October 8, 2008, and it provided notice to the owner that the dwelling was considered an abandoned structure. There have been three calls for service to the property by the Greenville Police Department. The dwelling has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months. The utilities to the dwelling have been disconnected since December 2006. There are no back taxes due for this property, and the September 19, 2008 Pitt County Tax Assessor's report valued the property at \$17,727 (the building value is \$15,182 and the land value is \$2,545). The estimated cost to repair the dwelling is \$25,835.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to adopt the ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 613 Ford Street. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-116)

ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE REPAIR OR THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF THE DWELLING LOCATED AT 1303 SOUTH GREENE STREET - ADOPTED

Code Enforcement Coordinator Rhonda Jordan informed the Council that the ordinance to be considered requires the owner of a dwelling which has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months pursuant to the enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1303 South Greene Street. The ordinance provides that the owner has 90 days to repair or demolish and remove the dwelling and if the owner fails to accomplish this within 90 days, then the City will proceed with repairing or demolishing and removing the dwelling. The initial notice of violation was sent by certified mail on May 12, 2008, informing the property owner of the minimum housing violations cited by the Code Enforcement Officer and of the remedies necessary to bring the dwelling into compliance. Since that date, there have been two certified notices mailed to the property owner regarding minimum housing violations of the dwelling. Staff has attempted to work with the owner, but no repairs have been made. The most recent notice sent to the owner was mailed on October 8, 2008, and it provided notice to the owner that the dwelling was considered an abandoned structure. There have been no calls for service to the property by the Greenville Police Department. The dwelling has been vacated and closed for a period of at least six months. The utilities to the dwelling have been disconnected since May 2006. There are no back taxes due for this property, and the September 19, 2008 Pitt County Tax Assessor's report valued the property at \$9,684 (the

building value is \$1,184 and the land value is \$8,500). The estimated cost to repair the dwelling is \$21,755.

Mayor Dunn declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was declared closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1303 South Greene Street. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-117)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

City Clerk Wanda Elks announced that the only person who had signed up to speak during the public comment period was Jill Twark of FROGGS. Because of the lateness, Ms. Twark had left and asked that the City Clerk provide her statement to the Council.

GREENVILLE CONVENTION CENTER NAMING RIGHTS - APPROVED

City Attorney Dave Holec informed the Council that staff received a request from Exhibit Hall Managers, the operator of the Greenville Convention Center, seeking to exercise the naming rights provision in the Convention Center Development, Pre-Opening, and Operational Agreement, dated September 11, 2000, which provides that "Greenville shall have the exclusive right to name the Exhibit Hall and the individual rooms or areas within the Exhibit Hall". Associating this public facility with a high quality and widely recognized corporation/entity provides an opportunity to enhance the Center's profile and a chance to generate additional revenue to support the facility. A key consideration in any naming rights activity is ensuring adequate standards are established. If this action is approved, staff will draft a proposal that retains the City's right to select the best proposal based on such factors as the proposer's longevity and proposer's reputation and standing in addition to the monetary value offered.

Mr. John VanCoutren, representing Exhibit Hall Managers, explained to the Council how naming rights have gotten popular. Exhibit Hall Managers has been solicited by a national company to include its name on the Greenville Convention Center. This opportunity could provide additional credibility and another step in branding the Greenville Convention Center on a national level.

After discussion and questions from the Council regarding how this would work, City Attorney Holec and Mr. VanCoutren stated that the agreement provides for a cap on the revenue paid into the naming rights fund, which is to be used for replacement and additions to the Convention Center furniture, fixtures, and equipment. Any amount above the naming rights cap of \$181,473 will be revenue collected by Exhibit Hall Managers from its operation of the Center. The naming rights cap is a legal requirement imposed as a result of the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to finance the construction of the Convention Center.

Motion was made by Council Member Kittrell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to approve the request by Exhibit Hall Managers to solicit proposals for a Convention Center naming rights agreement. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO CLOSE AN UNIMPROVED PORTION OF TRIPP LANE LOCATED WEST OF GRACE AVENUE - ADOPTED

City Engineer David Brown informed the Council that a petition requesting the closure of a portion of Tripp Lane was submitted by Mr. Edgar Denton and his wife, Mrs. Elaine Denton, of 3020 Tripp Lane. The portion of Tripp Lane in question was never improved to public street standards as part of the Clark's Lake Subdivision and is used as a driveway into the Denton's properties. The Dentons own all of the property along both sides of the street right-of-way proposed to be closed. If closed, some of the lots would become non-compliant with City ordinances. If closed, a 50-foot utility and access easement would be maintained. Due to surrounding development, this unimproved section cannot be extended. The resolution declaring the intent to close the unimproved portion of Tripp Lane begins the public input process. This Notice of Intent will be advertised in <u>The Daily Reflector</u> on November 10, 17 and 24 and December 1, 2008. Signs will also be posted at the location of closing advertising the public hearing. City Council will hold a public hearing on Thursday, December 11, 2008, to hear from affected persons and to consider closing the street. City staff has reviewed the request and, based on input from all departments, there are no objections to the closing.

Motion was made by Council Member Kittrell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to adopt the resolution of intent to close an unimproved portion of Tripp Lane located west of Grace Avenue. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 08-59)

ORDINANCE AMENDING THE NUISANCES REGULATIONS OF THE CITY CODE -CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 2008

Planner Mike Dail informed the Council that this amendment to the nuisances regulations of the City Code is being proposed to accomplish one of the implementation strategies included in the Lake Ellsworth, Clark's Lake and Tripp Subdivision Neighborhood Report. The implementation strategy that this amendment addresses reads as follows: "The City will continue amendment of the public nuisance regulations to allow trimming of vegetation and/or removal of vegetation from private property where vegetation impedes public safety vehicle ingress and egress in designated apparatus access areas." The proposed amendment has been reviewed and approved by the Greenville Fire/Rescue Department.

Concern was expressed about this issue not having received sufficient input from the public.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Glover to have a public hearing on this issue in December 2008. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff was asked to advertise this matter so that a public hearing could be held in December 2008, giving citizens an opportunity to comment.

2008 COMPREHENSIVE RECREATION AND PARKS MASTER PLAN - APPROVED

Director of Recreation and Parks Gary Fenton, reminded the Council that staff has been working with Site Solutions since early 2008 to update the City's 2000 Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan. Adoption of the 2008 Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan will indicate the Council's desire to work towards addressing the City recreation and parks needs through a systematic, purposeful plan, but does not commit to the funding or development of any specific aspect of the Master Plan. An additional point is awarded in the Parks and Recreation Trust Fund grant competition process for comprehensive master plans that have been adopted by the local "governing board". The Greenville Recreation and Parks Commission reviewed the 2008 Comprehensive Master Plan and recommended adoption by City Council with one modification, that being to remove "Mandatory Dedication" and "The City should consider reviewing its Land Use Code to see if including requirements for mandatory open space dedication (common and public) makes sense", located on page 5-9 of the document. Mr. Fenton stated that while adoption of the plan does not guarantee that everything in it will happen, it does say that the City will work to make it happen. The plan lists gifts as a possibility to help in the process. The department received \$2500 from Sheetz at its ribbon cutting for the purpose of offering recreational golf opportunities to youth who might not otherwise be able to have the opportunity to do so. The Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan gives a destination and how to get there.

Concern was expressed about the need to look at aging parks in existing neighborhoods. Mr. Fenton stated that there are recreation facilities and parks and the department would like to be able to address both.

Motion was made by Council Member Kittrell and seconded by Council Member Spell to approve the Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan with the modification recommended by the Recreation and Parks Commission, that being to delete "Mandatory Dedication" and "The City Should consider reviewing its Land Use Code to see if including requirements for mandatory open space dedication (common and public) makes sense", located on page 5-9 of the document.

After discussion about the methods of looking at all strategies for acquiring property and how it should be included in the report, Council Member Joyner asked that the motion be amended by removing the last sentence in the second paragraph under 'Zoning/Subdivision Regulations' on page 5-9 and adding a new section entitled "Study Committee" to read as follows: "A study committee comprised of representatives from the Community Development and Recreation and Parks Departments, elected officials, and the development community should be established to review the various methods available for acquisition and development." Council Members Kittrell and Spell accepted the amendment to the original motion, which was then voted on and carried unanimously.

2008-2009 CAPITAL RESERVE FUND DESIGNATIONS AND ORDINANCE - ADOPTED

City Manager Wayne Bowers presented an ordinance amending the designations for the Capital Reserve Fund. The 2008-2009 budget ordinance recognizes the recommended transfer of

\$1,205,990 from the General Fund to the Capital Reserve Fund. With the budget ordinance amendments to the 2008-09 budget that have been done through October and the \$250,000 designated to reserves for Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) for 2009-10, the recommended transfer to Capital Reserve is \$884,142. Combined with the unallocated Capital Reserve Interest, that is \$1,031,854 recommended for allocation to Capital Reserve. Of that amount, \$250,000 is designated for Fire/Rescue Ambulance (\$250,000), four police cars (\$120,750), and the Eppes Alumni Project (\$27,000), leaving \$634,104 unallocated that can be used on future Capital Improvement Project unidentified needs.

Motion was made by Council Member Spell and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to approve the 2008-2009 Capital Reserve Fund designations and adopt the ordinance. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 08-118)

REVENUE COLLECTIONS POLICY - APPROVED

City Manager Wayne Bowers presented a revenue collections policy, stating that staff is already doing the policy; however, it is not in writing. The policy identifies procedures and processes for the establishment and utilization of an allowance for doubtful accounts for the City's receivable balances and the write-off of accounts when remaining balances exceed the statutory limitation. The statutory limitations will vary depending on the revenue type. Approval of the policy by City Council will formalize an allowance for doubtful accounts and write-off practices for property taxes, rescue fees, and refuse fees and establish an allowance for doubtful accounts and write-off policy for miscellaneous receivable and lot cutting/cleaning accounts.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Mercer to approve the Revenue Collections Policy to formalize an allowance for doubtful accounts and write-off practices for property taxes, rescue fees, and refuse fees and establish an allowance for doubtful accounts and write-off policy for miscellaneous receivable and lot cutting/cleaning accounts. Motion carried unanimously. (Document No. 08-09)

REVISED FINANCIAL POLICY GUIDELINES - APPROVED

City Manager Bowers presented revised financial policy guidelines that establish reasonable parameters for the financial operations of the City and to ensure that operating and capital needs are met while maintaining financial stability. The policy reflects revisions and additions to the City's financial policies. Revisions include changes in debt, reserve, and budget policies. These guidelines also include the addition of the vehicle replacement fund and revenue collection policies. This policy serves as a guideline for managing the City's finances. Having and reviewing a financial policy is one criterion in evaluating the financial strength and capability of a city when it receives its bond rating from the national rating agencies. This revised financial policy will assist the City with maintaining its current bond ratings with Moody's Investors Services and Standard & Poor's. There are some other policies that are detailed and approved separately by City Council (i.e., Investment and Revenue Collections Policies). As a policy document, this will serve as a planning tool for future financial sustainability. This financial integrity will promote a greater degree of confidence in the City by its citizens, investors, and

observers outside of the City. These guidelines, last approved on August 7, 2006, will allow the City to continue to manage its resources in a conservative and professional manner.

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Council to approve the revised Financial Policy Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously. (Document No. 08-10)

COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

The Mayor and City Council gave general comments.

Council Member Mercer asked that the December 11, 2008 agenda include discussion of changing the Thursday night meetings from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Council concurred.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Wayne Bowers reminded the Council that Greenville is getting ready to host the 2009 North Carolina League of Municipalities Annual Conference. At the 2008 Conference held in Charlotte, Greenville was one of 78 cities recognized for the Green Challenge.

City Manager Bowers stated that the economy is going to have an impact on the budget, and steps need to be taken in order to lessen that impact. He has asked the department heads to hold back on discretionary spending and to be prepared in case revenues come up short. It is still early in the year to be sure and staff is trying to look at trends to see what the impact may be. Property taxes are up through the first three months by 20%, sales tax revenues for one month are up 16%, the quarterly utility tax payment is up 6%, telecommunications revenues are up 7% over last year; however, building inspection fees for three months are down 42% compared to last year. A \$693,000 deficit is projected by the end of the year. All departments have been asked to submit two percent budget cuts to operating expenses, which does not include salaries. They are also looking closely at fuel, as there should be some significant savings there. The combination of the two percent reduction, savings in fuel, and the amount mentioned earlier that they hold in reserve will meet the \$1 million deficit. The two percent reduction includes all departments, including the Mayor/City Council. It is early in the year; however, staff is taking proactive steps to address the possible revenue reductions.

The City Manager was asked to provide monthly reports like the one presented tonight until things level out.

City Manager Wayne Bowers reminded the Council of upcoming events, including Veterans Day, diversity training, the groundbreaking for Nathaniel Village, and Freeboot Friday.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Council Member Mercer and seconded by Council Member Joyner to adjourn the meeting at 11:59 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Wanda T. Elks

Wanda T. Elks, MMC City Clerk



City of Greenville, North Carolina

Meeting Date: 11/6/2008 Time: 7:00 PM

Title of Item:

2008 Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan

Explanation:

Since early 2008, Recreation and Parks staff have been working with Site Solutions, of Charlotte, NC, to update the City's 2000 Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan (CMP). The process included 3 public meetings, a random telephone survey, interviews with area "stakeholders," and an inventory and assessment of existing recreation and parks facilities within the City and County.

Site Solutions President Derek Williams presented Council members a copy of the plan and discussed the findings of the process at the October 6, 2008 meeting of the Greenville City Council.

Building on the 2000 plan, the update indentifies <u>existing</u> and projects <u>future</u> (through 2020) recreation and parks needs for the City of Greenville. The plan will serve as a "roadmap" for the improvements, expansion, and development of the City's recreation and parks system, and help establish priorities for the use of capital funds for parks.

Adoption of the 2008 CMP will indicate the Council's desire to work towards addressing the City recreation and parks needs through a systematic, purposeful plan, but does not commit to the funding or development of any specific aspect of the CMP.

It is anticipated that in-house modifications in the plan will be proposed about every two years in order to keep it current, and such changes will be bought back to City Council for approval.

Note: An additional point is awarded in the Parks and Recreation Trust Fund grant competition process for comprehensive master plans that have been adopted by the local "governing board."

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Commission has reviewed the 2008 CMP

and will consider recommending City Council adoption at their meeting on November 5, 2008. The City Manager will be informed of the result of the Commission vote immediately following that meeting.

Fiscal Note:

The proposed Plan includes total capital improvements of \$53,519,500. These improvements to be made as funds can be identified and appropriated.

Recommendation:

That City Council adopt the 2008 Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan.

Viewing Attachments Requires Adobe Acrobat. Click here to download.

Attachments / click to download



Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan



City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department Adopted: November 6, 2008



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

City of Greenville

City Council

Patricia C. Dunn, Mayor Mildred A. Council, Mayor Pro-Tem Rose H. Glover, District 2 Larry Spell, District 3 Calvin Mercer, District 4 Max Joyner, Jr., District 5 Bryant Kittrell, At-Large

Wayne Bowers, City Manager Thomas Moton, Jr., Assistant City Manager

Recreation and Parks Commission

Jimmy Bond, Chairman Sandy Steele, Vice-Chair Sue Aldridge Bill All Wilbur Bennett Jerry Clark Gary Hassell Wilson McDowell Freddie Outterbridge Larry Spell, City Council Liaison

Recreation and Parks Department

Gary Fenton, CPRP, Recreation and Parks Director Shana Kriewall, CPRP, Superintendent of Recreation Mark Gillespie, Superintendent of Parks

Park Planner

Derek Williams, Site Solutions 704-521-9880 www.sitesolutionspa.com



City of Greenville

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Executive Summary | EX-1 through EX-9 |
|--|-------------------|
| Section One Inventory | 1-1 through 1-28 |
| Section Two The People of Greenville | 2-1 through 2-18 |
| Section Three Recreation Standards and Needs Assessment | 3-1 through 3-26 |
| Section Four Proposal and Recommendations | 4-1 through 4-19 |
| Section Five Action Plan Implementation | 5-1 through 5-17 |



City of Greenville

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Town Common

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Greenville is rapidly becoming one of North Carolina's leading urban centers. Located in North Carolina's eastern coastal plain, the city enjoys a favorable climate, a beautiful rural landscape, and a community filled with southern warmth and hospitality. Add to that the educational and medical advantages of East Carolina University and Pitt County Memorial Hospital, and you have a community that is a regional attraction. As the community grows and urbanization takes place, it is very important that the City is prepared to provide adequate parks and recreation facilities for its citizens and visitors.

In 2000, the City developed a Recreation and Parks Comprehensive Master Plan. This plan identified park needs through the year 2020. Much has changed in the eight years since the 2000 plan was completed. The purpose of this comprehensive plan is to update the 2000 Comprehensive Plan by assessing the changes that are occurring, initiating a public discussion on future park needs, and establishing standards for future park development. Utilizing these standards, the master plan proposes a Plan of Action for achieving current and future needs. The following master plan document gives the Recreation and Parks Department a road map for the future development of its recreation and park system.



City of Greenville

Public Input

The most important aspect of the planning study was identifying the public's desire for parks and recreation facilities. The public was offered the opportunity to participate in this planning effort through:

- A series of three public meetings
- A countywide survey that included telephone interviews with local residents
- One-on-one interviews with over a dozen community stakeholders
- Working closely with the Recreation and Parks Department staff to better understand public needs

Growth and Population

In addition to gathering public input, a critical step in developing this plan is understanding the demographic and population changes that are occurring in the area. One of the most significant changes that has occurred since the 2000 plan is the City's growth projections. The 2000 Comprehensive Plan used a 2020 population projection of ± 86,000 as its planning guide. In the past eight years, the city's population growth has changed significantly. Today, the City's Community Development Department projects that the 2020 population will be 106,000. Based on this projection, the City's Recreation and Parks Department must plan for an increase of over 30,000 new park users over the next twelve years.

Park and Recreation Facility Needs

As described in Section Three "Recreation Standards and Needs Assessment", a park system is typically comprised of eight park types. These park types include:

- Mini Parks
- Neighborhood Parks

- Community Parks
- Sport Complexes
- Regional Parks
- Greenways
- School Parks
- Special Use Facilities

Each of these park types provide recreation opportunities that meet residents' recreational needs. In order to meet the growing needs of its expanding population, the City will have to make improvements to each of these eight park types.

Mini Parks

Mini parks are the smallest of the park types. These parks typically range in size from one-half acre to four acres and provide a limited range of activities (playground, picnicking, walking, etc.). Greenville's park system has six existing mini parks (Belmont/ Dream, Hillsdale, Peppermint, Tobacco Road, Westhaven, and Woodlawn). As part of the public input process, many people expressed a desire for easily accessible "walk to" parks. With this expressed demand, this plan recommends the City develop fourteen additional mini parks during the planning period. Some of these mini parks may be constructed as part of the subdivision development process as new neighborhoods are built.

Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks play an important role in providing both active and passive recreation in a community. Preferably in the ten to fifteen acre range,



Greensprings Park

these parks are large enough to provide programmed space (ballfields, play courts, playgrounds, etc.) and still provide some areas for open space (wooded or open). Generally, neighborhood parks have a onehalf mile service radius, locating them one mile apart.

Currently Greenville provides its citizens six neighborhood parks (Jaycee, Greensprings, Paramore, South Greenville, Thomas Foreman, and Andrew A. Best Freedom Park) on approximately seventytwo acres of parkland. By 2020, the City should construct seven additional neighborhood parks. These neighborhood parks should be located in underserved areas throughout the eastern, western, and southern areas of the city. In addition, a neighborhood park should be developed on FEMA buyout property south of the river, adjacent to the City's new Off-leash Dog Area.

Two of the City's existing parks (Thomas Foreman and South Greenville) should be improved. Master plans should be developed for each of the new and renovated parks.

Community Parks

Community parks are the foundation of most municipal park systems. At a size of 25 – 75 acres, these parks are large enough to provide a variety of active recreation facilities (ballfields, court games, etc.), and allow portions of the site to remain undeveloped, providing valuable open space.

The City has five existing community parks covering approximately two hundred acres. These parks (H. Boyd Lee, Elm Street, Evans, Greenfield Terrace, and West Meadowbrook) provide a large percentage of the Department's park and recreation facility offerings. By 2020, there will be a need for two additional community parks. The City's property on 10th Street Extension (Highway 33) would make an ideal community park. Based on the public's very strong support for developing a park at this location during each of the public meetings, it is recommended this property be developed as the City's next community park. A second site for a community park should be acquired in the southwest area of the city. Several of the City's existing community parks are underutilized. In addition to the development of these two new community parks, the City should develop master plans for Greenfield Terrace and West Meadowbrook Parks to determine how these parks might be improved to provide more recreation opportunities to the citizens in their service area.

Sports Complexes

Sports complexes are a new recreational park type that focus on active recreation with particular emphasis on team sports (soccer, baseball, etc.). Typically, the sports complex is a large park (80 – 100 acres) dedicated to league and tournament play. Often these events provide opportunity for economic development. Currently the City has three facilities that function as mini sport complexes (Bradford Creek Soccer Complex, Guy Smith Park, and Perkins Baseball Complex). Unfortunately, all of these facilities are extremely small by today's standards for sports complexes.



Bradford Creek Soccer Complex

While there does not appear to be a need for the City to develop a new sports complex, there is a need for additional ballfields. Likewise, there is considerable interest by both the Department and by Greenville-Pitt County Convention and Visitors Bureau to develop athletic fields for tournament play. With this understanding, the Department should consider the development of athletic fields (of all types) in the City's proposed community parks and at existing community parks that have adequate land for field expansion (H. Boyd Lee, Greenfield Terrace, and West Meadowbrook).

Regional Parks

Greenville has an outstanding regional park in River Park North. In addition to this facility, the City has an opportunity to develop a second regional park on the Phil Carrol property. Both of these park sites have wonderful settings for passive recreation with access to the river. River Park North currently provides a variety of passive recreation opportunities, but has even greater potential with the recent acquisition of additional park acreage. In order to maximize the public benefit of this wonderful property, a park master plan should be developed for this park. This master plan should include a feasibility study linking the downtown area (Town Common) and River Park North with a pedestrian connection (bridge, ferry, etc.).

The Phil Carrol property has great potential for passive recreation, but is currently undeveloped. A park master plan should be developed for this property to determine park improvements that will allow public access to this beautiful site, with minimal environmental impact.

Facility Needs

The second component of a needs assessment is a review of existing facilities within each of the park types to determine if there are adequate recreational facilities (ballfields, playgrounds, etc.) to meet demand. This needs assessment begins by establishing population based standards for facility development. The 2000 Recreation and Park Comprehensive Master Plan established standards of



By 2020, there will be a need for 9 additional outdoor basketball courts.

development for most types of recreation activities. A review of these standards by staff and the public at the public meetings resulted in a few changes from the standards established in 2000. These changes were not significant. The new standards for facility development are listed on Table 3-3, Standards for Public Facilities. The slight reduction in several of the recreational activities was offset by the larger projected population for 2020 (see Section Two).

As illustrated in the table below, most all recreation activities have some facility needs. With a population increase of over 30,000 by 2020, there will be significant facility needs in many recreation activities.

| | Existing Facilities | | 2020 Need |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------|--------------|
| Adult Baseball Fields | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Youth Baseball Fields | 8 | 4 | 10 |
| Softball Fields | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Football Fields | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Soccer Fields | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Basketball Courts | 5/4 | 3 | 9 |
| Tennis Courts | 24 | 5 | 18 |
| Volleyball Courts | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| Shuffleboard Courts | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| Horseshoe Pits | 5 | 2 | 6 |
| Picnic Shelters | 23 | 1 | 12 |
| Playground Activities | 16 | 8 | 19 |
| Miles of Hiking Trails | 3.8 | 14.2 | 22.7 |
| Miles of Jogging Trails | 6 | 8 | 15.2 |
| Rec. Centers w/Gym | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Rec. Centers w/out Gym | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Swimming Pools | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Spraygrounds | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Competition Pools/Indoor | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Golf Courses | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Miles of Bicycling Lanes | 0 | 36 | 53 |
| Camping Sites | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| Archery Areas | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Amphitheatres | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Neighborhood Performing A | Areas 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Stream/Lake Canoe Trails | 3 | 11 | 18.2 |
| Stream/Lake Access | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Disc Golf | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Skateboard Parks | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Off-Leash Dog Areas | 1 | 2 | 3 |

The majority of these facility needs can be met with improvements to existing parks, and the development of the two community parks, seven neighborhood parks, and fourteen mini parks that are recommended for development over the next decade.

Special Use Facilities

In addition to the basic park types described above, a park system should also provide users with a variety of special use facilities. During the public input process (survey, public meetings, and interviews), much attention was given to the importance of special use facilities. These facilities include:

Aquatics Facilities

Currently Greenville offers its citizens two swimming pools (City Pool at Guy Smith Park and the pool at the Aquatics and Fitness Center). Each of these pools has programming limitations. City Pool, which is the City's outdoor pool, operates only in the summer. During the summer months, demand by day camp activities, swim practice, and water safety classes greatly restrict the availability of the pool for free swim. Likewise, the pool at the Aquatics and Fitness Center, in addition to being limited to members, is programmed for the majority of the time. With these highly programmed pools limiting free play, there is a need for an additional pool in the City.

Another way to improve Greenville's aquatics offerings is to develop community spraygrounds. These water play areas are one of the nation's most popular answers to the need for water play. While not a true swimming pool, spraygrounds provide a fun filled water play experience without the development and operational costs of a swimming pool. By developing several spraygrounds strategically around the city, the need for building additional swimming pools is minimized.

Finally, there was much discussion during the planning process regarding the development of a competition level aquatic facility in Greenville. Currently there is an effort to bring a coalition of agencies (Pitt County Schools, City of Greenville, University Health Systems of Eastern North Carolina, and others) together to develop a world-class

aquatic center to accommodate a competitive level swimming program. While the City probably will not take the lead in this initiative, this type of facility offers programs and economic impact benefits to the community. The City should consider being a participant in this initiative if it takes flight.

Community Centers/Gymnasiums

The City of Greenville currently operates six gymnasiums (Elm Street, Eppes, South Greenville, H. Boyd Lee, Aquatic/Fitness Center, and Sports Connection). Most of these gyms are either extremely old and need major improvements, or operated as a fee based facility (Aquatics and Fitness Center and Sports Connection); therefore, while the number of gymnasiums appears to be adequate, availability/ function of the gymnasiums is limited.

The City should make major renovations to their oldest gymnasiums. There is a plan underway to convert the Elm Street Gymnasium into the Drew Steele Center. The proposed improvements for this gymnasium will greatly enhance its community use and should be undertaken. Like the Elm Street Gymnasium, the gymnasiums at the Eppes Center and South Greenville Park are extremely old and need major renovations as well. Plans for building improvements/expansion should be developed for both these facilities. Finally, while not an old facility, H. Boyd Lee Recreation Center will experience increased demand as the City continues to grow in that area. The master plan for



The Elm Street Gymnasium will be converted into the Drew Steele Center.

this building calls for the future expansion of the gymnasium to allow another basketball court. This plan should be considered in the later part of this planning period.

In addition to making major improvements to these four recreation centers/gymnasiums, the increase in Greenville's population will likely warrant consideration of another recreation center/ gymnasium in the future.

Greenways

Greenways are natural corridors often associated with streams and waterways that provide trails for pedestrians and cyclists. The community's desire for the preservation of its rivers and creeks, as well as its desire for the development of greenways, was expressed in all of the public meetings and through the public survey.

The City has already identified the importance of greenways through the development of the 2004 Greenway Master Plan. This plan identifies forty-two individual greenway projects, resulting in almost one hundred miles of greenway and sidewalk walking trails.

With the Greenway Master Plan in place, the City has the tool to begin greenway development. The capital improvements budget of this master plan includes over \$5 million in acquisition and development funding for greenways. These funds should provide over ten



The community's desire for greenways was expressed throughout the public input process.

miles of greenway development and significantly more if the private sector could be encouraged to donate land for greenway development.

Renovations to Existing Parks

Many of the City's parks and recreation facilities are over forty years old and repairs and/or improvements are needed. While the scope of this planning report does not include detailed master planning for any of the existing (or proposed parks), a list of parks needing improvements has been developed, and an order of magnitude cost for making the improvements has been established. See the Capital Improvements Plan (Table 5-1) for a list of proposed improvements.

Role of Pitt County Schools

Pitt County Schools operates over a dozen schools in the jurisdictional limits of Greenville. All of these schools contain some level of outdoor and/or indoor recreational facilities. Many of these facilities could provide recreational use to the citizens of Greenville during non-school hours. Likewise, the City's Recreation and Parks Department offers a variety of recreation facilities that offer program opportunities that could enhance school curriculum.

Wherever possible, Pitt County Schools and the City of Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department should work together to joint use facilities. This joint use approach should be considered in planning of the future schools and parks. The park school concept is an excellent avenue for saving tax dollars by sharing land, infrastructure, and facility development cost.

Other Recreation Providers

A number of recreation and park agencies within the Greenville area are at work to provide citizens with park and recreation opportunities. These agencies include:

- Pitt County Schools/Community Schools and Recreation
- Farmville Recreation and Parks Department
- Winterville Recreation and Parks Department

- Ayden Parks and Recreation Department
- North Carolina State Parks

All of these agencies should work to maintain open lines of communication with other parks and recreation providers in the area. Through open communication, duplication and competition can be minimized and programs strengthened.

Capital Needs

The development of over twenty parks, miles of greenways, and several special use facilities will require a significant financial commitment from the City over the next twelve to fifteen years. The Capital Improvement Budget required to fund the recommendations found in this master plan includes:

| Renovations and Improvements | \$27,329,500 |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Land Acquisition | \$ 2,980,000 |
| Park Development | \$12,760,000 |
| Special Use Facilities | <u>\$10,450,000</u> |
| | \$53,519,500 |

Section Four (Proposals and Recommendations) and Section Five (Action Plan Implementation) provide greater details on improvements included in this Capital Improvements Budget and strategies for funding the recommendations made as part of this master plan.

Table 5-1City of GreenvilleRecreation and Parks Department

Capital Improvement Plan

| 2008-2020 | | | |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| | 200 | 0 1 | 020 |

| 200 | 8-2020 | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Capital Improvement and Land Acquisition | Total Planning Period | Funding Years 2008-2013 | Funding Years 2014-2020 |
| Park Renovations | | | |
| Drew Steele Center | \$3,200,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$2,000,000 |
| South Greenville Recreation Center | \$5,700,000 | \$5,700,000 | ¢_,000,000 |
| Eppes Recreation Center | \$6,500,000 | \$6,500,000 | |
| Jaycee Park Arts & Crafts Center | \$1,200,000 | + - j j | \$1,200,000 |
| Boyd Lee Park Improvements | \$3,775,000 | | . , , |
| Parking | | \$375,000 | |
| Multi-purpose Fields | | \$400,000 | |
| Phase III | | | \$3,000,000 |
| River Park Improvements (parking) | \$300,000 | | \$300,000 |
| Bradford Creek Soccer Complex | \$700,000 | | · · · · · |
| Lighting | | | \$550,000 |
| Restroom shelter | | \$150,000 | |
| Community Center Improvements | \$1,500,000 | | \$1,500,000 |
| Park Maintenance Facility | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | |
| Spraygrounds | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Bleachers/Seating | \$100,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Park Signage | \$100,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Playground Improvements | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Equipment | \$150,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 |
| Walk/Trail Improvements | \$70,000 | \$70,000 | |
| Skate Park | \$350,000 | | \$350,000 |
| Planning & Design | \$2,484,500 | \$1,527,500 | \$957,500 |
| Park Renovations Total | \$27,329,500 | \$16,797,000 | \$10,532,500 |
| Land Acquisition | | | |
| Community Parks (1 site) | | | |
| West Greenville-(50 acres @ \$20,000) | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | |
| | | | |
| Neighborhood Parks (6 sites) | | | **** |
| West Central-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | | \$200,000 |
| West-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | | \$200,000 |
| South West-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | |
| East (10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | | \$200,000 |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mini-Parks (14 sites @ \$20,000) | \$280,000 | \$140,000 | \$140,000 |
| Greenway | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Land Acquisition Total | \$2,980,000 | \$1,790,000 | \$1,190,000 |
| Park Development | | | |
| Community Parks (2 sites) | | | |
| East Greenville-(Highway 33) | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | |
| West Greenville | \$3,000,000 | | \$3,000,000 |
| Neighborhood Parks (7 sites) | | | |
| River | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | |
| West Central | \$500,000 | | \$500,00 |
| West | \$500,000 | | \$500,00 |
| South West | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | |
| South Central | \$500,000 | | \$500,00 |
| South East | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | |
| East | \$500,000 | | \$500,000 |
| Mini-Parks (14 sites @ \$150,000/site) | \$2,100,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,100,000 |
| Planning and Design | \$1,160,000 | \$550,000 | \$610,000 |
| Park Development Total | \$12,760,000 | \$6,050,000 | \$6,710,000 |
| Special Use Facilities | | | |
| Recreation Center/Gymnasium | \$2,500,000 | | \$2,500,000 |
| Swimming Pool | \$1,500,000 | İ | \$1,500,000 |
| Sprayground | \$500,000 | | \$500,00 |
| Greenway (10 miles) | \$5,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$3,000,00 |
| Planning and Design | \$950,000 | \$200,000 | \$750,000 |
| Special Use Facilities Total | \$10,450,000 | \$2,200,000 | \$8,250,000 |

SECTION ONE **INVENTORY**



Guy Smith Stadium

Section One Inventory

The City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department offers the citizens of Greenville and the surrounding area a system of twenty-nine parks on 1,267 acres of land with many unique special use facilities (municipal golf course, indoor baseball training facility, tennis center, etc.). Through this diverse system of parks, citizens are offered a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities. In addition to the recreation opportunities, these valuable assets provide open space and environmental benefits to the rapidly urbanizing community.

This section provides a detailed inventory of the Department's parkland and recreational facilities. Inventorying these existing facilities is the first step in developing a plan for the future.



City of Greenville

MINI PARKS

BELMONT/DREAM PARK

A 2 acre mini park located in the northwestern section of Greenville, Belmont/Dream Park contains a playground.

HILLSDALE PARK

A 0.7 acre mini park located on Sunset Avenue in the southern section of Greenville, Hillsdale Park contains a picnic shelter and playground.

PEPPERMINT PARK

A 1.5 acre mini park with playground and picnic shelter. This park is well used by both children and adults.



Peppermint Park

TOBACCO ROAD PARK

A small mini park located in the western section of Greenville, Tobacco Road Park contains a playground.

WESTHAVEN PARK

A 1.67 acre mini park in southern Greenville. This park contains a playground, picnic shelter, and open space.



Westhaven Park

WOODLAWN PARK

A 0.6 acre mini park located at Woodlawn Avenue and Willow Street close to the Tar River. This park provides an ADA accessible playground, picnic shelter, volleyball court and outdoor basketball court.



Woodlawn Park

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

ANDREW A. BEST FREEDOM PARK

This 6 acre neighborhood park is located in south Greenville on Oakdale Road. Facilities include a playground, picnic shelter, multi-purpose field with backstop, restrooms (180 S.F.), and open space. A second phase of this park is currently planned.

Playground Picnic Shelter Multi-purpose Field Restroom

GREENFIELD TERRACE PARK Barnes-Ebron-Taft Community Center

A 27 acre community park located in the northern section of the city, Greenfield Terrace Park offers both indoor and outdoor recreation opportunities. Outdoor facilities include a playground, picnic shelter, outdoor basketball, and an open play field. The Barnes-Ebron-Taft Community Center is a 3,040 S.F. multi-purpose building that includes a large meeting/community room with a warming kitchen. This building is used for family reunions, parties, and senior citizens events. During the summer, the park and building are used as a site for a day camp.

Community Center Basketball Court Playground Picnic Shelter Multi-Purpose Field



Andrew A. Best Freedom Park



Greenfield Terrace Park

GREENSPRINGS PARK

Greensprings Park is a 16 acre passive park that provides a trailhead for the Green Mill Run Greenway. The park is a very nice wooded site with a picnic shelter and grill. A small, unpaved parking lot provides users easy access to the greenway.

Picnic Shelter Trail Head (Green Mill Run Greenway) Parking



Greensprings Park

JAYCEE PARK

Jaycee Park is a 13 acre neighborhood park that provides active and passive recreation opportunities. It is also the location of several of the City's speical use recreation facilities and the Department's administrative offices.

The Center for Arts and Crafts is a facility for arts and crafts education and promotion. Combined with the City's library, this facility is a true center for culture and education. For more information on the Center for Arts and Crafts, see the Special Use facilities in this inventory. Jaycee Park is also the site of the city's Extreme Park (see Special Use Facilities).

Jaycee Park offers a venue for more traditional sports as well. The park has a lighted softball field, lighted tennis courts, a playground, and a picnic shelter. Its large open lawn areas with large shade trees provide a wonderful setting for other passive recreation activities.

Softball Field (Lighted) 4 Tennis Courts (Lighted) Picnic Shelter Playground Extreme Park (Ramps) for Skateboards/ BMX Bikes Inline Hockey Rink Center for Arts and Crafts



Jaycee Park



Jaycee Park

PARAMORE PARK

A 15 acre neighborhood park in southern Greenville. This park contains a playground and picnic shelter with access to the Fork Swamp Greenway.

Playground Picnic Shelter



Paramore Park

SOUTH GREENVILLE PARK

South Greenville Recreation Center

One of Greenville's first recreation facilities, this 12 acre park and recreation center offers a variety of indoor and outdoor recreation opportunities. The South Greenville Recreation Center is a 14,744 S.F. community center/gymnasium offering a weight room, meeting rooms, and computer lab. Outdoor facilities include a youth baseball field, picnic shelter and a playground.

Improvements have been made to the recreation center in the past year to create computer labs and improved fitness areas. Additional improvements to the building and park are needed.

A master plan for both building and park improvements should be developed for this facility.

Gymnasium/Recreation Center Youth Baseball Field Multi-purpose Field Playground Picnic Shelter



South Greenville Recreation Center

THOMAS FOREMAN PARK

Eppes Recreation Center

Thomas Foreman Park and Eppes Recreation Center provide both indoor and outdoor recreation activities in a facility that has a long history of serving the citizens of Greenville. The park and recreation center was developed on the former campus of the C.M. Eppes High School.

The park site, covering 10 acres, contains a youth baseball field, two (2) tennis courts with lights, two (2) picnic shelters, and a playground. The youth baseball field is used by the Jackie Robinson League. The picnic shelters and playground are used for family reunions and special events, as well as support facilities for the ballfield.

The Eppes Recreation Center utilizes portions of the original high school building (including the gymnasium) and provides several meeting/activity rooms that have been added. Currently the 24,260 S.F. building includes a multi-purpose room (used for senior activities), an activity room, weight room, and gymnasium. Locker rooms, restrooms, and offices provide support space. The center serves as a site for the Police Athletic League (PAL).

Several renovations/expansions have been made to the original building, but improvements are still needed. This facility is an important part of the neighborhood, and reflects much of Greenville's history. Redevelopment and improvements to both the Eppes Recreation Center and Thomas Foreman Park should be a priority. A master plan study for both the building and park should be undertaken to determine the best use.

Recreation Center/Gymnasium (24,260 S.F.) Youth Baseball Field 2 Tennis Courts with Lights 2 Picnic Shelters Playground



Thomas Foreman Park



Eppes Recreation Center

COMMUNITY PARKS

H. BOYD LEE PARK

One of Greenville's newest facilities, this 92 acre park offers both indoor and outdoor recreational activities. The center of the park is a \pm 16,500 S.F. gymnasium/recreation center that offers a full gymnasium and two (2) meeting rooms. This facility also provides offices for Greenville Recreation and Parks Department athletics staff. The park includes a tournament level softball complex with three (3) lighted fields, a 626 S.F. scorers tower with concession stand, and outdoor restrooms (660 S.F.) Other outdoor recreation facilities include a playground, picnic shelter, walking trails/exercise station, and the City's only cricket pitch. The park has been designed to allow expansion of the gymnasium and athletic fields. Currently several of these expansion projects are on the Department's five year capital improvement plan. Located in south Greenville on Corey Road, the H. Boyd Lee Park provides a valuable park and recreation facility to Greenville and Pitt County residents.

Gymnasium/Recreation Center 2 Meeting Rooms 3 Softball Fields with Lights (320') Picnic Shelter Playground Walking Trail/Cross-country Course Walking Trails with Exercise Stations Cricket Pitch

ELM STREET PARK

One of Greenville's oldest and most used parks, Elm Street Park provides both indoor and outdoor recreation opportunities. The park is divided by Elm Street. The western section of the park (13 acres) contains the Elm Street Gym, an aging facility that has served the City of Greenville for many decades. The Elm Street Gym is a 14,500 S.F. building with a gymnasium with two (2) full basketball courts and meeting space on a mezzanine level above the courts. Plans for significant renovations to this building have been developed as part of the Drew Steele Center project. In addition to the recreation center, the western portion of the park includes a



H. Boyd Lee Park



H. Boyd Lee Park



Elm Street Park

picnic shelter, lawn games (4 horseshoe, 6 shuffleboard and bocce courts) and portions of the Green Mill Run Greenway.

The eastern portion of the park (8 acres) is dedicated to outdoor recreation, with an emphasis on youth baseball. This area of the park includes a tournament level youth baseball field, a "Field of Dreams" youth baseball field for special populations, six (6) lighted tennis courts, and a community center. The Elm Street Center is a 4,800 S.F. multi-use building with office space and classrooms. This area also includes two play areas; one of the playgrounds, identified as the CommonGround Playground, provides a barrier-free play environment. Park support facilities include three (3) picnic shelters, two (2) playgrounds, and a restroom/concession stand.

Recreation Center/Gymnasium(14,500 S.F.) Community Center (4,800 S.F.) Youth Baseball Field Field of Dreams 6 Tennis Courts (Lighted) 4 Picnic Shelters 2 Playgrounds/CommonGround Playground Lawn Games Trails Restroom/Concessions Building



Elm Street Park



Elm Street Gymnasium

EVANS PARK

River Birch Tennis Center

Evans Park is a 24.5 acre community park that provides active recreation as well as public open space. Facilities include two (2) lighted softball fields, twelve (12) lighted tennis courts, the River Birch Tennis Center (see special use facilities), and restrooms. The softball fields are predominately programmed with co-ed softball use. Pop Warner football practices on the softball field. The park also includes an archery range.

2 Softball Fields (275'/280')(Lighted) 12 Tennis Courts (Lighted) Archery Range Restroom Building

WEST MEADOWBROOK PARK

This 33 acre community park provides a variety of active and passive outdoor recreation opportunities. Facilities include a soccer field, youth baseball field, and a softball field.

A playground, picnic shelter, and restrooms provide additional activity and support facilities. West Meadowbrook Park is also the site of the City's 18hole disc golf course.

West Meadowbrook Park has the potential for development of additional facilities. A master plan should be developed for this park.



West Meadowbrook Park

Soccer Field Youth Baseball Field Softball Field (Lighted) Playground Picnic Shelter Restroom Disc Golf Course

REGIONAL PARKS

RIVER PARK NORTH

Walter L. Stasavich Science and Nature Center

A truly unique natural open space covering 448 acres along the Tar River, this park is primarily for passive recreation and environmental education. The park, which contains five (5) natural ponds and over 1.5 miles of river frontage, offers visitors a wide variety of opportunities to enjoy the unique natural features found in this riverine environment. Facilities include gravel walking trails (approximately one mile), two (2) picnic shelters, volleyball, and horseshoe courts. Water access is facilitated by a fishing dock, observation decks, canoe launch, boat ramps, and several primitive campsites. Support facilities include outdoor restrooms (234 S.F.), boat shed (240 S.F), and a park maintenance building (2,125 S.F.).

The "jewel" of River Park North is the Walter L. Stasavich Science and Nature Center. This 10,500 S.F. nature center is dedicated to environmental education and provides visitors with a small theatre/ auditorium, large display area with live and mounted animal exhibits, a 10,000 gallon aquarium, displays, and a "hands on" turtle area. A separate classroom offers opportunities for educational classes and special event rentals. A small gift shop sells educational items and nature center memorabilia.

The Nature Center is open to the public six days a week and generates some of its operational expense through a small admission fee (\$1 - \$2), fees for classes, and sales in the gift shop. The center is a favorite of school groups, scout groups, and civic organizations.

Gravel Walking Trails (approximately one mile) 2 Picnic Shelters Volleyball Court Horseshoe Pit Restrooms Boat Shed Park Maintenance Building Three Campsites Water Access Fishing Dock Observation Decks Canoe Launch



River Park North



Walter L. Stasavich Science and Nature Center

SPORTS COMPLEXES

BRADFORD CREEK SOCCER COMPLEX

The Bradford Creek Soccer Complex is a 26 acre sports complex dedicated to soccer. The complex provides five (5) regulation soccer fields (two of which are lighted) and one practice field. A small (240 S.F.) storage building provides space for some equipment storage. Currently support facilities are limited, but plans are underway to construct restrooms at the complex.

5 Regulation Soccer Fields (2 Lighted) Practice Field Storage Building



A center for active outdoor recreation, Guy Smith Park is a 13 acre sports complex offering a variety of special use facilities with a focus on baseball and swimming. The Guy Smith Stadium, originally the home of the Greenville Greenies, provides covered seating, as well as over 9,100 S.F. in restrooms, lockers, meeting room, and storage space. This baseball facility provides a field with a "big league" feel.

The swimming pool at Guy Smith Park is Greenville's only outdoor pool. This facility provides both a lap pool and diving well. A 3,100 S.F. pool building provides restrooms/changing areas, offices, and concession stand. The pool is used for day camps, lifeguard training, and free swim. Improvements to the pool building would improve operation and provide a more inviting facility to swimmers.

In addition to these special use facilities (swimming pool and baseball stadium), Guy Smith Park also contains a prep field and a youth baseball field. These fields are serviced by a 384 S.F. restroom/concession building.

Baseball Stadium (Lighted) Swimming Pool Prep Field (Lighted) Youth Baseball Field Restroom/Concession



Bradford Creek Soccer Complex



Guy Smith Stadium



Guy Smith Pool

PERKINS BASEBALL COMPLEX

Perkins Baseball Complex is a 3 acre sports complex that provides game and practice facilities for Greenville Little League and other youth play. The complex is located adjacent to the Teen Center and the Sports Connection In addition to the youth baseball fields, the Perkins Baseball Complex contains a \pm 2,700 S.F. restroom/concession/storage facility.

2 Youth Baseball Fields Practice Field Batting Cage Restrooms/Concessions/Storage Building



Perkins Baseball Complex

CIVIC PARKS

BEATRICE MAYE GARDEN PARK

Beatrice Maye Garden Park is a small greenspace with lawn areas, trees, and landscaped beds. No active or passive facilities are provided. The park is dedicated to Mrs. Beatirce Maye for her many years of civic duty to the City of Greenville.



Beatrice May Garden Park

TOWN COMMON

Located along the Tar River, adjacent to the Downtown Business District, Town Common is Greenville's most visible civic space. This large, beautiful downtown park space is considered "everybody's park". Town Common contains over 20 acres of open space for quiet reflection and passive recreation, as well as the perfect venue for city wide special events and concerts. Amenities include a river esplanade, walking trails, a 3,600 S.F. amphitheatre, a millennium sundial, and boat access.

The Town Creek Bridge will create a pedestrian connection to the South Tar Greenway and adjacent



Town Common

neighborhoods. Recently purchased land at River Park North gives the City control of land on both sides of Tar River in this area. A pedestrian bridge or boat connection across the Tar River at Town Common would create a valuable link between the downtown business area and the trails and natural areas of River Park North. Current discussions regarding the revitalization of the downtown area could result in changes to the Town Common. A downtown planning study will provide a master plan for this park.

SPECIAL USE FACILITIES

BRADFORD CREEK GOLF COURSE

Bradford Creek is an 18-hole golf course covering 282 acres north of the Tar River. This public course offers a challenging golf experience for both the novice and the experienced golfer. Based on tee configuration, the golf course yardage ranges from 5,124 yards to 7,151 yards. The driving range, which was recently lighted, provides an excellent practice facility and generates additional income. A proposed housing development that will construct houses along several of the course's fairways will enhance the area and significantly change the character of the course. Developers of the neighborhood are offering club/green fee discounts to those purchasing homes.

The Bradford Creek Clubhouse (8,000 S.F.) is a full service clubhouse facility. In addition to a pro-shop and locker rooms, the clubhouse provides a kitchen that offers a limited menu to golfers during the spring, summer, and fall. Improvements to the clubhouse to provide better operations should be considered. One proposed improvement project should be the construction of a golf cart storage barn.

The operation of Bradford Creek Golf Course should continue to strive to increase revenues through marketing efforts and careful management of facilities. In addition, the Department should look for ways to add features, such as the recent lighting of the driving range, to increase revenue.



Bradford Creek Golf Course

CENTER FOR ARTS AND CRAFTS

The Center for Arts and Crafts provides functional classroom/studio space for a variety of art activities. The center includes a small auditorium/stage for plays, dance recitals, etc., as well as studio space for ceramics, painting, sewing/weaving, photography, calligraphy, and book making. Activities include classes, camps, and workshops for youth and adults. The Center for Arts and Crafts is located adjacent to the administrative office of the Recreation and Parks Department in Jaycee Park. Together these two components contain over 11,000 S.F. of office, meeting, classroom, and auditorium space located adjacent to the city's library. A +/-1300 S.F. modular building located adjacent to the departmental offices provides office and classroom space.

EXTREME PARK

Extreme Park is a lighted facility that provides a cutting edge facility for skateboards and BMX bikes. In addition to a wide variety of ramps, the park provides an inline hockey rink for team play. This facility has been instrumental in making Greenville the center for world class BMX professionals. Many of these highly ranked professionals frequent extreme park.

OFF LEASH DOG AREA

Greenville's first dog park, this park facility has found immediate popularity with the citizens of Greenville. Located on River Drive at Ash Street, this facility provides a safe, fenced in environment for "Man's Best Friend". The location of the Off Leash Dog Area also provides great potential linkage with the proposed greenway trail along the river and FEMA "buy out" property in this area.





Center for Arts and Crafts at Jaycee Park



Extreme Park

RIVER BIRCH TENNIS CENTER

The River Birch Tennis Center, located in Evans Park, is an excellent tennis facility with eight lighted courts and a 3,000 S.F. clubhouse. The clubhouse contains a large reception space, tennis pro-shop, offices and restrooms/lockers. A wrap-around front porch provides an excellent place to sit, relax and watch people play.

Play is open to the public for a fee (\$4/court). Private tennis lessons and clinics are available. The center also hosts a league tennis team in the Downeast Tennis League.

8 Tennis Courts (Lighted) Pro-shop/Clubhouse Picnic Shelter

SPORTS CONNECTION

The Sports Connection is a unique indoor multipurpose facility that features indoor batting cages (baseball and softball) and gymnasium activities (basketball, volleyball, kickball, etc.). In addition to providing a valuable training facility for baseball and softball, this \pm 17,000 S.F. special use facility also offers a venue for birthday parties and other special events. A meeting room and arcade allow this facility multi-use capability. There is a charge for the use of programs and facilities.

Gymnasium 5 Indoor Batting Cages (Softball and Baseball) Pitching Area Arcade Meeting Room Offices



River Birch Tennis Center



Sports Connection

RECREATION CENTERS

GREENVILLE AQUATICS AND FITNESS CENTER

The Greenville Aquatics and Fitness Center is a 30,000 S.F. full service fitness and aquatics facility offering members a basketball gymnasium, indoor heated pool, weight room, fitness area, and aerobics/exercise classes. While the building is over 30 years old, recent and planned renovations create an updated, well maintained facility.

The Aquatics and Fitness Center charges a membership fee and produces the majority of its operational costs, although some programs are open to the general public. Approximately 1,300 individual and family memberships support the facility. Through creative programming and a strong marketing effort, membership to this facility could be increased.

In addition to the free play/exercise/swim the Center offers a wide selection of classes in aerobics, body toning, and aquatics. There are also classes in karate (youth and adult), ballroom dancing, and line dancing. Personal trainers are also available to assist members in their workouts.

| Gymnasium | Aerobics Room |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Indoor Heated Pool | Classroom Space |
| Weight Room | Supervised Kids |
| Exercise/Cardiovascular | Play Area |
| Area | Staff Offices |
| | Locker Room |

THE TEEN CENTER

The Teen Center is a 5,100 S.F. special use facility located adjacent to Perkins Baseball Complex. It provides meeting/activity space, as well as a variety of other indoor activities. The building contains two (2) meeting/activity rooms; one of the rooms includes a refreshment bar and game tables. An outdoor sand volleyball court is adjacent to the building. In addition to teen activities, the building is used for bridge, computer training, and summer camp.



Greenville Aquatics and Fitness Center



Teen Center

See previous description of these Recreation Centers: Elm Street Center, Boyd Lee Center, Eppes Recreation Center and South Greenville Recreation Center.

GREENWAY TRAILS

GREEN MILL RUN GREENWAY

The Green Mill Run Greenway is the initial step to Greenville's greenway system. The greenway begins in Greensprings Park on Fifth Street, runs along Mill Run Creek, through Wahl-Coates Elementary School, across Tenth Street, and through Elm Street Park. The trail, which is paved, crosses the creek several times along its 1.5-mile route.



UNDEVELOPED PARKS

PHIL CARROL NATURE PRESERVE

The Phil Carrol Nature Preserve is a 185-acre tract of undeveloped park land set aside as a nature preserve. Currently there is little infrastructure to support public use of this facility. Development of infrastructure (parking, restrooms, trails, etc.) would greatly enhance the use of this facility. A master plan should be developed for this property.

| | Acreage | blaia lladasa8 | Softball Field | Youth Baseball Fid | Soccer Football | Multi-Purpose Fie | Practice Field | Basketball (Outdo | Tennis Courts | Volleyball Court | Shuffleboard | Horse Shoes | Playground | Picnic Shelter | γεwnອອາວິ\lisıT | Vater Access | Amphitheatre | Pool/Swimming | Dog Park | Skatepark | Pisc Golf | Cricket | Агсрегу |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| UUTGOOT FACIIITIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | | | | | | | | - | | r |
| Mini Parks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Belmont/Dream Park | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hillsdale Park | 0.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Peppermint Park | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Tobacco Road Park | 0.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Westhaven Park | 1.67 | - | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | + | - | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | |
| Woodlawn Park | 0.64 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mini Parks Subtotal | 7.01 0 | 0.00 0. | 0.00 | 00. | 0.00 0.00 | 00.00 | 00.00 | 0 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 6.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.0 | 0.00 0. | 0.00 0.00 | 00.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Neighborhood Parks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Andrew A. Best Freedom Park | 6.00 | \vdash | \vdash | | $\left - \right $ | | | | | | | | - | - | | | \vdash | | | | | | |
| Greensprings Park | 15.00 | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | - | | _ | | _ | | | | | |
| Jaycee Park | 13.10 | | - | | | | | | 4 | | | | - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Paramore Park | 15.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| South Greenville Park | 12.29 | | - | - | _ | - | | | | | | | - | ~ | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Thomas Foreman Park | 9.73 | \dashv | \dashv | - | | - | - | - | 2 | | | | ~ | 2 | | \dashv | \dashv | _ | | - | | | |
| Neighborhood Parks Subtotal | 71.12 0 | 0.00 2. | 2.00 2. | 00. | 0.00 0.00 | 00 1.00 | 00.00 | 00.00 | 6.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 0. | 0.00 0. | 0.00 0.00 | 00.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Parks | - | | ŀ | ŀ | · | - | - | - | | _ | | | | | - | ŀ | ŀ | - | - | - | | | |
| H. Boyd Lee Park | 92.00 | | ю | | | | | | | | | | - | - | 9 | | | | | | | - | |
| Elm Street Park | 21.00 | | | - | | | | | 9 | | 9 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1.30 | | | | | | | | |
| Evans Park | 24.46 | | 2 | | - | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | - |
| Greenfield Terrace Park | 27.00 | | | | | - | | ~ | | | | | - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| West Meadowbrook Park | 33.00 | - | - | , - | _ | | \dashv | | | | | | - | - | | - | \dashv | | - | | - | | |
| Community Parks Subtotal | 197.46 0 | 0.00 6. | 6.00 2. | 00. | 1.00 1.00 | 00 1.00 | 00.00 | 0 1.00 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 6.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 7.30 0 | 0.00 0. | 0.00 0. | 0.00 0.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

| Regional Parks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|-----------|----------|---------|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|
| River Park North | 448.00 | | | | | | | | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | | |
| Regional Parks Subtotal | 448.00 (| 0.0 00.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 1.00 | 00.0 00. | 00 3.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 |

| La constantina de la constan | | | | pləi: | | | | 00L) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|--------|----------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Facility Inventory | Астеаде | Baseball Field | Softball Field | lisdəss8 dtuoY | Soccer | Football | Practice Field | Basketball (Outd | , struoO sinnaT | Volleyball Court | Shuffleboard | Horse Shoes | Playground | Picnic Shelter | Trail/Greenway | Water Access | Amphitheatre | gniqmsO | pnimmiw&\loo9 | Dog Park | Skatepark | Tisc Golf | Cricket | Агсһегу |
| Sports Complex | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bradford Creek Soccer Complex | 25.60 | | | | 5 | | • | 1 | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Guy Smith Park | 12.55 | 2 | | + | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | | |
| Perkins Baseball Complex | 3.00 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sports Complex Subtotal | 41.15 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 £ | 5.00 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 2. | 2.00 0.00 | 00.00 | 00.0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Civic Parks/Outdoor Special Use Facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Beatrice Maye Garden Park | 1.42 | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Town Common Park | 20.00 | | | | | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | | ~ | - | - | | | | | | | |
| Bradford Creek Golf Course | 282.00 | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offleash Dog Area | 14.00 | | | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| Extreme Park | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| River Birch Tennis Center | | | | | | | | | 80 | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Civic Parks/Special Use Facilities Subtotal | 317.42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8 | 0.00 0.00 | 00.0 00 | 0 8.00 | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greenways | | | ľ | ľ | | ł | | ŀ | - | | | | | | | | ľ | ĺ | | | | | ľ | |
| Green Mill Run Greenway | | | | | | _ | | _ | | | | | | | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | |
| Greenways Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .00 | 00 | 00 0.0 | 00.0 00. | 00.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grand Totals | 1267.16 | 2.00 | 8.00 | 7.00 (| 6.00 1 | 1.00 2 | 2.00 2. | 2.00 2.00 | 0 24.00 | 0 2.00 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 16.00 | 23.00 | 10.80 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| | өрсөтэА | Bi∋i Ilsd∋ss8 | Softball Field | bləiə Ilsdəss8 divoY | Soccer | Football | Practice Field Practice Field | Basketball (Outdoor) | <pre></pre> | ΛοΙΙεγ ρ all Court | Shuffleboard | Horse Shoes | Playground | Picnic Shelter | Trail/Greenway | eze∋⊃A tete | əntsəntirlqmA | gniqmsO | gnimmiw2\loo9 | Dog Park | Skatepark | Disc Golf | Cricket | Агсиегу |
| Undeveloped | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phil Carrol Nature Preserve | 185.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Undeveloped Subtotal | 185.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 00.0 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - | | | - | 1 | • | | • | • | | • | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| City of Greenville | quare Footage | ymnasium | ecreation Center | eeting Room | ool/Swimming |
|---|---------------|----------|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Recreation and Parks Facility Inventory | š | Gyi | Ř | Me | Å |

| Indoor Facilities | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|---|---|
| Gymnasium/Recreation Centers | | | | | |
| Elm Street Gymnasium | 14,500 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Eppes Recreation Center | 24,260 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Greenville Aquatics and Fitness Center | 30,000 | 1 | | | 1 |
| H. Boyd Lee Recreation Center | 16,500 | 1 | | | |
| South Greenville Park Recreaction Center | 14,744 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Sports Connection | 17,000 | | | | |
| Gymnasium/Recreation Centers Total | 102,504 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

| Community Centers/Meeting Rooms | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| Barnes-Ebron-Taft Community Center | 3,040 | | | 1 | |
| Jaycee Park Meeting Room | 3,500 | | | | |
| Teen Center | 5,100 | | | | |
| ommunity Centers/Meeting Rooms Total | 11,640 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Walter L. Stasavich Science & Nature Cntr. | 10,500 | | | | |
|--|---------|------|------|------|------|
| Center for Arts and Crafts @ Jaycee Park | 7,500 | | | 1 | |
| Recreation Centers Total | 18,000 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Grand Total | 132,144 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 |

















SECTION TWO THE PEOPLE OF GREENVILLE



Section Two The People of Greenville

Introduction

The first step in understanding the park and recreational needs of the City of Greenville is to develop an understanding of the people that make up the community. This section includes a review of the City's population and demographics and looks at the changes that are occurring in the area. Greenville is located in the North Carolina Coastal Plain Region. Home of East Carolina University, one of North Carolina's largest state supported campuses, and University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina, one of the region's finest medical institutions, Greenville has become a hub of education, healthcare and research for the region. The university and hospital have served as a catalyst for growth, and Greenville now stands out as a center of commerce east of Raleigh and the Research Triangle.

Since 1990, the population of Greenville has increased drastically (from 46,305 in 1990 to 72,000 currently). With the continued success of both the university and Pitt County Memorial Hospital, even greater growth is projected for the next decade. This population growth places greater demand on the City's parks. Identifying where future growth will occur, and understanding what the demographic make





Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan

up of the population will be in the future, is key to projecting park and recreational needs.

In addition to reviewing the projected growth patterns of the City, this planning process has invested time and energy in learning community preferences for park development.

When developing a needs analysis, it is not enough to simply review changes in population and demographics. It is also important to understand the community's desire for park and recreation activities. This planning effort incorporated several initiatives to assist the planning team in better understanding community preferences. These initiatives included:

- **Community Survey:** a community-wide survey with over 400 telephone interviews was conducted as part of this planning effort.
- **Public Meetings:** three public meetings were held to allow citizens to comment on park needs.
- **Stakeholder Interviews:** over a dozen one-onone interviews were held with local stakeholders to learn more about park needs.
- **Staff Meeting:** The planning consultant met with Recreation and Parks Department staff to discuss facilities, programs, and operation.

Through these efforts, considerable insight was gained regarding the public's desires for park and recreation programs and facilities. This section discusses the information gathered in preparation for the development of the master plan.

City History

Greenville was originally founded in 1771 as Martinsborough; named in honor of the Royal Governer Josiah Martin. In 1774, the Town was moved approximately three miles to the west along the southern bank of the Tar River. Martinsborough's name was changed to Greenesville in honor of general Nathanial Greene, the Revolutionary War hero in 1786. Later Greenesville was shortened to Greenville.



In the late 1800s cotton was one of Greenville's major exports.

Located on the Tar River, Greenville's early history was tied to the river. In the 1860s, Greenville was the home of several riverboat companies, and both goods and people came through the city as part of river transit. Like many rural communities, Greenville became a farming center. In the late 1800s, cotton was the major export, but by the turn of the century, tobacco had become the leading crop. Greenville became a center for tobacco marketing and warehousing.

In the mid 1960s, Greenville began to emerge as an educational center. East Carolina Teaching College grew into one of the state's largest state supported colleges. In 1967, East Carolina Teaching College became East Carolina University (ECU) and in 1977 the ECU Medical School admitted its first class. Today, the university has an enrollment of nearly 26,000 and attracts students from around the world. As ECU and its medical school have grown, Greenville's flagship hospital, Pitt Memorial Hospital, has become a regional center for health care. The combination of education and medical excellence has allowed Greenville to attract the best and brightest from across the nation and throughout the world.

The energy found on the university and medical campuses has now migrated to the business community. Greenville and Pitt County now lay claim to some of the nation's largest industries and businesses. DSM Pharmaceuticals (formerly Burrough's Wellcome), Rubbermaid, Nacco Materials Handling Group, Grady White Boats, and ASMO are just a few of the major corporations that have located facilities in Greenville/Pitt County.

The People of Greenville

The 2006 population of Greenville was 72,052; almost 20% more than the 2000 census population (60,476). While there has been significant change in the population since the 2000 census, a look at the census demographics is helpful in planning for the City's future park needs.

Based on the 2000 census data, Greenville has a larger female population (53.7%) than male (46.3%). This 7% variation is significantly greater than the national male/female ratio which is almost evenly balanced (50.8% female).

In 2000, the median age of the Pitt County resident was 26, significantly younger than the 35.3 median age for the rest of North Carolina. It is assumed that this lower median age is attributed to the large number of students in the area.

White persons comprised 60.6% of the City's population in 2000. This reflects a significantly lower percentage than the white population reflected throughout North Carolina (72.1%) or the entire country (75.1%). Black/African American persons made up 34.1% of Greenville's population; while the state and country's Black/African American population (21.6% and 12.3% respectfully) is significantly less.

The median household income in 2005 was \$26,633. This reflects a 10% decrease in household income from the 2000 census which showed a median income of \$28,648. It is also significantly lower than the national median household income of \$41,994 (2000).

Based on census data, over 46% (15,690) of Greenville's civilian labor force (34,072) is in management, professional, or related occupations.



Arts and Crafts Center at Jaycee Park

Sales and office occupations (8,748) comprise roughly a quarter (25.6%) of the workforce. Service occupations represent another 17% of the working population.

Education, health care, and social assistance is the largest industry employer group in Greenville. Almost 40% of the population is employed in this segment of the local economy. Arts, entertainment, recreation, and accommodations (including food service) comprise approximately 15% of the workforce, while retail sales is the third largest industry (12%) in the community.

Greenville is a very well educated community. 40% of the City's population over 25 years of age holds at least a bachelor's degree; 15% of the community have a graduate or professional degree. 88% of the population 25 years or older obtained their high school diploma or equivalent.

The demographics of Greenville are somewhat unique for North Carolina. East Carolina University and the hospital system provide a unique effect on the community. Their presence skews the median age of the community and fuels much of the local economy. Overall, the City has a very young, active population with a very high percentage of women and Black/African Americans. The population is very well educated with a relatively high percentage of professional workers.

Population Projections

There has been significant growth in Greenville's population since 1990. In the past eighteen years, the City's population has gone from 46,000 to 72,000; a 56% increase. This growth has been spurred by the expansion of the University and the Medical Center. This rapid rate of growth is expected to continue over the next twelve years (2020). The City's Community Development Department has projected that the City will have a population of 106,000 by 2020. This projection is based on a departmental study of the community's growth with particular emphasis on new utility connections. This increase in population is significantly greater than the proposed population projections used in the development of the 2000 Comprehensive Plan. The 2000 Plan projected a ± 2% annual growth rate that ultimately resulted in a projected 2020 population of 86,398; roughly 20,000 less than the current population projection.

Public Input

Perhaps the most important step in the planning process is obtaining an understanding of the public's needs and desires for park and recreation programs and facilities. As part of this planning process, the Recreation and Parks Department staff and the planning consultant (Site Solutions) developed a methodology for gathering input from the public. Several methods were used to ensure the public was offered an opportunity to speak. The public input process included:

Public Survey

As a means of determining the public's preferences for park and recreation facilities and programs, a telephone survey was conducted using a standard questionnaire. The survey was developed and administered by Clark and Chase Research, Inc., a Charlotte based market research firm. Household selection was accomplished through a random sample of published telephone numbers throughout Pitt County.

During the spring of 2008, a total of 401 telephone interviews were conducted. The adult in the household was randomly selected to ensure that men and women of all ages were represented in the sample. Data was broken down into two geographic areas: Greenville city limits and the remainder of Pitt County. Because the primary focus of this planning study is the City of Greenville, the majority of responses (301) came from city residents.



Based on the methodology used, the study resulted in a maximum sampling error of \pm 4.9 percentage points at a 95% confidence level for the study. The following findings were from the survey:



Importance of Parks

Almost everyone interviewed (97%) felt that recreation areas and parks enhance the physical and mental well being of the community. Nine out of ten interviewed (89%) felt parks enhance the economic health of the community and 80% of those interviewed felt parks and recreation programs help reduce crime.

89% of the survey sample felt there is at least some need for additional public parks and recreation facilities; 45% of those interviewed felt the need is great. The responses to this series of questions was consistent between both City and County residents. Non-whites (69%), households with children (56%), individuals aged 18-44 (56%), and park users (52%) were more likely to indicate there is a "great need" for additional parks.

Utilization of Public Parks

Two-thirds of all County residents have used a park or recreation area in the past year. Greenville residents visit parks more than County residents (82% vs. 51%). Families with children (78%), individuals 18-44 years of age (82%) and college graduates (80%) were the heaviest users of parks.

Among those who have visited a park in the last year, the majority have visited parks more than five times. The most popular park in the area is Elm Street Park. Almost onefourth of all park users have visited Elm Street Park this year. River Park North was the second most popular park.

Adults who do not currently use public parks said their primary reasons for not doing so was lack of desire (20%) or lack of time (18%).

Park Activities and Recreational Facilities

Respondents indicated that they are most interested in using public parks for walking, jogging, and bicycling (90%). There was also a high demand for fitness activities and for festivals and concerts, and swimming received significant support (70%). While there is still considerable demand for organized athletics, these recreational activities did not rank as high as other park uses. Of all organized sports, basketball (63%) and baseball (55%) ranked the highest. Overall, there was very little difference in responses between Greenville and County residents on this question.




Yes

69%

When asked about what other recreational facility they would like to see, 91% of those surveyed indicated they would like to see more greenway development and 82% felt open space should be increased. Community recreation centers received 82% support, while 75% said they would like additional water based activities. Responses from both City and County residents were very similar on this question.

Public Swimming Pools and Aquatics Activities

Over half of those responding (53%) said that they did not use public swimming pools. Greenville residents (55% vs. 36%) were more likely to use a public swimming pool. It is assumed this greater use is because the public pool is located in the city. Usage of City Pool is greatest among non-whites (38%), households with children (33%), and park users (33%).

More than six in ten adults (63%) have used the Tar River for recreation. Park users (76% vs. 36%) are the most likely to use the river for recreation.

Satisfaction with Recreation and Parks

When asked about the level of satisfaction with the public parks in the area, fifty percent of the respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the public parks in their area. Satisfaction was highest among respondents 65 and older. Approximately 10% of those responding said they were not satisfied at all with existing public recreation. Those living outside Greenville were most likely to express dissatisfaction with public recreation services.

Funding Recreation and Park Facilities

The majority of those interviewed (60%) felt that current taxes should be utilized to fund parks. Only one in four (25%) expressed support for funding parks with new taxes. County residents were less likely to express support for new taxes to fund parks and recreation than Greenville residents.

When asked directly whether they would support a bond referendum to develop new and existing parks, seven in ten (69%) said they would support a park bond. Support was significantly higher (79%) among Greenville residents than County residents (58%).

A graded scale was used to ask respondents how much they would be willing to pay on an annual basis to improve recreation and park facilities. Twenty-five percent of those interviewed said they would be willing to spend \$200 or more annually for better parks. At the other end of the spectrum, forty-five percent said they would only pay \$25 or less per year. Those with children, park users, and individuals 18-44 expressed the greatest willingness to pay for park improvements.

Summary

The people of Greenville believe that parks and recreation programs and facilities benefit the community. They also agree that there is a need for park improvements (nearly 90% of those responding said there was at least some need for additional public parks).

Respondents spoke strongly for the desire to walk, jog, and bicycle. Likewise, there was strong support for using parks for passive recreation, special events, and preservation of green space. On the active side of recreation, there was strong demand for fitness and aerobic activities, but less support for team sports (football and soccer). With regard to water based recreation, there was demand shown for swimming in the question regarding desired activities. However, use of the City's existing swimming pool (City Pool at Guy Smith Park) is not popular.

Finally, with regard to willingness to pay for new park facilities, the majority of citizens are not supportive of new taxes for parks, but would overwhelmingly (79% of City residents) support funding park improvements with bonds. Almost a quarter of those interviewed said they would be willing to pay \$200 annually to support new parks. Conversely, almost half of those said they were



willing to pay only \$25 or less annually, or were not sure what they were willing to pay.

Stakeholder Interviews

As part of this planning effort on March 25th and May 7th, one-on-one interviews were conducted with fourteen stakeholders. The purpose of these interviews was to gain important insight into the specific needs of various park user groups and community advocates for park and recreation. The interview findings are very insightful and represent a wide-spectrum of public and private interests. Views expressed during these interviews provided an important backdrop for the development of this Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan.

The following citizens/stakeholders were asked to share their views:

| 51 | hare their views: | |
|----|----------------------|------------------------------|
| | Mark Gillespie | Parks Superintendent |
| | Shana Kriewall | Recreation Superintendent |
| | Larry Spell | City Councilman/Parks and |
| | | Recreation Liaison |
| | Thomas Moton | Assistant City Manager |
| | Wayne Bowers | City Manager |
| | Merrill Flood | Community Development |
| | | Director |
| | Sandy Steele | Recreation and Parks |
| | | Commissioner |
| | Dr. Patricia C. Dunn | Mayor |
| | Max Joyner, Jr. | City Council Member |
| | Rose Glover | City Council Member |
| | Bryant Kittrell | City Council Member |
| | Ray Craft | Former City Council Member |
| | Dr. Nelson Cooper | East Carolina University |
| | Dr. Jimmie Grimsley | Retired East Carolina |
| | | University Professor |
| | Denise Walsh | Uptown Greenville |
| | Debbie Vargas | Director, Greenville |
| | - | Convention and Visitors |
| | | Bureau |
| | David McRae | Chief Executive Officer, |
| | | University Health Systems of |
| | | Eastern Carolina |
| | William Brian Floyd | Vice President, |
| | - | Cardiovascular Services, |
| | | University Health Systems of |
| | | Eastern Carolina |
| | | |

Each interviewee was asked a list of questions regarding the community, current parks and recreation services, and their vision of the department for the future. There was an overall agreement and similarity in many of the responses. The following is a summary of these one-on-one conversations:

1. What do you like most about living in Greenville?

Almost everyone interviewed spoke of the value of living in a community with an outstanding university. The university attracts a diverse population of educated, sophisticated, and worldly people. These people help create a city with lots of cultural activities and a metropolitan feel. This gives Greenville a large town feel, without "big city" problems.

Many also mentioned wonderful natural resources of open space, the Tar River, and rural character of the surrounding landscape. Likewise, many mentioned the parks and facilities offered by the Recreation and Parks Department as a valuable community asset.

2. What do you like least?

Several people mentioned that while the city is rich in diversity, this diversity sometimes leads to segregation between groups of people. Likewise, there is sometimes a differentiation between Greenville natives and those moving into the community.

Several people pointed out the City's lack of sidewalks and trails. Greenville is not a walkable community.

The importance of "smart growth" was mentioned several times during the interviews. It was also mentioned that recent growth has resulted in traffic congestion.

A number of intervewees noted that while "metropolitan" in many ways (see answers in question number 1), as a relatively small city, Greenville lacks some of the retail and entertainment opportunities found in larger cities.



Youth sports, and associated tournaments, can be a source or economic development.

3. What role do local parks and recreation offerings (facilities and programs) play in the quality of life for the community?

Everyone interviewed felt the Recreation and Parks Department provides both programs and services that are meeting many of the community's needs, and as a result, are critical to the excellent quality of life found in the community. Several people mentioned the quality of youth athletics, particularly youth baseball.

The value of the department goes beyond "play" value. Greenville's quality programs and parks make the city attractive to businesses and adds to the economic vitality of the community. Likewise, youth sports, and associated tournaments, bring people to Greenville, also adding economic development.

4. What role should they be playing?

Most people interviewed felt the City's Recreation and Parks Department is doing a good job providing both facilities and programs. It was generally felt that the Department should continue to be responsive to citizen needs, constantly try to improve upon the delivery of recreation services, and improve existing facilities (where needed) and expand facilities and services as the city grows.

Several people expressed the importance parks and recreation programs can, and should, play in bringing diverse groups together.

5. What things are the Greenville Parks and Recreation Department doing right (facilities and programs)?

The following accomplishments were listed as "done right":

- Extremely strong sports program; particularly youth programs
- A variety of excellent, well maintained facilities
- Strong senior programs
- Some internal procedures very strong (risk management and safety programs)
- Development of soccer complex was a big step
- Strong arts and crafts program
- Department is visible within the community; good public relations and marketing

6. What things could be improved?

- Need good and equitable distribution of facilities throughout the city
- Many suggested expanding greenways, trails, sidewalks; implement recommendations from the Greenway Master Plan
- Expanding facilities in perimeter areas of the city will help meet future needs
- Greenville is growing; need to plan for growth with land acquisition and facility development
- New neighborhood parks are needed; several stakeholders suggested requiring developers to dedicate land or make payment in lieu of dedication would facilitate these parks; others were against this approach
- Identify those who are not currently using parks and determine why they do not use the system
- Vandalism in some parks is a problem that needs to be addressed
- The Department's marketing efforts should be expanded
- More interaction between the City's recreation centers; this may be an avenue for bringing diverse groups together
- Facilities in west side need to be improved. Parks throughout the city should be equitable.

7. In the next ten years, Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department should:

- Determine existing and future needs for parkland and facilities, prioritize those needs, and begin now to purchase land for future parks
- Strive for greater equity of facilities among all sections of the city
- Improve some internal operations of the department; establish more standardized procedures
- Develop a city wide greenway system
- Develop a major park in each quadrant of the city
- Expand the city's aquatic program/facilities (mentioned several times)
- Construct several spraygrounds
- Provide an inclusive method of meeting special population needs
- Encourage community to take more ownership of parks
- Improve facilities in poorer neighborhoods
- Improve existing recreation centers
- Possible need for new recreation centers
- Parks can play an important role in downtown revitalization. Civic parks downtown provide a sense of place. Town Common is an excellent green space, but could be even better.
- Expand links to Tar River
- Review 100% Cost Recovery Policy
- Expand special events oriented around active recreation. This should go beyond softball and soccer tournaments but should include 10ks, walk-a-thons, etc.



Spraygrounds provide an alternative to swimming pools.

8. As the largest parks and recreation department in Pitt County, Greenville currently provides park facilities and programs for citizens who live both within and outside city limits. What role should Greenville play in providing services to non-city residents and how should the City work with Pitt County in coordinating county-wide services?

Everyone interviewed felt there should be communication and cooperation between the City and County departments to ensure that duplication of services and facilities is minimized. It is important to recognize that county needs (more rural) are different than city needs (more urban); therefore, focus of departments will be different.

It was noted by several stakeholders that many County residents are using City facilities.

There are many opportunities where the City and County could work together on programs; for example, Senior Olympics and Special Olympics. Greenways and trails are another area that should have a strong link.

There are no written agreements to outline roles and responsibilities since 1993. Written agreements between the two departments should be developed and executed.

While it was mentioned in several interviews, no one suggested a merging of the two departments.

9. What role should Pitt County Schools be playing in providing opportunities for park and recreation activities?

Everyone interviewed agreed that the Recreation and Parks Department and the school system should be working together on joint use of facilities whenever possible. This will lead to the best use of public funding for facilities.

Many stakeholders pointed out that school recreational facilities are not adequate for school or recreational use.

Written joint use agreements should be established between the schools and the Recreation and Parks

Department. There are some good joint use programs going on (City uses school buses for summer programs). These should be built upon.

Staff Meeting

Members of the Greenville Recreation and Parks Department met with the planning consultant on Wednesday, May 7th to review the master plan process and discuss ways to make the master plan relevant and useful. The meeting began with an overview of the planning process and schedule. Staff members seemed very supportive of the master plan process and were actively engaged in discussions about the Department; how to build on its success, and how to improve in areas of need.

Following the discussion of the planning process, the group went through a series of open-ended questions about current programs and facilities and goals for the future. The following questions were asked and comments made:

What things are the Greenville Recreation and Parks Department doing right (facilities and programs)?

- Baseball programs are some of the best anywhere.
- The Department offers a wide variety of programs.
- Outstanding special use facilities. A municipal golf course and tennis center in a city the size of Greenville is an accomplishment.
- Outstanding playgrounds. They are up to date and well maintained.
- Lawns and grounds are well maintained.
- Programs for special populations have grown.
- Senior citizen programs with County.
- The Department is working with other agencies to provide programs and services but could expand/build relationships with the County parks department and ECU.
- Greenville has one of the best departments in the region. People from outside the area recognize Greenville as a leader in the parks and recreation field.

What things could be improved?

- Marketing of the Department's facilities, programs, and accomplishments should be improved. A marketing position should be added to the Department. It was noted that public information sent through the City's Public Information Department has improved.
- Information on programs should be sent out (particularly to schools and businesses) in a timely manner.
- Park maintenance facilities need to be improved. The Department's central maintenance facility is old and outdated. Maintenance operations should be reviewed to see if a district maintenance system should be considered.
- Bike and walking trails should be expanded.
- More inclusion programs should be developed. Accessibility of all facilities should constantly be reviewed and improved.
- Ballfield lighting is needed on many fields.
- Bradford Creek Golf Course needs major improvements.
- Maintenance entrances/access in many parks (Boyd Lee & Bradford Soccer Complex) need to be improved.
- Radio communication for maintenance and operational staff needs to be improved.

In the next ten years, Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department should:

- Demand for parks will grow in the next ten years. Retirement of the Baby Boomers, greater transportation costs, etc. will result in more people using parks. The Department must plan for this increased demand.
- Security in parks and on greenways must always be a concern.
- Water conservation will become a critical issue in facility development and maintenance.
- Volunteer programs are a great way to expand the Department while not expanding operational cost. Ways to encourage volunteers should be explored and encouraged.
- Maintaining facilities in good, safe condition is important.

- Better signage is needed in parks. Getting people to parks, and then guiding them through the parks is important. Currently many parks do not have adequate signage.
- Expansion of walks/boardwalks in River Park North will increase use and environmental education opportunities.
- A water park facility would provide a unique special use facility and could be used for revenue generation.
- Develop a system for rotating programs throughout recreation centers.

The Master Plan should include:

- An assessment of operational and maintenance cost of any proposed capital improvement. The Master Plan should not include more new facilities than can adequately be programmed and maintained.
- Recommendations on improvements to maintenance facilities.
- Acknowledgement that staff are the key to success. The Department should invest in attracting, training, and keeping quality people.
- The Department needs to clearly identify their client. City residents vs. County residents.
- A review of other institutions in the service area providing recreational services and facilities and determine if services are complimentary or competitive.



It was mentioned in the staff interviews that more ballfields should be lighted.

Public Meetings

As part of the planning process, three public workshops were held to obtain citizen input and allow a public review of the plan as it was developed. These workshops were held over a period of several months in different areas of the city. The following is a summary of these meetings:

First Public Meeting

The first public meeting to discuss the Greenville Comprehensive Plan for Recreation and Parks was held on Tuesday, May 6th at Jaycee Park. Over 40 people attended the meeting.

Gary Fenton, the City's Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those in attendance, introducing staff and local officials in attendance, and giving a brief overview of the role of the comprehensive plan and the importance of public input in developing the plan. He then introduced Derek Williams of Site Solutions, the park planner for the planning process.

Mr. Williams began the presentation by explaining the purpose of the meeting (to obtain public input) and noted that the meeting was about asking questions and listening. No plans or recommendations have been formulated to date. With that understanding, the six steps of the planning process were presented and findings from the county-wide recreation survey were shared.

Following the discussion on planning process and survey, attendees were asked a series of questions regarding current park facilities and services, and desires for future facilities and services. Attendees were asked to express their preferences on the following questions/issues:

When asked if they had used a public recreation area, park, or trail in Greenville within the past year, everyone attending except one person said yes. Half of those present said they used a park monthly; almost half said they used a park weekly. Parks used included:



Walking, jogging, or bicycling ranked highest in public meetings as an activity participants would most like to participate in.

Paramore Park Greensprings Park Open Space on 33 East H. Boyd Lee Park River Park North Town Common Bradford Creek Golf Course River Birch Tennis Center Elm Street Park Bradford Soccer Complex Jaycee/Extreme Park

Participants were asked to identify activities they currently participated in or would like to participate in. The following results were recorded:

| Walking, jogging, or bicycling | 22 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Golfing | 6 |
| Swimming | 10 |
| Baseball | 1 |
| Arts and crafts | 2 |
| Basketball | 2 |
| Performing arts | 11 |
| Soccer | 2 |
| Nature activity | 23 |
| Lacrosse | 2 |
| Festivals, concerts | 18 |
| Fitness activity | 16 |
| Fishing | 3 |
| Activity for teenagers | 3 |

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with Greenville parks. Following some discussion on the difference between evaluating the condition and value of existing facilities, and evaluating the overall departmental offerings (whether or not existing facilities are adequate to meet current/future needs), the group decided that the question should differentiate between the evaluation of existing park facilities and an evaluation of whether the current facilities were adequately meeting recreational needs.

| C | ondition | Availability |
|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| of | existing | of existing |
| f | facilities | facilities |
| Very Satisfied | 7 | - |
| Satisfied | 8 | - |
| Somewhat Satisfied | 5 | 15 |
| Not Satisfied at all | - | 8 |

Overall it was felt that there was general satisfaction with many of the department's existing facilities, but the majority of people felt additional facilities were needed. It was noted on several occasions that the department is excellent; staff is "top notch". Lack of facilities is the problem.

When asked what improvements and/or expansions to facilities and/or programs the department should consider, the following ideas were presented:

- Provide large open spaces
- Expand greenways and trails
- Build pocket/urban parks
- Design and build all facilities with safety in mind
- Improve existing facilities
- Need additional swimming pools/water based recreation
- Connect people with parks through greenways
- Provide mixed use/multiple use parks
- Developers should be responsible for providing some park facilities
- Look for 501(C)(3), public/private ventures to build parks
- Light ballfields and courts to extend use
- Provide parks for solitude and nature classes
- Provide a place for astronomy

- Provide equitable distribution of parks in all areas of the city including Afro-American areas
- Develop safe bikeways
- Develop walking trails (mentioned repeatedly)
- Use old City landfill as a park

Participants were asked if they felt the current offerings of the following facilities were meeting community needs, or should these types of facilities be expanded. The following responses were made:

| | Needs Expansion/ Improvements | Meeting Needs |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Greenways, | | |
| walk/bike trails | 25 | - |
| Open space | 25 | - |
| Athletic fields | 10 | 9 |
| Water based recreatio | n 12 | - |
| Community Centers | 13 | - |

Overall there was strong support for greenways and open space, with mixed support of athletic fields, water based recreation, and community centers.

Finally, participants were asked how public recreation and park facilities should be funded.

| Current taxes | 25 |
|--------------------|----|
| New taxes | 20 |
| Usage fees/charges | - |
| Government bonds | 21 |

Several people also suggested raising money through donations and corporate sponsorships, and several people said developers should be required to dedicate land and/or donate funding for park development.

When asked how much their household would be willing to spend on an annual basis to improve recreation and park facilities, the following responses were received:

| \$0 | - |
|-----------------|----|
| \$0-25 | - |
| \$25-50 | 1 |
| \$50-\$100 | 3 |
| \$100-\$200 | 6 |
| More than \$200 | 12 |

Following the discussion on the planning process and the response to questions, the meeting was opened up for public comments and questions. Six citizens signed up to speak, but several others also made comments. The following is a summary of their remarks:

Marion Blackburn provided a wonderful description of the city-owned property (120 acres) on NC 33 East/10th Street Extension and the desire to see this property developed as a park with active and passive recreation. Possible uses included:

- Trails
- Tent Camping
- Ballfields (on open fields)
- Picnicking
- Star Gazing
- Environmental Education
- Dog Park

It was noted that this park has received support from many Greenville residents and there are many opportunities for funding this park (Clean Water Trust Fund, Friends of the Park, etc.). Marion appeared to be the designated speaker on this issue, but most everyone in attendance showed support for the development of this park.

Bill All, President of Carolinas Skies Astronomy Club and recent appointee to Greenville's Recreation Advisory Commission, spoke of the need of a "Greenville Family Astronomy Park" to provide a place for astronomy, star gazing and education. He noted the land on Route 33 would be ideal for such a use.

Terri Edwards spoke of the growing popularity of lacrosse and the values of youth sports to the community. There is a growing need for lacrosse fields.

Don Williams talked about the value of parks for open space/green space and the need for places for walking, outdoor classrooms, community gardens, and for unstructured play like hide and seek. Herb Carlton spoke on the value and importance of greenways (open space, exercise, alternative transportation, etc.) He was on the Planning Committee of the 2004 Greenway Master Plan and supports the implementation of the plan. Herb stressed the importance of maintaining existing and proposed park facilities, and the importance of considering the cost of maintenance and operation when planning for these future facilities. He recommended park construction and operation should be based on "green" principles, and include recycling in planning.

Bob Edwards discussed the importance of biking and development of bike trails.

Following the six speakers who signed up to share their comments, a general discussion was held, and many people expressed their views on park needs. Overall everyone was very supportive of the planning effort and felt parks play an important role in the community. As noted above, many of those in attendance expressed strong support for the development of a park on the City's property on Highway 33.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. by Gary Fenton, who thanked everyone for attending and asked them to attend the second public meeting on June 3^{rd} at Eppes Recreation Center.

Second Public Meeting

The second public meeting to discuss the City's Comprehensive Plan for Recreation and Parks was held on Tuesday, June 3 at Eppes Recreation Center. Over twenty-five citizens attended the meeting. Many of those in attendance had also attended the first public meeting on Tuesday, May 6th. In addition to the citizens, the Mayor and several Council members (Council, Glover and Mercer), and representatives from the City's Recreation and Parks Department were present.

Gary Fenton, the City's Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those in attendance and provided a very good description of the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan. He then introduced Derek Williams, Park Planner.

Mr. Williams explained the purpose of the meeting was to gather public input and that it was a continuation of the first public meeting. Further, he explained that much work has been done on the plan since the May meeting, and while a general framework has evolved, all work is in the formative stages. Input from this meeting will guide the plan as it is solidified.

The presentation was a combination of information from the first public meeting (to inform those who had not attended the first meeting) and recommendations for recreation standards to be used in developing the master plan. A general overview of the planning process was given, as well as a summary of the findings from the telephone survey. In addition to the background information, new standards for park development and recreation facility development were provided. Overall, many of the standards and assumptions made in the 2000 Master Plan are still valid. Based on this understanding, there appears to be a need for the following additional parks:

> 1 District Park 2-3 Community Parks 4-5 Neighborhood Parks 12-15 Mini Parks

Next, a list of general observations/recommendations was made. These recommendations included:

- Greenville is rapidly growing. Open space is disappearing. Preserving open space is important. The significance is becoming more apparent as the city grows.
- Many of the facilities in the inner city are in need of improvements/expansion. Park resources must be balanced between improving existing facilities and building new facilities.
- Greenville is not pedestrian friendly. Greenways and trails should be developed to provide pedestrian links between different sections of the city.
- There is a need for an additional indoor aquatic facility.



Expansion of the City's aquatic program and facilities received public support

- There is a desire to develop more neighborhood/ mini parks. Walk-to type parks.
- A marketing position in the department is needed.
- As the department grows, maintenance operations will grow. Currently there is a need for significant improvements to the existing maintenance facility. Future development may lead the department to consider district maintenance.
- The ten-year capital needs for parks will be significant. Partnerships will need to be developed to share these costs.

Following Mr. Williams' presentation, the meeting was opened to the public for comment. Three people originally signed up to speak, but several others voiced their opinions of future park/departmental development. Comments included:

Dr. Melanie Hames spoke in support of developing a public park on the land on Highway 33 and suggested that this future park be connected to other parks and the river by greenways. She discussed the importance of trails and bikeways as they relate to healthy and active lifestyles and that the Tar River is a valuable asset that should be utilized for waterbased recreation.

Ann Weingartz spoke on the importance of youth athletics in developing well-rounded youth. There are many participants in all youth sports and the City has a need for practice facilities and fields. Donna Whitley spoke about the Elmhurst Neighborhood and how it should be used as a development model for future neighborhoods. It has endured as a successful neighborhood for generations. Its success is related to having schools, parks, and greenspace all within walking distance. She feels that neighborhood parks are important and should be included in the plan.

Other Comments made by citizens included:

- The County has many miles of easements along drainage easements throughout the county. These easements, if properly utilized, could provide a county-wide greenway access to the river.
- While the river is relatively shallow and offers only limited use of power boats, it is an excellent water source for canoes and kayaks.
- The Tar River should be utilized more. The quality of the water will support swimming and other aquatic use. Trash, rocks and other hazards are the real obstacle for using the river.
- The importance of developing bikeways (off and on-road) throughout the city was mentioned several times. It was noted that this is not simply a recreation and parks issue, but must also involve public works and transportation.
- A bikeway task force has been established. The Recreation and Parks Department should stay actively engaged in their discussions and promote their efforts to improve the City's bike routes.
- Interconnectivity of parks is important; another reason to build greenways.
- Disc golf is a popular and inexpensive sport. Currently the City has one disc golf course. Others should be developed.
- The buyout property adjacent to the City's new dog park could be developed as a new city park with open space, water access, canoe launch, and fishing dock. River Park South.
- Sidewalks should be built throughout the city. These sidewalks can become part of a citywide greenway that would provide a walkable community and connect parks and other points of interest.

- Preservation of greenspace is important for the quality of the community. Currently developers are building residential communities with no open space or parks. The City should require developers to dedicate land for parks and open space. (This was mentioned by several people)
- The youth tackle football program needs practice fields.
- Councilwoman Glover spoke of her involvement with the League of Municipalities and her trip to California where she saw an outstanding sprayground/playground made of recycled tires. She also discussed the Kaboom Playground in Creedmore and her interest in working with this organization to build parks. She noted there are many things the City (working with volunteers and corporate sponsors) can do to provide parks and playgrounds.

The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m. after more than an hour of comments/discussion by those in attendance. Overall there was very strong support for developing better parks and preserving open space throughout the city. Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton closed the meeting by thanking all of those in attendance for their participation and inviting them to participate in the third, final meeting on June 24th at Boyd Lee Park.

Third Public Meeting

The third public meeting to discuss the City's Comprehensive Recreation and Park Master Plan was held in H. Boyd Lee Park's gymnasium. The meeting was very well attended; over 75 people were present. Many of those present had attended one or both of the previous public meetings.

Gary Fenton, Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those present and introducing the city staff, Advisory Board Members, and elected officials in attendance. He then provided the audience with a description of the purpose of the master planning process, stressing the importance of public participation in developing and implementing the plan.

Following Mr. Fenton's remarks, Derek Williams, Park Planner, led those present through a brief review of the planning process and presented a summary of proposed improvements/recommendations to be included in the Master Plan. These recommendations included:

The Acquisition and Development of the Following Parks:

- 15 Mini Parks
- 6 Neighborhood Parks
- 2 Community Parks

Development of the Following Facilities:

Fields

- 2 Adult Baseball Fields
- 9 Youth Baseball Fields (game/practice)
- 6 Softball Fields
- 4 Football Fields
- 8 Soccer Fields

Courts

- 5 Basketball Courts (outdoor)
- 10 Tennis Courts
- 5 Volleyball Courts
- 8 Shuffleboard Courts
- 5 Horseshoe Pits

Outdoor Areas

- 20 Picnic Shelters
- 15 Playgrounds

Trails

- 17.7 Miles of Hiking/Greenway Trails
- 11 Miles of Fitness Trails

Aquatic Facilities

- 1 Swimming Pool
- 3 Splash Pads
- Consider participation in community competition pool

Specialized

- 1 Recreation Center w/Gymnasium
- 14 Miles of Blueways
- 1 Disc Golf Course
- 3 Neighborhood Performing Areas
- 3 Off-leash Dog Areas

Major Renovations to the Following Existing Facilities:

- Eppes Center
- Drew Steele Center
- South Greenville Recreation Center
- City Pool
- Highway 33 Community Park
- H. Boyd Lee Park

Consideration of the Following Operational and Relationship Recommendations:

- Increase marketing efforts/add staff position
- Improve/expand maintenance facility
- Add a park planning position
- Research/implement operational and construction measures to make department "greener"
- Investigate "outside" sources to assist in development of parks
 - Public/private partnerships
 - Development community
 - Friends of the parks
 - Corporate sponsorship/donations
- Explore ways to continue and expand joint use opportunities with Pitt County Schools in the use/development of facilities.
- Where applicable, coordinate programs and facility development with Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation.
- Work with University Health System of Eastern Carolina in developing programs that promote healthy lifestyles.
- Work with the task force on development of bikeways throughout the community

Following the presentation of these recommendations, the meeting was opened to the public for comment and discussion. Nine people signed up to speak and the following comments were made:

Bill All spoke in support of the development of a site for stargazing and astronomy would provide a valuable program/educational element to the City's park offerings. The City's property on Highway 33/10th Street Extension would be ideal for this park use.

Tony Parker spoke in support of developing a park on the City property on Highway 33.

Ginny Cooper spoke on behalf of Greenville's population with special needs. Speaking as a mother of a child with special needs, she asked that the Department seek advice and work with parents and caregivers as they plan and develop programs and facilities. It was noted that the Department once had excellent service/support for citizens with special needs, but currently is not as actively engaged with this segment of the population. In summary, the Department should be open to listening to those with special needs.

Ryan Nyquist spoke about the unique opportunity Greenville has to become a major center for extreme sports because of all of the world class competitors that currently live in the area. He praised the City for its support and development of Extreme Park and asked for additional facilities to be constructed as new parks are built.

Matthew Farris gave an excellent presentation describing the sports/activities he enjoys and asked that the City provide opportunities for those activities for all citizens; including those with special needs.

Tammy Perdue spoke of the need for an indoor/ outdoor complex for competitive swimming. The value it would bring as a sport, and the value it would bring as a catalyst for economic activity. She presented a petition of support for an aquatic facility signed by 149 citizens.

Chris Mansfield, from the Tar River University Neighborhood, spoke in favor of developing a park in the City's "buy-out" property adjacent to the Offleash Dog Area (River Park South). He stressed the importance of "connectivity" between parks; through greenways or sidewalks. In addition, he talked about the importance of partnerships for developing the many park needs which have been identified as part of this master planning process. Marion Blackburn spoke in support of developing a park on City property on NC33 and provided a list of potential park uses (see minutes from first public meeting).

Greg Lewis, a member of Pitt-Greenville Soccer Association (PGSA), stressed the growth and popularity of soccer and the need for additional fields. He thanked the Department for the development of the Bradford Park Soccer Complex, but requested improvements to the complex; particularly the need for restrooms. Suggested tournament level soccer facilities would result in more tournaments which would generate economic activity.

The last two speakers did not identify themselves. One spoke of the values of greenways; stressing the importance of safe crossings at streets. The second spoke of the value of the Tar River, and how the City was not using the river to its full potential; recommending the development of river access and of blueways.

Overall, everyone seemed in general agreement with the recommendations that were made. Several people spoke in support of some of these recommendations, and no one spoke against any of these recommendations.

Following almost an hour of open discussion, Gary Fenton closed the meeting by thanking everyone for attending and providing input. SECTION THREE

RECREATION STANDARDS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT



Concert at Town Common

Section Three Recreation Standards and Needs Assessment

Introduction

This section contains the analysis and assessment on which the recommendations of this Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan is based. It begins with a brief history of previous planning efforts conducted by the City of Greenville, and how the documents developed from these studies have shaped the current system. Next, we review how other communities are working to provide park and recreation facilities to their constituents, and national and state trends in park and recreation preferences. This review of previous planning studies and similar agencies is followed by a description of the park types that typically make up a park system. Using these park types as a backdrop, national and state standards are reviewed and used as a basis for establishing standards for park development for Greenville. Standards quoted in this study are based on those proposed by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) and the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR), and established in previous Master Plan studies. It should be noted that the NRPA, in its 1995 report "Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines", determined there are no "national standards" for park development. Instead, the latest NRPA study recommends that each community is unique, and that standards reflecting



City of Greenville

the local "uniqueness" should be established. With this understanding, this Master Plan uses a combination of local standards to evaluate the City's current system and to establish goals to meet future growth.

This study looks at two types of park standards. The first analysis looks at total acreage of parkland within the system and how this acreage is broken into park types. From this study it is possible to see how Greenville's existing parks compare with other communities, both in overall park acreage and park types within this overall acreage.

The second analysis looks at recreation activities and the facilities required to program these activities. By establishing a population-based standard for various recreation activities, this study establishes the type and quantity of facilities the Department should develop in the future.

The design standards used in this study were derived from citizen input and input from the Recreation and Parks Department staff. The development of these standards is perhaps the most important step in this planning process.

Previous Planning Efforts

2000 Comprehensive Master Plan

In 1999 the City went through a similar planning process to develop a comprehensive master plan. This effort was the first major planning effort for parks since the 1970s. Much like the process undertaken for this planning effort, the 2000 Comprehensive Master Plan included a detailed inventory of existing facilities, several public meetings, and much public involvement. The plan set direction for the Department for a twenty year period (2020).

The 2000 Comprehensive Master Plan included recommendations for the following park improvements/expansion:

• \$14.5 million in renovation to the City's existing parks

- Acquisition and development of over 400 acres of new parks
 - 2 new district parks (1 City, 1 County)
 - 2 new community parks (East Greenville & West Greenville)
 - 5 new neighborhood parks (east, 2 south, west, southeast)
 - 15 mini parks
- Major improvements to Greenville's special use facilities
- Expansion of/improvements to the aquatics center
- Expansion of River Park North
- Development of the Carrol property
- Improvements to Town Common
- Improvements to Guy Smith Park
- Expansion of Green Mill Run Greenway
- Development of a soccer complex
- Improvements to Bradford Creek Golf Course
- Development of an aquatics facility

The park development and improvements recommendations found in the plan represent a capital improvements program of \$45 million over the twenty year planning period. The 2000 plan recommended a series of park improvement bonds, a one cent increase to the City's property tax, and exploration of joint-use development (schools, county, etc.) of facilities.



The 2000 plan recommended improvements to Town Common.

The 2000 plan called for developers to "assist Greenville in the dedication or reservation of future park sites as part of the overall land development process". Recommendations included "parkland dedication requirement" and a payment in lieu of dedicated programs.

Greenway Master Plan 2004

Greenville's original greenway master plan was developed in 1991. In 2004, the City developed an update to the 1991 plan. The planning recommendations were based on input received at two public workshops on greenways. The 2004 Greenway Master Plan validated many of the decisions made in the original plan and proposed new greenway corridors for areas of the city that had developed since the 1991 plan.

The Greenway Master plan identified fortytwo individual greenway projects. If these recommendations are followed, the City will develop over 90 miles of greenways and sidewalk connectors. While the majority of these improvements are trails along creeks, parks, etc., the greenway plan also calls for the convergence of several sidewalk corridors to provide a pedestrian link.

Horizons: Greenville's Community Plan

The City's first comprehensive plan was adopted in 1981. In 1992, the original Horizon Plan was adopted. This plan, which established recommendations for all aspects of community development, was amended in 1997 and updated in 2004. Recreation and Parks were among the community services addressed in this plan. The following objectives were stated as part of the 2004 Horizons Update:

- To provide park and open space opportunities in all neighborhoods.
- To provide a diversity of recreational experiences to all residents.
- To provide residents with opportunities for new recreational experiences.
- To promote, preserve, and protect Greenville's natural environment.

- To increase access to and use of recreational facilities at City parks and public schools.
- To increase the public awareness and utilization of the Tar River.
- To continue the construction of greenway projects in the city.
- To continue to acquire more open space for the enjoyment of citizens.
- To expand recreation infrastructure (i.e., sidewalks and bike paths).
- To require dedicated park/recreational facilities for all new development.
- To develop/provide for a variety of recreation facilities and programs for people of all ages.

In addition to the section on Recreation and Parks, parks, greenways, and open space were mentioned in many other sections of the Horizon document. Greenways, sidewalks, and trails were discussed as alternatives to vehicular traffic. In the section on greenways, preservation of open space was listed as an objective of growth and development. Encouragement of provisions for public recreational facilities and areas was listed as an objective of services and facilities. This section also included recommendations of revising the subdivision regulations to require standards of NRPA, considering impact fees for financing parks and open space and coordinating development of recreational facilities with the school system.



Ribbon cutting at new park.

Under the Environmental Quality section, recommendations include conserving open space, using 100 year flood plains as open space and greenways, and incorporating wetlands into future parks. Under the sections covering smart growth, recommendations included encouraging compact building patterns to preserve land for city and neighborhood parks.

It is apparent when reading the City's Horizon Plan that parks and recreation areas should be playing an important role in the fabric of the community. The acquisition and development of parks, open space, and greenways can have a significant influence on the quality of life of the community.

In an effort to understand the demand for various recreation activities, this Master Plan reviewed other studies on similar parks and recreation issues.



National and State Studies on Outdoor Recreation Demand

Surveys designed to determine the demand for outdoor recreation have been conducted on the Federal level by the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors, the State of North Carolina, and various other organizations and associations.

President's Commission

The President's Commission Report indicated the following significant facts:

The top ten outdoor recreation activities nationwide are as follows:

Picnicking Driving for pleasure Swimming Sightseeing Bicycling Playing sports Fishing Attending sporting events Boating Walking for pleasure

Activities rapidly growing in popularity include:

| Canoeing | Sailing |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Bicycling | Hiking/backpacking |
| Attending outdoor sports | Walking for pleasure |
| Camping, all types | Water skiing |

The local levels (cities and counties) of the nation are providing 39% of the public recreation opportunities.

National Sporting Goods Association Survey

The National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) conducts an annual study of sports participation. The survey lists the following top 30 activities per million participants. A participant is defined as someone seven years of age or older who participates in a sport more than once within a year for all sports except aerobic exercising, bicycle riding, exercise walking, exercising with equipment, running/jogging, step aerobics, weight lifting, and swimming. For these seven fitness sports, participation is defined as six times or more during the year. The following information reviews the findings for the past ten years.

| Sport | 2006 | 2004 | 2002 | 2000 | 1998 | 1996 |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|
| Exercise Walking | 87.5 | 84.7 | 82.2 | 81.3 | 77.6 | 73.3 |
| Swimming | 56.5 | 53.4 | 53.1 | 58.8 | 58.2 | 60.2 |
| Exercising with Equipment | 52.4 | 52.2 | 46.8 | 44.8 | 46.1 | 47.8 |
| Camping | 48.6 | 55.3 | 55.4 | 49.9 | 46.5 | 44.7 |
| Bowling | 44.8 | 43.8 | 42.4 | 43.1 | 40.1 | 42.9 |
| Fishing | 40.6 | 41.2 | 44.2 | 47.2 | 43.6 | 45.6 |
| Workout at Club | 37.0 | 31.8 | 28.9 | 24.1 | 26.5 | 22.5 |
| Bicycle Riding | 35.6 | 40.3 | 39.7 | 43.1 | 43.5 | 53.3 |
| Aerobic Exercising | 33.7 | 29.5 | 29.0 | 26.7 | 25.8 | 24.1 |
| Weight Lifting | 32.9 | 26.2 | 25.1 | 22.8 | na | na |
| Billiards/Pool | 31.8 | 34.2 | 33.1 | 32.5 | 32.3 | 34.5 |
| Hiking | 31.0 | 28.3 | 27.2 | 24.3 | 27.2 | 26.5 |
| Boating, Motor/Power | 29.3 | 22.8 | 26.6 | 24.2 | 25.7 | 28.8 |
| Running/Jogging | 28.8 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 22.8 | 22.5 | 22.2 |
| Basketball | 26.7 | 27.8 | 28.9 | 27.1 | 29.4 | 31.8 |
| Golf | 24.4 | 24.5 | 27.1 | 26.4 | 27.5 | 23.1 |
| Hunting with Firearms | 17.8 | 17.7 | 19.5 | 19.1 | 17.3 | 18.3 |
| Target Shooting | 17.1 | 19.2 | 18.9 | 16.9 | 18.9 | 21.2 |
| Baseball | 14.6 | 15.9 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.9 | 14.8 |
| Soccer | 14.0 | 13.3 | 13.7 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 13.9 |
| Backpack/Wilderness Camp | 13.3 | 17.3 | 14.8 | 15.4 | 14.6 | 11.5 |
| Softball | 12.4 | 12.5 | 13.6 | 14.0 | 15.6 | 19.9 |
| Football (tackle) | 11.9 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 9.0 |
| Volleyball | 11.1 | 10.8 | 11.5 | 12.3 | 14.8 | 18.5 |
| In-Line Roller Skating | 10.5 | 11.7 | 18.5 | 21.5 | 2 7.0 | 25.5 |
| Tennis | 10.4 | 9.6 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 11.2 | 11.5 |
| Skateboarding | 9.7 | 10.3 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 5.8 | 4.7 |
| Scooter Riding | 9.5 | 12.9 | 13.4 | 11.6 | na | na |
| Mountain Biking (off road) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 7.3 |
| Hunting w/Bow & Arrow | 5.9 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 5.5 |

Ten-Year History of Selected Sports Participation

SOURCE: National Sporting Goods Association, Mt Prospect, IL 60056

North Carolina Outdoor Recreation Survey

The North Carolina Outdoor Recreation Survey provides an indication of the most popular outdoor recreation activities in the state. These activities include:

- 1. Walking for pleasure
- 2. Driving for pleasure
- 3. Viewing scenery
- 4. Beach activities
- 5. Visiting historical sites

- 6. Swimming
- 7. Visiting natural areas
- 8. Picnicking
- 9. Attending sports events
- 10. Visiting zoos

Benchmarking Relative to Other North Carolina Communities

The Recreation Resources Service at North Carolina State University conducts an annual study of municipal and county spending on parks and recreation services throughout North Carolina. This study reviews both operational and capital spending of these municipal and county agencies. Over one hundred agencies participated in the study.

The study breaks agencies into groups based on population, geography, and agency type (municipal vs. county). The City of Greenville was included in Category/Class B; agencies with populations between 50,000 and 99,999. With a current population of 72,000, Greenville is in the middle of its Class B category in size.

Operational Expenditures

Based on information provided for the 2007-2008 study, Greenville's proposed operational and capital budget for this period was \$6,277,071, higher than most of those in the Class B category.

As noted below, the City of Greenville's operating and capital expenditures is comparable to municipal agencies throughout the state.

| Class B Cities | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Mean Expenditures | \$6,911,341 |
| Median Expenditures | \$5,516,887 |
| Greenville Expenditures | \$6,274,071 |

Agencies from throughout North Carolina with similar populations were chosen for a more detailed comparison. These included:

| Agency | Population |
|----------------|------------|
| Asheville | 73,189 |
| Concord | 63,429 |
| Gastonia | 70,243 |
| Greenville | 68,852 |
| High Point | 92,491 |
| Jacksonville | 73,121 |
| Kinston-Lenoir | 58,278 |
| Rocky Mount | 56,291 |
| Wilmington | 97,135 |

A detailed breakout of this operational spending shows that the City of Greenville ranks relatively high among cities in North Carolina with similar populations.

| Agency | Salaries | All Other Direct Spending | Construction | Land, Equipment, and Existing Structures | Total |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|---|------------|
| Asheville | 4,527,717 | 7,150,102 | | 203,624 | 11,881,443 |
| Concord | 1,067,491 | 2,422,007 | 547,491 | 76,895 | 4,113,884 |
| Gastonia | 1,626,920 | 692,920 | 80,463 | | 2,400,303 |
| Greenville | 3,540,809 | 1,858,782 | 501,985 | 375,495 | 6,277,071 |
| High Point | 3,603,977 | 2,214,226 | 313,272 | | 6,131,475 |
| Jacksonville | 804,893 | 1,372,390 | 648,734 | 101,985 | 2,928,002 |
| Kinston-Lenoir | 1,360,256 | 1,454,435 | 367,991 | | 3,182,682 |
| Rocky Mount | 2,980,562 | 1,573,786 | 8,496,988 | 1,713,875 | 14,765,211 |
| Wilmington | 3,106,743 | 3,127,015 | 253,022 | 75,328 | 6,562,108 |

Per Capita Expenditures by Individual Agency

A review of the per capita spending (including both operational and capital expenditures) for the same cities demonstrates that the City of Greenville ranks relatively high in overall per capita spending.

| Agency | Operation Expenditures Per Capita | Capital Expenditures Per Capita | Total Per Capita |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Asheville | 159.56 | 2.78 | 162.34 |
| Concord | 55.01 | 9.84 | 65.86 |
| Gastonia | 33.01 | 1.14 | 34.15 |
| Greenville | 78.28 | 12.72 | 91.00 |
| High Point | 62.89 | 3.39 | 66.28 |
| Jacksonville | 29.78 | 10.27 | 40.04 |
| Kinston-Lenoir | 122.02 | 15.95 | 137.97 |
| Rocky Mount | 181.39 | 80.91 | 262.30 |
| Wilmington | 64.18 | 3.38 | 67.56 |

Gold Medal Winners

Another way of benchmarking the City's parks and recreation facilities/programs is to compare Greenville with other outstanding communities from across the nation. The American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration (AARPA), in partnership with the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) presents National Gold Medal Awards to the nation's outstanding park and recreation agencies for excellence in the field of recreation management. Gold Medal winners exhibit excellence in:

- Long range planning
- Fiscal resource management
- Citizen support systems
- Environmental stewardship
- Preservation
- Technological integration
- Program planning and assessment
- Professional development
- Agency recognition
- Services for special populations

With a current population of \pm 72,000, Greenville is similar to cities in the Class III population category (50,001 to 100,000). This planning effort reviewed Gold Medal winners from the Class III category from 2006 and 2007.

City of Bloomington Parks and Recreation, Bloomington, Indiana

2007 Gold Medal Winner, Class III (population 50,001 to 100,000) Population 69,291 Median Family Income (2000 dollars) \$50,054 Median Home Value \$162,700 Employees: 58 Full Time (300 seasonal employees)

The City of Bloomington's Park and Recreation Department is responsible for \$43 million in community assets including thirty-one parks and approximately 2,300 acres of public land (includes two cemeteries and a golf course). The Department offers four community centers, a golf course, two sports complexes, an ice arena, community theater, and thirty miles of trails. Recreation facilities include eleven shelters, thirteen ballfields, twenty-two tennis courts, and nineteen basketball courts. In addition to the distinction of being a Gold Medal winner, the Department has maintained accredited status through the Commission of Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies.

Bend Metro Park and Recreation, Bend, Oregon

| 2006 Gold Medal W | /inner, Class III (p | opulation 50,001 - 100,000) | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Population | 70,328 | Median Family Income (2005 dollars) | \$40,857 |
| | | Median Home Value | \$279,900 |
| Employees: | 90 Full Time | | |
| 10 Year Car | oital Improvement | Plan (2002-2011) \$87,178,991 | |

The Bend Metro Park and Recreation District is a special tax district separate from the City of Bend. The Department provides residents with over 2,300 acres of developed and undeveloped parkland in 74 parks and open spaces. Special use facilities include the Juniper Swim and Fitness Center, and the Bend Senior Center. The Department also contains fifty-six miles of trails.

Classifications For Parks, Open Space And Greenways

A comprehensive park system is made up of a variety of park types that range from very large regional parks (often encompassing hundreds of acres) to very small mini parks (sometimes less than one acre). The descriptions on the following pages define the parks that should make up a comprehensive park system. A variety of agencies (federal, state, county, and municipal) play a role in providing this system, and to understand this role, one needs to understand the make up of a comprehensive park and recreation system.

The following sheets describe the various park types:

Regional Parks/Nature Preserves

Regional parks are typically very large sites, encompassing unique qualities that exemplify the natural features, the diverse land formations, and the variety of vegetation and wildlife found in the region. Examples of the types of facilities provided in a regional park include environmental centers, camping, nature trails, observation decks, and picnic areas. Open fields for non-structured activities, such as frisbee throwing or kite flying, are also generally found in these parks.

Land chosen for future preserves or the expansion of existing sites should contain the previously mentioned characteristics accompanied with natural water features such as beach areas, rivers, and creeks. The majority of the site should be reserved for passive recreation, with the remaining acreage used for active recreation.

Specific standards/criteria for developing regional parks are as follows:

| Service Area: Acreage/Population Ratio: Typical Size: | Countywide 10 acres per 1,000 persons Sufficient area to encompass the resources to be preserved and managed. Typically a minimum of 200 acres; up to 1,000 acres. |
|---|--|
| Typical Facilities: Environmental Center Equestrian Center Primitive Camping Group Camping Recreational Vehicles Camping Nature Trails Observation Deck Picnic Shelters with Grills | Picnic Tables with Grills (not under shelter) Restrooms/Vending Beach Swimming Boating Fishing Piers/Boat Docks Parking Caretaker's House |



Sports Complex

Sports complexes function as the major source of active recreation in the community. Activities are similar to those found in community parks, but are developed to support tournament competition. Passive recreation opportunities are usually limited, but may be found in undisturbed areas, preferably within surrounding buffers.

Sites for sports complexes should be relatively flat to alleviate excessive grading of active facilities. Since most of the land will be developed for athletic fields, sites without significant vegetation or natural features are acceptable, and in some cases may be preferred. Sites should be accessible from major thoroughfares. Direct access to residential areas should be limited and buffers, where adjacent to residential areas, should be provided.

Listed below are standards for developing sports complexes:Service Area:3 to 5 mile radiusAcreage/Population Ratio:2.0 acres per 1,000 personsTypical Size:40-80 acres

Typical Facilities:

| Playground | Picnic Shelter with Grills |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Basketball Courts | Picnic Tables with Grills (not under shelter) |
| Tennis Courts (lighted) | Nature Trail |
| Tournament Level Tennis Facilities | Benches or Bench Swings |
| Volleyball Courts | Restroom/Concessions |
| Multi-purpose Fields | Parking |
| Tournament Level Soccer Fields | Service Yard |
| Tournament Level Baseball/Softball F | ields |

Alternate Facilities:

| Recreation Center |
|-------------------|
| Tennis Center |
| Running Track |

Amphitheater Observation Decks

Development of sports complexes typically falls within the responsibility of the county or municipal agency.



40-80 Acres

Typical Sports Complex

Community Park

Community parks provide for the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or large sections of the community. A range of facilities is typically provided and may support tournament competition for athletic and league sports or passive recreation. These parks also present opportunities for nontraditional types of recreation. Fifty percent of the community park site should be developed for passive recreation. These relatively undisturbed areas may serve as buffers around the park and/or act as buffers between active facilities.

Community park sites should have varying topography and vegetation. Forested areas should have a variety of tree species. Cleared areas should be present for siting active recreational facilities. One or more natural water feature(s), such as a lake, river, or creek, are desirable in community parks. Parkland should be contiguous and strategically located in order to be accessible to all users within the neighborhoods it serves.

Development of these parks should be based upon the following standards:

| Service Area: | .5 - 3 mile radius | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Acreage/Population Ratio: | 3 acres per 1,000 persons | |
| Typical Size: | 20-75 acres | |
| | | |

Typical Facilities:

| Recreation Center | Picnic Tables with Grills |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Basketball Courts | Benches or Bench Swings |
| Tennis Court (lighted) | Nature Trails |
| Baseball/Softball Fields (lighted) | Restroom/Concessions |
| Multipurpose Fields | Parking |
| Soccer Fields (lighted) | Playgrounds |
| Swimming Pool | Volleyball Courts |
| Amphitheater | Disc Golf |
| Observations Decks | Lakes |
| Picnic Shelters | Paddle Boat/Canoe Harbor |
| Picnic Shelters with Grills | Fishing Piers/Boat Docks |
| | |

Fifty percent of the community park site should remain undeveloped for passive recreation/open space.

Specialty facilities may be added to or substituted for other facilities depending on community need or special site characteristics.

Development of community parks may fall within the responsibility of the municipality or the county agency.



Neighborhood Park

Volleyball

Trails/Walkways

Neighborhood parks provide the basic unit of the park system. These parks are usually located within walking distance of the area serviced and provide a variety of activities of interest to all age groups. While their small size requires intense development, fifty percent of each site should remain undisturbed to serve as a buffer between the park and adjacent land users.

The standards for neighborhood park development are as follows:

| Service Area: | .5 to .75 mile radius to serve walk-in recreation needs of surrounding populations | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Acreage/Population Ratio: | 1.5 acres per 1,000 persons | |
| Typical Size: | 5-15 acres | |
| Typical Facilities: | | |
| Playground | Picnic Shelters with Grills | |
| Court Games | Picnic Tables with Grills (not under shelter) | |
| Informal Play Field | Benches or Bench Swings | |
| Vollevball | 50% of Site to Remain Undeveloped | |

Where municipal jurisdiction is available, neighborhood parks are typically developed by the municipality.

Parking (7-10 spaces)

50% of Site to Remain Undeveloped



3 - 16

School Park

The trend in public agencies is toward joint use. Through joint use both schools and parks benefit from shared use of facilities and valuable land resources. The school park concept maximizes the joint use objective and provides a planned facility that maximizes public funds. The school park concept typically varies depending on the school. The elementary/middle school provides the ideal setting for a neighborhood park, while the middle/high school follows the function of a community park or youth sports complex.

| Service Area: | Varies depending on school type and park type |
|---------------------|---|
| Desirable Size: | Varies depending on school type and park type |
| Typical Facilities: | Varies depending on school type and park type |

Development of school parks may fall within the responsibility of the municipality or the county agency.



Mini Park

Mini parks are the smallest park classification. These parks are located within walking distance of the area serviced, and they provide limited recreational needs. Mini parks' small size requires intense development and allows little to no buffer between the park and adjacent land users is provided.

The standards for mini park development are as follows:

| Service Area: Acreage/Population Ratio: Typical Size: | .25 mile radius to serve walk-in recreation needs of surrounding populations.25 acres per 1,000 persons1-4 acres |
|--|--|
| Typical Facilities: Playground ½ Basketball Courts Open Play Area | Picnic Tables with Grills (not under shelter) Benches or Bench Swings Landscaped Public Use Area |

Where municipal jurisdiction is available, mini parks are typically developed by the municipality.



Greenways

Greenways provide an important component of the overall park system. They:

- Provide links between park components.
- Emphasize harmony with the natural environment.
- Provide safe pedestrian movement.
- Provide resource based outdoor recreational opportunities.
- Enhance adjacent property values.

Greenways are very similar to natural resource sites; the primary difference is the emphasis on pedestrian trails found in the greenway system.

Desirable Size: Greenways form corridors that vary considerably in length. Widths of these corridors vary as well, although a 50' width is generally considered a minimum.



NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The first step in establishing a park needs assessment for the City is to establish standards for park and facility development. These standards are based on a review of standards used by other agencies of similar size and a review of standards now (or currently) suggested by national and state associations.

Park Needs

Table 3-1 provides information on standards used by other agencies/associations in the development of parks. The final two columns on this table reflect the local standards that were used as part of the City's 2000 Comprehensive Plan, and the standards utilized in the development of this plan. Standards proposed for use in developing this plan are very similar to standards used in 2000.

Utilizing these standards, Table 3-2 illustrates the park acreage requirement for the City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department service area. The acreage requirement is based on the population ratio method (acres of park land per 1,000 population) established for each park. The current population for the City is approximately 72,000 and the 2020 projected population is 106,000 (see Section Two).

Based on this projected population, the City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department will need to add several hundred acres of additional parkland over the planning period (2008-2020) as outlined in Table 3-2 Total "Park Sites and Acreage Needs Per Park Classification". During that period, the City should develop the following additional parks:

14 Mini Parks7 Neighborhood Parks2 Community Parks

Section Four defines the City's need for new parks in greater detail.

Facility Needs

Minimum standards for recreational facilities (i.e., ballfields, courts, picnic shelters, etc.) proposed for the Department were developed in accordance with the industry guidelines established by the NRPA and the NCDENR and from input gained during the public meetings, telephone survey, and the interviews with local stakeholders. These standards, identified in Table 3-3 "Standards for Public Facilities", and discussed in greater detail in Section 4, are the minimum recreation facility standards that should be used in establishing a needs assessment for the city.

Based on these standards, the number of public facilities needed in the park system through the planning period (2008 to 2020), are identified in Table 3-4, "Current and Projected Facility Needs" and summarized below:

| | Current | 2020 |
|---------------------------------|---------|------|
| Adult Baseball Fields | 2 | 3 |
| Youth Baseball Fields | 4 | 10 |
| Softball Fields | 3 | 8 |
| Football Fields | 3 | 5 |
| Soccer Fields | 6 | 12 |
| Basketball Courts | 3 | 9 |
| Tennis Courts | 5 | 18 |
| Volleyball Courts | 4 | 8 |
| Shuffleboard Courts | 1 | 4 |
| Horseshoes | 2 | 6 |
| Picnic Shelter | 1 | 12 |
| Playgrounds | 8 | 19 |
| Miles of Hiking Trails | 14.2 | 22.7 |
| Miles of Fitness/Jogging Trails | 5 8 | 15.2 |
| Rec. Center w/Gym | 0 | 1 |
| Rec. Center w/out Gym | 0 | 1 |
| Swimming Pools | 0 | 1 |
| Sprayground | 3 | 4 |
| Competition Pool | 1 | 1 |
| Miles for Bicycling Lanes | 36 | 53 |
| Camping | 4 | 8 |
| Archery | 0 | 1 |
| Amphitheatre | 0 | 1 |
| Neighborhood Performing Area | a 4 | 5 |
| Stream/Lake Canoe Trail | 11 | 18.2 |
| Stream/Lake Access | 1 | 2 |
| Disc Golf | 1 | 2 |
| Off-leash Dog Area | 2 | 3 |
Table 3-1

City of Greenville Standards for Park Acreage by Park Classification/Type

Acres per 1000 Population

| | | | City of Greenville 2000 | City of Greenville 2008 |
|---|----------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Park Type | NRPA | NCDENR | Standards | Standards |
| Mini-Park | .255 | N/A | .25 | .25 |
| Neighborhood | 1-2 | 2 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Community | 5-8 | 10 | 3-5 | 3 |
| Regional | N/A | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Unique/Special Areas Linear/Greenway Parks | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable |

 Table 3-2

 City of Greenville

 Total Park Sites and Acreage Needs Per Park Classification

| Park Types | NRPA Guidelines | Greenville 2008 | Current Population 72,000 | 2020 Population 106,000 | Existing Parks # Sites Total Acreage | Park Needs Current Population | Park Needs 2020 Population |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mini Parks | 1-3 Acres/Park | 1-4 Acres/Park | 18 acres | 26.5 acres | 7 acres | 11 acres | 19.5 acres |
| | (.25 acres/1,000) | (.25 acres/1,000) | 14 sites | 20 sites | 6 sites | 8 sites | 14 sites |
| Neighborhood | 7-15 Acres/Park | 5-15 Acres/Park | 108 acres | 159 acres | 72 acres | 36 acres | 87 acres |
| Parks | (2 acres/1,000) | (1.5 acres/1,000) | 9 sites | 13 sites | 6 sites | 3 sites | 7 sites |
| Community Parks | 40-100 Acres/Park | 20-75 Acres/Park | 216 acres | 318 acres | 198 acres | 18 acres | 120 acres |
| | (5 Acres/1,000) | (3 Acres/1,000) | 6 sites | 7 sites | 5 sites | 1 site | 2 sites |
| Sports Complex | 60-100 Acres/Park | 40-80 Acres/Park | 144 acres | 212 acres | 46 acres | 98 acres* | 166 acres* |
| | (2.5 Acres/1,000) | (2 Acres/1,000) | 3 sites | 3 sites | 3 sites | 0 site | 0 site |
| Regional Parks | 100-250 Acres/Park | +/-200 Acres/Park | 540 acres | 795 acres | 448 Acres | 92 Acres | 347 Acres |
| | (10 Acres/1,000) | (7.5 Acres/1,000) | 2 sites | 2 sites | 1 sites | 0 sites | 1 site** |

*No additional sites required.

*The City of Greenville has three (3) sports complexes that provide multiple facilities/ fields, but are extremely small. Based on acreage per population assessment, there is a need for additional acreage, but with three (3) existing sports complexes, no additional complex is needed.

**Improvements to Phil Carrol Nature Preserve would provide the second regional park.

Table 3-3 City of Greenville Standards for Public Park and Recreation Facilities

The table below provides a listing of national and state standards commonly used in the development of recreation facilities. The final two columns reflect standards recommended specifically for the City of Greenville.

| Fields | NRPA | NCDENR | Fayetteville- Cumberland | High Point | Rocky Mount | New Hanover | Greenville 2000 | Greenville 2008 |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Adult Baseball | 1/12,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/15,000 | 1/15,000 | 1/12,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 |
| Youth Baseball | 1/10,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/6,500 | 1/6,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/6,000 | | 1/6,000 |
| Softball | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/6,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/7,000 | | 1/6,000 |
| Baseball/Softball | | | | | | | 1/ 4,000 | 1/ 4,000 |
| Football | 1/10,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/20,000 |
| Soccer | 1/10,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/4,000 | 1/6,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/6,000 |
| Courts | | | | | | | | |
| Basketball | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/6,000 |
| Tennis | 1/2,000 | 1/2,000 | 1/4,000 | 1/2,000 | 1/2,000 | 1/2,000 | 1/ 2,000 | 1/ 2,500 |
| Volleyball | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/15,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/10,000 |
| Shuffleboard | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/15,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/ 2,000 | 1/10,000 |
| Horseshoe | 1/5,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/15,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/10,000 | 1/ 2,000 | 1/10,000 |
| Outdoor Areas | | | | | | | | |
| Picnic Shelter | N/A | 1/3,000 | 1/5,000 | 1/3,000 | 1/3,000 | 1/3,000 | 1/ 2,000 | 1/ 3,000 |
| Playground Activities* | N/A | 1/1,000 | 1/3,000 | 1/3,000* | 1/2,500 | 1/3,000* | 1/1,000 | 1/1,000 |
| Trails | | | | | | | | |
| Hiking | 1/region | .4 mile/1.000 | .4 mile/1,000 | .4 mile/1.000 | 1 mile/5,000 | .4 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/4,000 | .25/1,000 |
| Fitness/Jogging | | | | | | | 1 mile/5.000 | .20/1,000 |
| Specialized | | | | | | | | |
| Community Center | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/20,000 | | N/A |
| Rec. Center w/Gym | | | | | | | 1/25,000 | 1/ |
| Rec. Center w/out Gym | | | | | | | 1/10,000 | 1/ 20,000 |
| Swimming Pool | 1/20,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/30,000 | 1/20,000 | 1/50,000 | | 1/35,000 |
| Sprayground | | | 1/50,000 | | | | | 1/25,000 |
| Competition Pool | | | | | | | 1/75,000 | 1/75,000 |
| Golf Course | 1/25,000 | 1/25,000 | 1/300,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/ Community | 1/25,000 | 1/ Community |
| Bicycling Lanes | N/A | 1 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/1,000 | 1 mile/2,000 | 1 mile/ 2,000 |
| Camping | N/A | 2.5 sites /1,000 | 2.5 sites /1,000 | N/A | 2.5 sites /1,000 | 2.5 sites /1,000 | | 1 site /1,000 |
| Archery Area | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 | 1/50,000 |
| Amphitheatre | | | | | | | 1/20,000 | 1/60,000 |
| Neighborhood Performing Area | ļ | | | | | | | 1/20,000 |
| Stream/Lake Canoe Trails | N/A | .2 mile/1,000 | .2 mile/1,000 | .2 mile/1,000 | .2 miles/1,000 | .2 mile/1,000 | .2 mile/1,000 | .2 mile/1,000 |
| Stream/Lake Access | N/A | 1/10 miles | 1/10 miles | 1/10 miles | 1/10 miles | 1/10 miles | 1/10 miles | 1/5 miles |
| Disc Golf | N/A | N/A | 1/50,000 | | | | | 1/35,000 |
| Skateboard Park | N/A | N/A | 1/150,000 | | | | | 1/ Community |
| Off-leash Dog Area | N/A | N/A | 1/50,000 | | | | 1 | 1/30,000 |

Table 3-4 **City of Greenville Current and Projected Facility Needs**

Utilizing the standards for facility development identified in Table 3-3, this table identifies facility needs (current and projected) for the City.

| | Greenville 2008 | Existing Facilities | Current Demand 72,000 | Current Need | 2020 Demand 106,000 | 2020 Projected Need |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Fields | | | | | | |
| Adult Baseball | 1/20,000 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Youth Baseball | 1/ 6,000 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 10 |
| Softball | 1/6,500 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 16 | 8 |
| Football | 1/20,000 | - | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Soccer | 1/6,000 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 18 | 12 |
| Courts | | | | | | |
| Basketball | 1/6,000 | 5/4 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 9 |
| Tennis | 1/ 2,500 | 24 | 29 | 5 | 42 | 18 |
| Volleyball | 1/10,000 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 8 |
| Shuffleboard | 1/10,000 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 4 |
| Horseshoe | 1/10,000 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 6 |
| Outdoor Areas | | | | | | |
| Picnic Shelter | 1/ 3,000 | 23 | 24 | 1 | 35 | 12 |
| Playground Activities* | 1/1,000 | 16 | 24 (72/3) | 8 | 35 (106/3) | 19 |
| Trails | | | | | | |
| Hiking | .25/1,000 | 3.8 | 18 | 14.2 | 26.5 | 22.7 |
| Fitness/Jogging | .20/1,000 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 21.2 | 15.2 |
| Specialized | | | | | | |
| Rec. Center w/Gym | 1/17,000 | 5 | 4 | - | 6 | 1 |
| Rec. Center w/out Gym | 1/ 20,000 | 4 | 4 | - | 5 | 1 |
| Swimming Pool | 1/30,000 | 2 | 2 | - | 3 | 1 |
| Sprayground | 1/25,000 | - | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Competition Pool/Indoor** | 1/75,000 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Golf Course | 1/ Community | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Bicycling Lanes | 1 mile/ 2.000 | - | 36 miles | 36 miles | 53 miles | 53 miles |
| Camping | 1 site /1,000 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 8 |
| Archery Area | 1/50,000 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Amphitheatre | 1/60,000 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Neighborhood Performing Area | 1/20,000 | - | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Stream/Lake Canoe Trails | .2 mile/1,000 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 21.2 | 18.2 |
| Stream/Lake Access | 1/5 miles | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Disc Golf | 1/35,000 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Skateboard Park | 1/ Community | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Off-leash Dog Area | 1/30,000 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |

*Each playground contains 3-4 play activities. ** City should consider participation in the joint agency development of a competition pool.

SECTION FOUR

PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS



City Pool

Section Four Proposal and Recommendations

Introduction

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department is a well established department. Its recent award as Sportstown, USA, a Sports Illustrated magazine recognition of the nation's top fifty recreation programs, is evidence of the Department's dedication and professionalism. The Department offers the citizens of Greenville many programs in organized team sports, and has developed a number of special use facilities (Walter L. Stasavich Nature Center, Bradford Creek Golf Course, Aquatic and Fitness Center, Extreme Park, etc.). These facilities provide the citizens of Greenville (and Pitt County) with a wide variety of active and passive recreation.

Greenville is a rapidly growing and changing community. The expansion of East Carolina University and the associated growth of Pitt County Memorial Hospital, have spurred an increase in population and an influx of new ideas and a diversity of lifestyles. In the next twelve years, the City's population will increase significantly. This rapid growth will result in the continued urbanization of Greenville, and much



City of Greenville

of Pitt County, and will give rise to a broadening of citizen expectations with regards to recreation and parks. The citizens of Greenville recognize the importance of both recreation and parks (and open space), and they expect civic leaders to take a lead role in ensuring that park needs are met.

As Greenville continues to grow over the next decade, land for parks, greenways, and open space will become scarce, particularly in tracts with adequate acreage for neighborhood (8-10 acres) and community (40-70 acres) parks. Available land will increase in cost and, as illustrated in Section Three, there will be needs for both park acreage and recreation facilities as the population grows.

Greenville's ten year park needs are significant. By 2020, over twenty new parks and miles of greenways will be needed, and many of the Department's older parks will require major renovations. In addition to these park needs, there will be a need for several special use facilities (aquatics facilities, recreation centers, gymnasiums, etc). Most of these park and recreation facilities will require land acquisition as well as development capital.

The City of Greenville is not alone in the mission to provide parks and athletic facilities to the community. In addition to its classrooms, Pitt County Schools offers students a wide range of athletic facilities. While there is some joint use of existing facilities, the exploration and expansion of joint use opportunities would benefit taxpayers.

Pitt County, as part of its school system, offers citizens programs and facilities through Community Schools and Recreation. The Towns of Farmville, Winterville, and Ayden all offer park and recreation programs through a full time director at several parks. The Towns of Winterville and Ayden offer park and recreation departments. In addition to these County and municipal facilities and programs, the State of North Carolina offers several state parks within an hour's driving time of the city.

All of these governmental recreation providers offer the citizens of Greenville facilities and services that influence their demand for facilities and programs. Each of these agencies should be considered as the City of Greenville develops its proposals and recommendations for future parks. Likewise, each of these agencies should meet on a regular (semiannual) basis to discuss park and recreation issues and share information about future initiatives.

Another major player with the mission of improving citizens' health and quality of life is the University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina and its flagship hospital, Pitt Memorial Hospital. The City should look for opportunities to partner with the hospital in the promotion of healthy lifestyles.

The private sector also plays an important role in providing recreational opportunities throughout Greenville. These facilities include championship golf courses, numerous swim and tennis clubs, health clubs, two Boys and Girls Clubs, and the health facilities offered at Viquest. While most of these facilities are not available for free, they are meeting the recreational and fitness needs for many residents and reduce the demand for some public facilities. In addition, the private sector may play a role in providing recreation facilities to residents through potential public/private ventures. Public agencies are linking with private vendors to provide recreation opportunities in many communities



throughout North Carolina. Examples of public/ private joint ventures may include health/fitness facilities, swim clubs, and RV camping facilities.

This plan addresses the need for providing parks with both passive and active recreation opportunities. "Passive recreation", such as walking, hiking, and picnicking, typically accommodates the need to preserve green space and allows people to experience nature first hand. "Active recreation" includes activities such as softball, baseball, soccer, and other physical (indoor and outdoor) activities. These types of recreational activities have facilities that are usually provided at sports complexes, community parks, recreation/community centers, and school sites.

To determine specific park and recreation recommendations for the City of Greenville, it is essential to clearly define how the City will interface with the other recreational providers in the community. This cooperative effort will eliminate duplication of facilities and services. The proposals and recommendations of this Master Plan are established based on what is anticipated each recreational provider will offer through the twelve year planning period (2008 - 2020).

Roles of Recreational Providers

State of North Carolina

Several state parks (Goose Creek, Pettigrew, and Cliffs of the Neuse) are within a relatively short drive of Greenville. It is anticipated that the State of North Carolina will continue to maintain and operate all state parks within the region. The City, along with other nearby government agencies, should provide a unified message to the State on their interest to see these parks enhanced to their utmost potential. This may include the expansion of facilities and recreational opportunities. The State should continue to offer a variety of recreational facilities and programs on a regional basis. In



Cliffs of the Neuse State Park

addition, the State should be the provider of regional state parks that include opportunities for camping, fishing, biking, and special facilities of regional and statewide interest.

Pitt County

Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation is a collaborative effort by the Pitt County Board of Commissioners and the Pitt County Board of Education. This office coordinates the use of facilities at thirty-five schools, provides avenues for volunteering, offers recreation programs for citizens of all ages, works with agencies throughout the county and North Carolina coordinating after school programs at twenty schools, and collaborates with schools and communities to develop school parks.

While relying heavily on existing school facilities for program space, they opened their first recreation center in 2005 and are currently developing a twenty-three acre county park with a softball field, multipurpose fields, and a quarter mile trail. Future improvements will include a playground, basketball courts, and nature areas. In addition to this county park facility, Community Schools and Recreation, through its capital outlay program, assists local communities in developing recreation facilities on school grounds.

The services and facilities provided by Community Schools and Recreation serve many needs and should be a continued priority for the County. As evidenced by the county-wide survey, there is a need and demand for parks throughout Pitt County. This demand is evident in many of the City's parks and programs and is reflected in the enrollment by county residents in city programs.

City and County recreation professionals should work closely together to minimize duplication and explore opportunities for joint development and use of facilities. An example of that cooperative operation is current discussions regarding connecting county trails/greenways with City trails and greenways.

Surrounding Park and Recreation Agencies

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department is not the only recreation provider in Pitt County. In addition to Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation, the Town of Farmville has a full time recreation director and offers park and recreation programs through both indoor and outdoor facilities. The Towns of Winterville and Ayden also provide municipal recreation departments. All park and recreation agencies operating within the county should communicate with each other in an effort to minimize duplication and maximize cooperative planning.



Winterville Recreation Park hosts local, state, and regional baseball tournaments.

Pitt County Schools

Value of Joint-Use Agreements – Parks, Recreation and Schools

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department has a tradition of collaborating with other agencies and organizations in the delivery of quality leisure experiences and the development and management of parks and recreation areas and facilities. The City also has a tradition of partnering with Pitt County Schools in the development of outdoor facilities that serve the needs of both the schools and citizens as public park facilities.

The justification for the creation of joint use agreements is based on the premise that the majority of costs for developing and operating schools and recreation facilities come from the same source, local taxpayers. The development of duplicate facilities by those entities would constitute a waste of public funds. A shortage of affordable land and rapidly increasing construction costs are reasons enough for encouraging the efficient use of land and tax revenue. Combining resources allows for greater potential in the development of school and recreation facilities that neither entity is likely to afford if pursued independently. Other potential advantages of joint development and management include:

- The development of centralized public facilities usually requires less land than would be required if the schools and the parks department were to develop separate facilities. The creation of a Capital Facilities Review Committee for Recreation and Parks would be a very positive step in helping to assure the coordination and cost-effectiveness of any new facilities.
- Centralized locations for city services (including schools and parks) allows for the convenience of all citizens, particularly parents, by facilitating their children's participation in various education and recreation pursuits.
- Centralized school/park developments eliminate the duplication of maintenance functions and result in overall cost savings.
- Many of the outdoor areas and facilities needed for schools are also necessary for park and recreation services. Partnering in the development and management of facilities minimizes the duplication of land acquisition and development needs and represents an efficient use of public resources
- Joint developments are eligible for grants from the North Carolina Park and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF). Coordination of PARTF applications also helps avoid submission of competing projects in Pitt County.
- School/Park partnerships encourage the development of positive after-school and weekend enrichment activities focused on the development of the "whole child".
- Park systems usually have the resources for developing and maintaining higher quality sports fields than can be found in most school systems.

Joint use agreements between local park and recreation agencies and school systems are very prevalent across the country. Examples of school/ park and recreation joint use agreements in North Carolina can be found in Cumberland, Scotland, Watauga, Wake, and New Hanover counties.

With all of the advantages, Greenville should work diligently to ensure joint use agreements are enacted and maintained wherever feasible.

University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina

Greenville is home to one of North Carolina's finest health care systems. With its flagship facility, Pitt Memorial Hospital, University Health Systems of Eastern Carolina provides residents of Greenville and the surrounding region with outstanding health care. Recent studies on obesity and healthy lifestyles have made it apparent that a community's health is linked to regular physical activity. Many of these activities are offered by the City's Recreation and Parks Department.

With this shared mission of improving the community's health, there are many opportunities where the Hospital and Recreation and Parks Department could work together to assist citizens in achieving a more active lifestyle. The Department and Hospital have already begun general discussions about how this might occur. These discussions should continue to explore cooperative efforts/ programs.

Role of Greenville

The City of Greenville, through its Recreation and Parks Department, currently affords its citizens a variety of recreation opportunities with over twenty parks. These parks provide opportunities for both active and passive recreation. The offerings of the Greenville Recreation and Parks Department are varied. There is a nice balance between large parks (regional and community) and the smaller "walkto parks" (neighborhood and mini). The City also offers an array of special use facilities in addition to these more traditional park types. The majority of the City's parks are well designed and maintained, and are in relatively good condition. Several of the parks are older facilities and could be significantly improved (both in appearance and function) by redesign and/or renovation. Likewise, the City owns several undeveloped parcels that need facility development if they are to reach their true park and recreation potential.

While the City's existing parks provide a solid foundation of recreation facilities and green space, there are a number of areas where expansion and improvements are needed. This is especially important if Greenville is to keep pace with its rapid population growth and land development.

One of the most important roles the Recreation and Parks Department can play in the future of the community is the preservation of green space and the protection of riparian areas. The City's Community Development Department, as well as many other public and private agencies, recognizes the importance of preserving green space in a rapidly urbanizing community. Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department can preserve some of the valuable green space that is rapidly disappearing through the acquisition of land for parks and greenways.

In order for the City of Greenville to provide the parkland and facilities that will be required, it must work in conjunction with other agencies in



Westhaven Park

the community. This collaborative effort should include working with the Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation Department and adjacent municipal departments to minimize duplication of facilities by developing and maintaining joint use agreements for school facilities.

Park Proposal and Recommendations

Through the planning and public involvement process, the standards established in the 2000 Parks and Recreation Master Plan have been updated to reflect current community demand. These standards are defined in Section Three "Standards and Needs Assessment". With these standards as a backdrop, the following recommendations are made for future park development:

Regional Parks

Regional parks are typically large, passive-oriented parks that highlight and utilize a unique natural feature in a community. River Park North is an example of a regional park. Located across the Tar River from the downtown area, this park contains over 448 acres of land and water and provides a variety of passive recreation opportunities. In addition to River Park North, the Phil Carrol Nature Preserve provides a second undeveloped regional facility for the preservation of open space, passive recreation and environmental education. Improvements to



Fishing at River Park North.

both facilities would greatly expand the public's access to the Tar River and to undeveloped open space. While River Park North has been developed with a variety of passive recreation opportunities for public use, recent land acquisition and changes in needs have resulted in a need to look at the park's current and future facility needs. A master plan for River Park North should be developed. As part of this master plan, pedestrian access across the river to the City's downtown area should be studied.

The Phil Carrol Nature Preserve needs infrastructure improvements to allow public use of this property. The City should develop a master plan for this property that will provide for public use without degradation of the site's natural features. As with all master plans, the planning process should incorporate public input.

Once the Phil Carrol property has been improved to provide public access, these two regional parks, along with the state parks found in the area, will provide Greenville with adequate passive recreation opportunities.

Community Parks

Community parks are perhaps the most important component of a municipal park and recreation system. These parks are typically large enough to provide valuable active recreation opportunities while allowing portions of the park to be left undeveloped for open space and passive recreation.

Currently the City of Greenville has five community parks (H. Boyd Lee, Elm Street, Evans, Greenfield Terrace, and West Meadowbrook). The majority of these parks are located within the City's central core. These five parks provide a core component of the City's park and recreation facilities. Each of these parks should be studied to ensure they are meeting current community needs. West Meadowbrook Park, which is one of the City's larger parks, is relatively undeveloped. A master plan should be developed for this park to maximize use. Greenville's community parks were developed under older NRPA standards that recommend these parks be 20 to 75 acres. This standard has resulted in the development of relatively small community parks. The current NRPA standard for community parks is 40 to 100 acres. This additional acreage allows for both active and passive recreation.

The national and state standards for development of community parks is five to ten acres per 1,000 population (see Table 3-1). The 2000 Master Plan established a criteria of three to five acres per 1,000 population for community parks. This Master Plan utilizes the more conservative standard of development (three acres per 1,000). Even using this more conservative number, there is a current need for eighteen acres of additional community park land in the city; by 2020 that need increases to 120 acres. At a size of \pm 50 acres per park, this standard would indicate two additional community parks will be needed in the next twelve years.

One of these community parks should be developed on the City's property on Highway 33 (10th Street Extension). This site received tremendous support for park development at all of the public meetings. At 120 acres, this site is large enough to allow active recreation (ballfields), while allowing much of the site to be preserved as public open space. This site would also provide an ideal setting for the City's first star gazing area.

Finally, a note about athletic fields in community



parks. Based on the small size of the City's sports complexes (see section below), the City should focus its athletic field development in many of its community parks (existing and proposed). Through the development of multi-field complexes in these community parks, the City will be able to develop tournament level facilities that will not only provide for league play, but can also be used for tournament play. Through these tournament level facilities, economic impact might be realized.

Sports Complexes

Sports complexes are larger athletic facilities where many clusters of athletic fields can be developed. Usually 80 to 100 acres, these multi-field complexes can meet much of a community's demand for league play and often provide a tournament level facility for regional play. Currently the City has three sports complexes (Bradford Creek Soccer Complex, Perkins Baseball Complex, and Guy Smith Park and Stadium). While each of these sports complexes provide excellent athletic facilities that are meeting much of the City's league-play needs, they are too small to provide the type of venue that will draw regional tournament play. This limits the economic impact they have for the community. Plans for each of these parks should be reviewed to identify improvements that can enhance playability and use. Particular emphasis should be placed on adding infrastructure at Bradford Creek Soccer Complex.

Utilizing a very conservative standard for the development of sports complexes (two acres per 1,000 population vs. five to ten acres per 1,000 population used by state and national guidelines), there is a demand for 144 acres of additional sports complex facilities. At a recommended size of 40 to 80 acres per facility, this standard results in a need for three sports complexes. Currently the City has three sports complexes. While the acreage of these complexes is small, the number of facilities appears to be meeting demand.

Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks play an important role in providing both active and passive recreation in a community. Usually in the 5 to 15 acre range, these

parks are large enough to include both active and passive recreation opportunities, but small enough to allow for a wide geographical distribution.

The City has six neighborhood parks (Andrew A. Best Freedom Park, Jaycee, Greensprings, South Greenville, Thomas Foreman, and Paramore), but still has much work to do in this area of neighborhood park development. The desire for neighborhood parks was expressed in every public meeting and in many of the stakeholder interviews. The 2000 Recreation and Parks Master Plan established a standard for development of neighborhood parks of one and a half acres per 1,000 population (see Table 3-1).

Maintaining the 2000 criteria for neighborhood park development (1.5 acres/1,000 population) results in a current need for an additional \pm 36 acres of neighborhood park land. Assuming eight to ten acres per park, this standard indicates a current demand for three new neighborhood parks. By 2020, this need will increase to seven neighborhood parks.

New neighborhood parks should be spaced throughout the city in areas currently not being served by a neighborhood park. Typically, neighborhood parks have a half mile service radius, locating them one mile apart. One obvious location for a new neighborhood park is the land adjacent



Andrew A. Best Freedom Park

to the new off-leash dog park the City acquired as part of the FEMA buyout program. During the public meetings, several people expressed a desire for development of a park on this site; calling it a potential River Park South.

In addition to the proposed new neighborhood parks, several of the City's existing neighborhood parks need expansion and/or improvements. Particular emphasis should be placed on improving Thomas Foreman Park and South Greenville Park. Master plans outlining proposed park improvements/ expansion should be developed for both of these parks.

Mini Parks

Mini parks are the smallest of the park types. These parks typically range in size from one half to four acres and provide a limited range of activities (playground, picnic shelter, benches, etc.). There are six mini parks (Belmont/Dream, Hillside, Peppermint, Tobacco Road, West Haven, and Woodlawn) containing approximately five acres of parkland within the Greenville Recreation and Parks system.



Woodlawn Park

Many municipal park agencies are placing less emphasis on mini parks because their small size limits their recreational use and these small parks are geographically dispersed requiring considerably more maintenance effort and cost than fewer, larger parks. Even with this understanding, the demand for small mini parks was evident in all of the public meetings and stakeholder interviews. Based on this strong desire to develop "walk to" parks and utilize the standards of development that were identified in the 2000 plan (a quarter acre per 1,000), there is a current need for eleven acres of additional mini parks or eight new parks. By 2020, this demand will grow to almost nineteen and a half acres with a need for fourteen new mini park sites.

Greenways

The most popular form of outdoor recreation in the nation is walking. This popularity was reflected in the survey that was conducted as part of this planning study and in comments made during the public meetings. Greenway trails are typically offroad trails that meander through neighborhoods and natural areas providing transportation corridors and recreational opportunities for walkers, joggers, roller bladers, and cyclists. The trail surface can either be natural or paved and is normally eight to ten feet in width. In addition to providing environmental protection and recreation opportunities, greenways can produce economic development. The North Carolina Department of Transportation Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation recently conducted a study on a bicycle trail constructed along the northern Outer Banks region. This study determined that a \$6.7 million investment in offroad bike paths and shoulder improvements produced an estimated \$60 million annually in economic the study found that



Greensprings Mill Greenway

- Bicycle facilities in the area are an important factor to many tourists visiting the region.
- Investments in the bicycle facilities improved the safety of the area's transportation system.
- Bicycle activities include the benefits of health, fitness, quality of life, and the environment.

Greenways also offer a valuable alternative to automotive transportation. A greenway trail provides a linkage between communities, schools, churches, businesses, and parks. A proposed pedestrian connection across the Tar River between the downtown area and River Park North can provide a valuable link between the northern and southern parklands.

In 2004, the City developed a greenway master plan to identify corridors for development, establish a budget for land acquisition and construction, and create a plan of action (with schedule) for greenway development. This plan recommended 42 greenway projects with over 102 miles of proposed greenways and/or sidewalk trails.

The implementation of this plan, and the construction of the initial phases of a greenway system, should be one of Greenville's highest park improvement priorities. Walking, jogging, and biking (all activities that occur on greenways) ranked extremely high in all of the public input responses.

Greenways should be developed in conjunction with other park and recreation providers in the area (ECU and Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation Department) to ensure it is coordinated with other planning efforts and that there is continuity between plans.

The development of greenways was originally under the direction of the Public Works Department. The responsibility for greenway development has been moved to Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department. While the Public Works Department should be commended for its leadership role in developing the Greensprings Mill Greenway, City Administration showed true leadership and vision by moving the responsibility of greenway development to the Recreation and Parks Department.

To facilitate this level of park and greenway planning, the Recreation and Parks Department should add technical staff that can facilitate this type of planning. A park and greenway planner or landscape architect should be added to the Recreation and Parks staff.

Bikeways

The need for bikeable roads and the development of greenways for biking was repeatedly mentioned in many of the interviews and all of the public meetings. Many people sited the lack of bike lanes as a citywide problem. With the focus on healthy lifestyles, the environment, and alternative transportation, there is a great need to develop a city-wide bike plan. A special task force has recently been established to facilitate a community wide bike plan. The Recreation and Parks Department should be engaged in this planning process.

The City should encourage the State to include bike lanes whenever roadway improvements are made or new roads constructed. This plan should also become part of the City's subdivision process, where developers are required to accommodate bicycle (and pedestrian) traffic in the roadway improvements they construct as part of the development process.

The City should consider tapping into the federal government's SAFETEA program which funds nonvehicular transportation projects that encourage alternative means of transportation. These funds have been used to construct bike lanes and greenway trails in communities throughout North Carolina.

The development of a city-wide greenway, along with a city-wide bike plan would provide an important amenity that would benefit residents. As documented in the NCDOT study on bicycle facilities along the northern Outer Banks, the development of a bicycle/pedestrian trail system can have a



significant economic impact on a community.

A city task force on improving bikeways in general has been established. A representative from the Recreation and Parks Department (possibly the proposed park planner) should be a participant in this task force and the Department should be a strong proponent of the development of safe bikeways. This need was expressed in the survey, interviews and in all of the public meetings.

Renovation/Expansion of Existing Parks

While the focus of the previous recommendations has been on the acquisition and development of new parks, there is also a need to improve/expand facilities at a number of the City's existing parks. As part of the ongoing planning and budgeting process, the City's Recreation and Parks Department annually establishes a list of capital improvement projects. This list of capital improvement needs is then used by the Department and elected officials to establish yearly capital improvement budgets. Many of the projects currently listed on the City's Capital Improvement Plan have been included in the Capital Improvement Program listed in Table 5-1.

As noted in previous sections, master plans should be developed for many of the City's existing parks and recreation buildings. Parks/facilities that warrant special study include:

- River Park North
- Phil Carrol Property
- Thomas Foreman Park/Eppes Center
- Greenfield Terrace Park
- South Greenville Park/Recreation Center
- Park Maintenance Facility

Facility Proposals and Recommendations

Based on the previous recommendations on park development, the City of Greenville should construct over twenty parks, add several recreation buildings, expand its greenway trail, and renovate several of its existing parks by the year 2020. The improvements that will be made as part of these renovations and expansions will add many new facilities to the parks inventory. The City should consider the list of facility needs established in Section Three and described in greater detail below:



Adult Baseball

Over the past five to ten years, the popularity of adult baseball has waned. While most communities include adult baseball fields in their facilities, the sport does not carry the popularity it once held. The City's 2000 Master Plan recommended a standard of one field per 20,000 people for the development of adult baseball fields. Utilizing this standard of field development, the City will have a need for three additional adult baseball fields by 2020. Whenever possible, utilization of school facilities for adult baseball will allow the City to focus resources in other areas.

Youth Baseball

Youth baseball is very popular in North Carolina. The 2000 Master Plan established an extremely aggressive criteria for the development of youth baseball fields (one field per 4,000). Based on this standard for youth baseball, the City exhibits a demand for this sport greater than that expressed in the national, state, and other similar municipal department standards. While it is apparent there is considerable demand for the sport, reducing the standard for field development should be considered. With this understanding, the standard for facility development of youth baseball fields has been set at one field per 6,000 people. This is still significantly greater than the national and state standards (one field per 10,000). Utilizing this standard for development results in a current need for four additional youth baseball fields, with ten additional fields needed by 2020. In addition to constructing new fields, the City should consider lighting more of its existing fields.

Softball

Men's adult softball has traditionally been a very popular sport in North Carolina, and NRPA and NCDENR standards (one field per 5,000 people) reflect that popularity. While the sport is still popular, there has been some shift in demand of men's adult softball in the past few years. Based on a standard of one field per 6,500, the City has a current need of three softball fields with a further need of eight new fields by 2020. Some of these fields should be designed to facilitate co-ed play.

It should also be noted that changes in demand have now placed additional emphasis on women's softball. Either some of Greenville's future softball fields should be designed to accommodate this new area of play, or some of the existing fields should be retrofitted to allow for women's play.



Football

Football's popularity has been influenced by the emergence of soccer and (most recently) lacrosse. With this understanding, the standard for development of football fields is one field for every 20,000 people within the service community. This standard results in a current demand for three football fields. Based on this very conservative standard, Greenville should consider building four to five additional football fields over the next ten years.



Soccer

One of the fastest growing sports in America, soccer has surpassed the demand for football in this country. This master plan reflects this demand by establishing a standard of one field for every 6,000 people within the service population. This standard exceeds national and state standards significantly. Since the development of the 2000 plan, Greenville developed the Bradford Creek Soccer Complex, but even with the development of this facility, there is a need for ten to twelve additional soccer fields over the next decade. In addition to developing more fields, there are facility improvements to be made at Bradford Creek Soccer Complex that will enhance play and use of this facility. These improvements include construction of additional picnic shelters, lighting additional ballfields, and constructing trails.

As with other sports facilities, the City should consider lighting its soccer fields. Lighting fields doubles the effective use of the fields.

A final note on soccer. The demand for soccer fields will only continue in the future, and will be made more intense by the new interest in lacrosse. Played on a field very similar to a soccer field (they are slightly larger than soccer fields), lacrosse will increase in popularity and should be planned for as the City reviews its soccer field needs. The new sport should be taken into consideration since play for both sports can be programmed on similar fields. One method to accommodate the variety of field games (soccer, lacrosse, rugby, football) is to develop larger multi-use fields that can be used for play by a variety of field games.



Basketball

Basketball is still an extremely popular sport in the United States. Played by a variety of ages, and increasingly by females, this sport can be played either indoors or out. The development of outdoor basketball courts cost considerably less than an indoor gymnasium. Currently the City provides five outdoor and four indoor courts. Based on national and state standards of development of one basketball court per 6,000 people, Greenville currently has a need for three additional outdoor courts. By 2020, that need will increase to nine additional courts.

Outdoor courts are relatively inexpensive to construct and do not require significant space in a park. They do require careful placement because activity around the court is often aggressive and male dominated and does not mix well with other youth activities.

See the section on community centers/gymnasiums for the community's needs of indoor courts.



Tennis

Tennis has not experienced the same growth and interest as some of the nation's newer sports (soccer, lacrosse, etc.), but as the baby boomers move into their 50s and retirement, the demand for sports that keep people active without physical contact will increase. This assessment was reinforced as part of the interview with stakeholders.

The River Birch Tennis Center is an excellent facility, but even with this facility, there is a need for additional tennis courts throughout the City. Utilizing a standard of facility development slightly less than the national and state standards (one court per 2,500 people), there is a need for five additional tennis courts. By 2020, this need will increase to eighteen additional courts. These courts should not be constructed as part of another

tennis center, but instead should be located in groups of two to three courts in neighborhood and community parks.

Volleyball

The national and state standard for development of volleyball courts is one court per 5,000 people. Reducing this standard by half (one court per 10,000 people) would result in the need of four to eight additional outdoor courts. Volleyball courts are relatively small and can easily be added to existing parks.



Shuffleboard

Like volleyball, there are only limited public shuffleboard courts in Greenville's park system. This activity provides a recreational outlet and opportunities for social interaction, particularly in the elderly population. The City currently has six shuffleboard courts in Elm Street Park that need improvements. While the national and state standard of one court per 5,000 people seems excessive, the development of some additional courts would provide an excellent activity for the community's older population. Reducing the national and state standards by half (one court per 10,000 people) will result in a need for four of these game courts. Like volleyball courts, shuffleboard courts are easily added to existing parks.

Horseshoes

Horseshoes is a popular pastime for both young and old. The City offers horseshoes at Elm Street Park and River Park North. Based on a development standard of one court per 10,000 (similar to the standard used for volleyball and shuffleboard), the City will need to construct six additional courts by 2020.



Picnic Shelters

Picnicking was one of the most popular recreational activities listed by respondents in the city-wide survey. The City currently has twenty three shelters in its park system. Based on a standard of one shelter per 3,000 people, there is a need for twelve additional shelters by 2020.



Playgrounds

The City has sixteen playgrounds in its parks. As new parks are developed, the City should look for

locations for additional playgrounds. Larger parks may warrant more than one playground.

Pedestrian Trails

Walking is the number one outdoor recreational activity in the United States. Based on the positive response it received in the public survey (90% indicated they either are currently walking or would like to walk), it is an extremely popular activity in Greenville as well.

With this level of public demand, the development of walking trails should be a priority for future park development. As noted previously in this section, the City should work on implementation of its 2004 Greenway Master Plan. In addition to the greenway, a priority should be placed on walking trail development in all existing and future parks. A paved walking trail is an important component of all park types, and should be provided in all neighborhood and community parks as well as sports complexes.



Stream/Lake Canoe Trails/Access

The Tar River, and its system of natural streams, provides the City of Greenville with a wonderful opportunity to develop a blueway canoe trail similar to the greenways that have been started. This blueway stream system should include vehicular access/parking, canoe/kayak input areas, and designated canoe trails with maps and markers. The development of a blueway trail along the Tar River would provide a unique and valuable park facility for residents, and potentially provide a tourist destination with economic impact benefits.

Biking Trails

Walking, jogging, and hiking ranked as the number one activity of those interviewed as part of the survey expressed an interest in biking. As discussed earlier in this section, the City should expand opportunities for biking through the development of a greenway trail system, including paths suitable for biking in existing and future parks, and through encouraging NCDOT to develop roads with bike lanes or wider shoulders to accommodate bikers. The Recreation and Parks Department should work with other stakeholders, including the Bicycle Friendly Community Task Force, to help promote and facilitate new bikeways throughout the City.

Amphitheatres/Neighborhood Performing Areas

Currently the City has one amphitheatre located at Town Common. This facility provides a venue for city-wide concerts and special events. Recent discussion on downtown revitalization and development of a master plan for Town Common could result in improvements to this facility. Any proposed master plan should include provisions for an amphitheatre facility that can accommodate and attract regional events and concerts. The promotion of such regional events can have significant economic impact for the City.

In addition to a large regional amphitheatre, the City should also make provisions for smaller, neighborhood gathering places for plays, small concerts, and other special events. These facilities would provide a small stage and space for gathering in a more informal manner than the large amphitheatre at Town Common.

Special Use Facilities

Community Centers/Gymnasiums

The City of Greenville currently provides four recreation centers with gymnasiums (Boyd Lee, Elm Street, Eppes, and South Greenville). Two other facilities (Aquatics and Fitness Center and the Sports Connection) provide gymnasiums to those paying a fee. In addition to these public facilities, there are gymnasiums at the local high schools and middle schools (see section on Joint Use), Viquest, and ECU.



Boyd Lee Gymnasium

As the city grows, there will be a need for one additional public community center with a gymnasium and one additional community center without a gymnasium within Greenville.

A number of the City's existing gymnasiums are extremely old and need significant renovations. A plan has been developed for the renovation of the gymnasium at Elm Street Park and efforts are currently underway to convert it into the Drew Steele Center. This project received strong public support in each of the public meetings. The City should continue these efforts until funding can be raised and improvements made. In addition to the Drew Steele Center, the City should begin plans for similar makeovers at Eppes Center and South Greenville Recreation Center.

Swimming Pools/Spraygrounds

In the past NRPA and NCDENR provided a standard for pool development of one pool for every 20,000 people. This standard was based on the concept of multi neighborhood or community pools. Today, with the cost of operation and construction of swimming pools, very few agencies develop neighborhood/ community pools to that old standard; instead they typically provide more centralized facilities where one pool may serve a greater population. Based on input from interviews, public meetings, and the survey, a standard of one pool for every 30,000 people has been proposed.



Currently the City of Greenville offers its citizens two swimming pools (indoor pool at the Aquatics and Fitness Center and outdoor pool at Guy Smith Park).

Based on a standard of one pool per 30,000 population, the City will need to construct one additional swimming pool within the ten year planning period.

In addition to the need for an additional pool, the City should consider building several spraygrounds. Spraygrounds are growing in popularity across the country. In addition to offering a water-based play experience, the play structures, sprays, etc. afford kids of all ages a total play environment and are much more economical to operate than a standard swimming pool. A properly designed, large water park sprayground will also serve as a regional draw to provide revenue to the Department as well as economic impact to the surrounding areas.

There is no competition level indoor aquatic facility in the Greenville region. Based on demand for an indoor competitive swimming facility, there is a need for a regional indoor swimming facility. An effort has been underway for some time to bring multiple agencies together to develop a major indoor facility. Promoters will likely need the schools, the hospital, the County, and the City as partners in this facility. Greenville should consider how it can partner in this much needed regional facility.

Golf Courses

The City of Greenville offers its citizens an outstanding opportunity to enjoy golf through its Bradford Creek Golf Course. This is a relatively new course providing residents with quality facilities and programs. Much of the golf course's revenues are put back into the facility to reduce debt. This has resulted in minimal reinvestment in course improvements. In the future, greater attention (and funding) will be needed to keep this course competitive with other golf facilities in the area. Improvements like the recent lighting of the driving range are good investments because then can improve golf course revenues.



Archery

The City currently has an archery range at Evans Park adjacent to the River Birch Tennis Center. Archery is a skill sport enjoyed by some, but based on the relatively low percentage of people who participate, development of any additional archery areas should not be a high priority.

Camping

Camping provides an opportunity to enjoy nature and experience social interaction. The City of Greenville offers primitive campground facility at River Park North. While camping is not typically a recreational activity that municipal agencies provide, River Park North offers opportunities for providing a primitive camping experience. Likewise, the development of the Phil Carrol Property could offer additional campus opportunities. The development of some camp sites at one or both of these parks could introduce this park activity to non-campers and create a connection to the natural environment.

Trends in Park and Recreation Facilities

The list of recreational activities developed for this Master Plan is based on national and state standards that have been used in park planning for decades. As noted earlier in this section, these standards are used as a point of reference, with the understanding that each community should develop a set that are unique to their specific needs.

One of the downsides of the national and state standards is that they are not updated often and fail to incorporate newer trends and activities. In the past decade, several new activities have been growing in popularity that should be included in future park development. These activities include:



Skateboard Parks/Extreme Sports

Skateboarding has been popular for several decades. In the past decade, many communities have recognized its popularity and have tried to provide a safe and vandal resistant setting for this creative sport. Greenville is a truly unique community that has attracted a number of nationally recognized extreme sport athletes and has become a haven for BMX, skateboarding, and other extreme sports. To support and foster this activity, Greenville has a skateboard and BMX facility at its Extreme Park at Jaycee Park. While portions of this park receive heavy use, the area designated for roller hockey is currently under-utilized. Alternative uses should be considered for this area of Extreme Park. Likewise, operation of the skate park warrant review. Currently, the facility is supervised and there is a charge for using the facility. Trends in skateboarding park operation have moved away from supervised operation to a more "freeplay" style. The Department, along with the City Attorney, should investigate the feasibility of this type of operation.

With the strong local demand for these facilities, the City should consider improvements to the facilities at Jaycee Park. In addition to this citywide skate park/extreme sports facility, there may be opportunities for smaller skate facilities in neighborhood or community parks.

Skateboard parks can be as simple or elaborate as a community's budget will allow. The primary goal is to provide a safe, attractive setting for users. Recent litigation has reduced the liability exposure for communities that provide these facilities.

Disc Golf

The popularity of disc golf continues to rise. Currently, the City has a disc golf course at West Meadowbrook Park. Additional courses should be considered at new or existing parks.



Off-leash Dog Areas

One of the newest trends in park development, the off-leash dog areas (also known as dog parks), is a response to the nation's love of pets. Communities throughout North Carolina are now constructing dog parks.

Dog parks take many forms, but are primarily a place within a park where park users can bring their dogs to run, walk, and recreate. They usually include a fenced open area where dogs, accompanied by their owner, are allowed to run free. Often the off-leash dog area is divided into sections for large and small dogs.

Greenville recently opened its first off-leash dog area on a floodway buyout property adjacent to the river. The park has met with outstanding support. The facility is has received tremendous use and has had a very favorable response from users.

Several people at the public meetings expressed the desire to see an off-leash dog area added to one of the City's public parks.

Park Facilities as Economic Developers

John L. Crompton, in his publication "Parks and Economic Development", determined there are four economic development benefits that a community may derive from park and recreation services. These benefits include:

- Attracting Tourists: The features and programs that attract tourism to a community include parks, beaches, historic sites, museums, special events and festivals, and athletic tournaments. The majority of these features are provided by public agencies (national, state, local park agencies, etc.).
- Enhancing Real Estate Values: Research shows people will pay more to live close to natural park areas. These higher property values result in owners paying higher property taxes, which in turn offsets some of the cost for the development parks and preservation of open space.
- Attracting Business: Quality of life issues influence where businesses locate. Parks, recreation, and open space are an important component of the quality of life equation. Good parks help cities attract and retain businesses.
- Attracting Retirees: A new growth industry for American communities is the retirement population. The decision to relocate by this segment of our population is primarily governed by climate and recreation opportunities. This segment of the population is extremely attractive to local governments because retirees are unlikely to have children enrolled in the local school system and therefore are less of a burden on the community's tax base.

The City of Greenville has traditionally placed a high value on parks and recreation programs and facilities that provide quality of life improvement. Town Common, River Park North, and Elm Street Park each set a tone of community pride in public parks and reflect the priority the City places on public recreation and open space. Development of this master plan update is further evidence that the City recognizes the importance parks play in the quality of life.

Through these investments in parks over the years, City officials have ensured that Greenville provides the quality of life that helps attract new businesses, enhances real estate values, and provides an attractive option to the retirement community. The City and the Greenville Convention and Visitor's Bureau also realize the importance of building and promoting tourism as a means of economic development. The Convention and Visitor's Bureau is already promoting sporting events in the Greenville region. Currently the Bureau is working to promote tournaments with regional draw in the following sports:

- Softball
- Soccer
- Baseball
- Basketball

There are many more opportunities for attracting economic impact to Greenville through tourism. John Crompton lists the following opportunities for tourist attractions:

Arts

- Theaters
- Art Galleries
- Museums
- Performing groups, Music
- Concerts

Heritage Places

- Ethnic cultural places
- Shrines/churches
- Historical sites and structures
- Educational institutions
- Industry factory tours

Parks

- National
- State
- Regional
- Local
- Beaches
- Theme parks

Recreation

- Events and festivals
- Aquatic and coastal areas
- Outdoor recreation (e.g., camping, fishing, hunting)

Arenas

- College sports
- Professional franchises
- Concerts and exhibitions

Many of these activities and facilities are already found within the City. The majority of these potential tourism attractions are in the public realm or are a public/private venture.

The City of Greenville is already embracing economic development through tourism with its tournament level athletic facilities and its regional parks and golf courses. Further expansion of tourism could be realized in the areas of the proposed arts center, a regional natatorium and swimming facility, and the expanded soccer facilities. The expansion of these facilities would provide additional local programming capabilities as well as provide tournament and special events opportunities with tourism and economic impact benefits.

The City should be open to new park facilities and activities that can provide tourism opportunities. Facilities with potential economic impact capabilities include:

- Zoo
- Arboretums
- Velodrome
- BMX track
- Ice skating/hockey
- Roller hockey
- Frisbee golf
- Equestrian center

Greater study of these, and other tournament facilities, may be warranted.

SECTION FIVE

ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION



Sarah Vaughn Field of Dreams

Section Five Action Plan Implementation

Introduction

The City of Greenville's Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan is based upon a review of the community's character and growth, an analysis of the existing park system, the identification of user needs, the development of recreation standards, and an adherence to stated proposals and recommendations. The plan is intended to be "action-oriented", designed to provide a framework from which the City's Recreation and Parks Department can enhance their parks and recreation system.

Instrumental to the implementation of the Master Plan is the identification of adequate funding for land acquisition and park development. Finding adequate funding is particularly difficult in this time of escalating construction cost and land values. These rising costs place an even greater value on planning for the future to meet park and recreation needs.



City of Greenville

Implementing the recommendations made in this Master Plan will result in meeting the future needs for parks and recreation services, as well as preserving open space in the area. The City of Greenville should continue to establish annual budgets on projected capital improvements, staffing, operations and maintenance costs for the Department that not only meet current needs, but also allow acquisition and development for future needs. This action plan is designed to give the City and the Department a realistic approach to financing the proposals and recommendations of this Master Plan.

Capital Improvement Program

The Capital Improvement Program for the acquisition, renovation, and development of parks for the planning period was prepared with input from City staff and public involvement. All of the proposed costs are shown in 2008 dollar values. The capital improvement costs include funds for land acquisition, site preparation, site utilities, and facility development as well as estimated planning and design fees.

The Capital Improvement Program can be summarized into the following components:

| Park Renovations | \$27,329,500 |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Land Acquisition | 2,980,000 |
| Park Development | 12,760,000 |
| Special Use Facilities Program | 10,450,000 |
| Total Capital Improvement Budget | \$53,519,500 |

Table 5-1 "Capital Improvements Plan" shows the costs associated with the capital improvement program (twelve-year planning period). The table reflects the proposals and recommendations as outlined in Section Four of this Master Plan.

Operational Recommendations

In addition to looking at future facility needs of the Department, this Master Plan must also address some of the operational issues that will face the Department in the coming decade. These issues relate to the manpower and organizational changes that will be required as the Department adds new parks/facilities and hundreds of acres of park land. Likewise, these recommendations address some of the critical operational issues the Department needs to identify as it works to become not only a bigger department, but a better department.

Staff Needs

With the expansion of park facilities over the next decade, there will be a need for additional staff to develop, operate, and maintain these new facilities. These anticipated new facilities will require program/operational staff for one new recreation center/gymnasium, one new swimming pool, and several spraygrounds. In addition, two new community parks, seven new neighborhood parks, fourteen new mini parks, and miles of new greenways will require new grounds crews, park supervisors, and administrative staff.

While the development of a true operation and maintenance program for these future facilities is beyond the scope of this master plan study, it is important that the City plan and budget for adequate staff positions for any new facilities that are constructed. Likewise, as these new facilities come on line, the City should actively seek the highest level of programming staff with strong educational experience in the various areas of park and recreation administration.

As part of this planning process, two specific, immediate departmental needs have emerged. First, there is a need for a full time marketing position within the Department. This person will focus attention on promoting to the public the wide variety of activities and programs that are available through the Department and the benefits to the individual and community that these services afford. Through this promotion, citizens will be better served because information regarding programs and facilities will get to the user. The Department will also benefit through greater participation in its programs. This will result in potentially greater revenues. In addition to the more traditional marketing roles, the Department's new Marketing Director will lead efforts to develop and energize programs through a park foundation and promote corporate sponsorships of the parks.

A second position mentioned throughout the planning process is the need for a full time park planner. This person will provide valuable project management skills as the Department constructs new facilities, and will offer insight in the design of these new facilities. In light of the park construction that will occur over the next ten years, this position is critical to the success of the Department.

Operational Costs

As noted above, the development of new recreation facilities will require additional staff for the Department. These new staff positions will add to the annual operational budget in both staff and equipment costs. The expansion of park facilities will also add significantly to the energy and utility cost of park and recreation facilities. Based on recent increases in energy cost, these operational costs could be substantial. The recommended facility improvements included in this Master Plan will increase the Department's facilities by 25-35%. Expansion of this magnitude will have significant implications to the operational budget. The Department's management staff and elected officials must carefully consider the financial impact of each major capital improvement project as projects are considered. No capital improvement project should be undertaken without the commitment of support for adequate ongoing operational funding. Likewise, consideration should be given to the positive economic impacts that some facilities may have on the Greenville economy, and if applicable, their potential for revenue generation.

Improve Operations/ Maintenance Facilities

As noted throughout this planning document, citizens and staff believe Greenville's parks are well maintained. Currently maintenance operations

for the entire department is based from the Department's maintenance facility on 3rd Street. Departmental staff does an excellent job providing a quality maintenance program for its existing facilities, but to meet increased demand and prepare for new facilities, the maintenance facility will need significant improvements/expansion. A detailed architectural and site study should be made of the existing facility and a plan for expansion/ improvements made.

Greener Operation

As the world's population expands and environmental concerns over global warming, conservation of resources, and preservation of our fragile natural systems become more apparent, greater environmental responsibility by public and private agencies has become critical. As a government agency, particularly one that is involved with the management of public open space and the improvement of the public's health, the Recreation and Parks Department should make a sincere and concerted effort to minimize its environmental impact.

With this understanding, the Department should evaluate its maintenance and operational procedures with an intent to minimize waste and environmental impact. Where economically feasible, the Department should look to implement operational procedures that emphasize conservation, recycling, and sustainability. Likewise, as the Department looks to build new facilities, it should consider constructing facilities that minimize environmental impacts, conserve energy, and reuse building materials where possible.

As a starting point for this conversion to a "greener" operation, the Department should establish a committee of operation, maintenance, and construction stakeholders to study the options available and develop a plan for becoming "greener".

Key Funding/Revenue Sources

The City's Recreation and Parks Department has strong public support for parks, programs, and services. Even with this support, innovative measures will be required if the City is to keep up with the needs of one of the fastest growing urban areas in the state. The proposed additional facilities and expanded operations will require the City to seek funding dollars from a variety of sources. Greenville will need to create a combination of revenue sources to meet the future needs of local residents. The following funding sources are provided to help the City evaluate funding options.

Revenue Plan

Upon adoption of the Master Plan, the Department, with input from civic leaders, should consider the establishment of a revenue plan. A revenue plan incorporates all available funding resources in a community, prioritizes them, and puts each option into a funding strategy. In a revenue plan, the following funding alternatives are evaluated for their appropriate use in funding capital improvements and programs:

General Tax Revenues

General tax revenues traditionally provide the principle source of funds for general operations and maintenance of a municipal and county recreation and parks system. Recreation, as a public service, is scheduled along with health, public safety, schools, etc. in annual budgets established by the governing authority. Assessed valuation of real and personal property provides the framework for this major portion of the tax base. This tax base is then used to fund the majority of municipal services. If the City wishes to offer a park and recreation system that provides quality of life and health maintenance opportunities for the community, the level of funding for parks and recreation must be maintained or increased.

User Fees

Recreation facilities such as game fields, courts,

and boat/water areas are typically covered by a combination of general tax revenues and user fees. All park and recreation systems have different values in place for how they fund various portions of a recreation experience. Tax subsidies vary by activity and the City will need to determine the level of commitment expected under these values or principles.

User fees are currently offsetting maintenance costs and provide limited capital improvements. This method of funding is particularly applicable to the Bradford Creek Golf Course. The Department will need to update its current revenue and pricing policy as part of an overall revenue plan based on the values and guiding funding principles of the area. The cost of additional facilities and operation of those facilities must be increasingly bourne by the user through user fees. The City of Greenville has a number of significant revenue sources of this type. Fees from the City's golf course, Aquatics and Fitness Center, and tennis center provide significant income which is then reflected in the operation and expansion of these programs.

The City currently has a policy of allowing citizens to participate in programs for free if they cannot afford the fee for participation. While this is a wellmeaning policy that should be continued, policy guidelines should be developed to provide greater control over how this policy is administered.

General Obligation Bonds

General tax revenue for parks and recreation are usually devoted to current operations and maintenance of existing facilities. General obligation bonds are often used to finance capital improvements in parks. The State of North Carolina gives municipal and county governments the authority to accomplish this borrowing of funds for parks and recreation through the issuance of bonds not to exceed the total cost of improvements (including land acquisition). For purposes of paying the debt service on the sale of these bonds, cities are often required to increase taxes through reevaluation or increases in the tax rate. Total bonding capacities for local government is limited for parks and recreation to a maximum percentage of assessed property valuation.

The City of Greenville has used this method of financing park improvements in the past. In view of the recommended capital improvements suggested in this plan, borrowing of funds to acquire new land and develop facilities will continue to be necessary.

An added value of a governing agency's bonding authority and capacity is its ability to use those funds to leverage other funding opportunities. Bonding enables government agencies to utilize funds to match federal grant-in-aid monies or state funds. General obligation bonds are still the greatest source utilized to fund park projects in North Carolina. Over the next ten years, Greenville will need to create a series of bond referendums to achieve the capital improvements identified in the plan.

The positive response to bonds, both in the public survey and during the public meetings, suggests this may be the avenue to provide funding for much of the proposed park improvements. Through a well thought out and publicly presented bond campaign, voters would be given the opportunity to choose to support park improvements through the sale of bonds.

Revenue Bonds

Revenue bonds have become a popular funding method for financing high use specialty facilities like golf courses, aquatic centers, ice rinks, tennis centers, and complexes for softball and soccer. The user, and other revenue sources, then repay the bonds. This revenue source would only be of use to the City if they choose to change their tax subsidy policy for using this type of funding. The City most likely would not seek out this option.

Limited Option or Special Use Tax

Limited option or special use taxes can be established in various ways. A municipality or county can establish the tax by determining the source, such as property valuation, real estate transfer taxes, or sales tax. This option will require legislative approval. Typically, special use taxes are structured on sales tax or transfer taxes and earmarked for a project need. A governing body can approve a tax that is identified or earmarked on property valuation; however, other sources may require state approval. The idea behind a special option or limited option tax is that the tax is identified or limited for a special purpose or projects and the duration can also be limited to accomplishing the projects.

Park Foundation (Partners for Parks)

A park foundation can be instrumental in assisting the City in acquiring land, developing facilities, sponsoring programs, and buying equipment for the Department. Park foundations typically create five funding strategies for accessing money to build up their coffers. These include a foundation membership, individual gifts, grants from other recognized and national foundations, long term endowments, and a land trust for future acquisitions. As noted previously in this section, a departmental marketing position would be instrumental in getting a park foundation actively promoting city parks and recreation programs and facilities.

General Foundations

Another source of revenue is the direct contribution of money from General Foundations within the state or nation. Foundation funds should be sought for both development and construction of facilities as well as providing programs. They should include general-purpose foundations that have relatively few restrictions, special program foundations for specific activities, and corporate foundations with few limitations and typically from local sources. The Trust for Public Land and NC Rails-Trail have been instrumental in providing financial and technical assistance for open space conservation and development of greenways in North Carolina. Another source of local assistance may be large corporations with foundations established to provide grants for public projects. Companies such as Bank of America, Wachovia, and Progress Energy, may have available funding through existing grant programs, or they may be interested in creating

a program or partnership for specific projects. The Department should actively pursue grants from foundation and trust sources on a regional and national level. Information on trusts and foundations can be found through the Foundation Center, 79 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003-3076 (http://foundationcenter.org/) and the Non-Profit Gateway to Federal Government agencies (http:// www.usa.gov/index.shtml).

Federal and State Assistance

Federal funding sources are available to assist with financing Master Plan recommendations. One of the oldest park funding sources has been available from the U.S. Park Service's Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Unfortunately, funding through this program has been sporadic over the past few years. Other potential federal funding sources are the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

The North Carolina General Assembly passed a bill in 1994 creating a consistent source of funds for parks and recreation in the state. The Parks and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF) provides money for capital improvements, repairs, renovations, and land acquisition in state and local parks. Revenues from the state's portion of the real estate deed transfer tax support the fund. Revenues vary from year to year, but have ranged from \$50-\$55 million annually. Of the funds allocated, 65% go to the state parks system, 30% provide matching grants to local governments, and the remaining 5% go to the Coastal and Estuarine Water Beach Access Program. The maximum matching grant is limited to \$500,000 for a single project. The PARTF system allows an agency to apply for a 50/50 cost-sharing grant to develop or acquire parkland and facilities. The City has received funding through this program in the past and should continue to apply for funds through this program on a regular basis.

Additionally, the State can fund projects such as bikeways and pedestrian walks through the federally funded SAFTEA [formerly known as the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)]. The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) administers the funds and the local government agency can use these funds for developing portions of any proposed greenway system. Local communities can also apply for assistance with pedestrian, bikeway, and greenway projects by applying for "NCDOT Enhancement Funds."

Another source of state administered funding is through the Clean Water Management Trust Fund (CWMTF). These funds are set aside for the acquisition of riparian properties, financing of innovative wastewater management initiatives, stormwater mitigation and stream bank restoration projects, support for greenways, and some planning programs. The acquired or purchased property can be used for recreation while protecting valuable water resources from the affects of urban encroachment. Money from this grant is particularly applicable to the preservation of open space, greenway development, and water access.

Earned Income Opportunities

The City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department currently generates funds to offset operational and capital costs through developing earned income opportunities. The Department should be constantly exploring opportunities for generating income. Some of these opportunities include:

- Sponsorships from private businesses operating in the area. Sponsorships typically come in the form of product sponsors, event sponsors, program sponsors, cause-related sponsors, and in-kind sponsors. These sponsorships can also take the form of naming rights for a facility or program. When this avenue of earned income is used, sponsorship/naming agreements should include very specific details with regards to sponsorship cost, duration, use of promotional materials, etc.
- Based on the needs of the Department, grants from local foundations, state and federal agencies, or individuals are typically created by staff. Most grants take time to prepare and require coordination effort with other agencies or departments from within the community to

create a quality submittal. Grants also require extensive tracking of expenditures and outcomes for attaining future funding.

- Partnerships are the new area of earned income in that many communities are seeking to share costs in providing services to the community. Many times the partners are two or more government agencies. This earned income requires both agencies to have common visions, values, and goals for the partnership to be successful. Typically, partnerships follow some of these general trends:
 - Church partnerships in providing neighborhood parks or recreation services.
 - Youth sports associations where volunteers help the Department in providing the service to the community for the sports that they represent.
 - Trail sponsors that adopt sections of trails for maintenance and cleanup.
 - Adopt-a-park partners that help maintain park lands. These sponsors are typically in the form of neighborhood associations and businesses that are in proximity to parks.
 - School partnerships where both partners invest in the development of facilities and programs based on shared use of facilities and staff. This investment may be financial, or may include other means of support.
 - Special event partners that assist with the development of community-wide events.
 - Program partners who assist each other in providing services to the community. The YMCA, YWCA, or schools working with the Recreation and Parks Department to cosponsor programs is an example of this partnership.
- Park foundation development is another earned income opportunity that park systems have embraced to enhance their facilities and programs. Park foundations help seek individuals who wish to invest in the system by providing donations of land, cash, or in-kind related services. These donations can add value to the City.
- Advertising and licensing in programs, facilities, and events sponsored by the Department. This

earned income allows the City to leverage highly exposed advertising space where businesses will pay a premium for the right to advertise.

- Volunteer development programs are a highly valued earned income opportunity the Department can create through effective recruitment. Volunteers can create advocacy and bring down the cost of programs and services.
- Privatizing the development of facilities or services is an earned income opportunity that is used by communities when they are unable to control the cost of labor and are unable to find the needed capital to develop a recreational facility or a concession operation. This gives the government agency a management tool to create an asset or improve a service without tapping into their own resources. Facilities that are typically considered for privatization may include golf courses, marinas, camping/RV facilities, boat rentals, bike rentals, equipment rentals, and other forms of concessions.
- Marketing strategies are an important component in developing earned income opportunities. The City of Greenville should consider assessing program participants \$1 for development of a marketing budget that will provide promotional services, research, and reserve funds for the Department. These promotional activities improve awareness of the activities provided by the Department and assist in bringing more revenue to the system by filling programs and facilities.

Methods for Acquisition and Development

In order to meet future park needs, administration and staff must be creative in the acquisition and development of new facilities. Through this creativity, the City should explore a wide range of options for acquiring and developing parks. Methods available for acquiring and developing parks recommended in the Master Plan include the following:

Fee Simple Purchase

The outright purchase is perhaps the most widely used method of obtaining parkland. Fee simple purchase has the advantage of being relatively simple to administer and to explain to the general public to justify a particular public expenditure. Unfortunately, fee simple purchase often is the most expensive means of obtaining and utilizing a property.

Fee Simple with Lease-Back or Resale

This technique of land acquisition enables the Department to purchase land to lease or sell to a prospective user with deed restrictions that would protect the land from abuse or development. This method is used by governments who impose development restrictions severe enough that the owner considers himself to have lost the major portion of the property's value and it is more economical for him to sell with a lease-back option.

Long -Term Option

A long-term option is frequently used when a property is considered to have potential future value though it is not desired or affordable to the Department at the time. Under the terms of a long-term option, the Department agrees with the landowner on a selling price for the property and a time period over which the Department has the right to exercise its option. The first benefit of this protective method is that the option stabilizes the escalating land cost and establishes land use for the property. Secondly, the Department/City does not have to expend large sums of money until the land is purchased. Thirdly, the purchase price of the land is established. The disadvantage of this method is that a price must be paid for every right given by the property owner. In this case, the cost of land use stabilization and a price commitment comes in the form of the cost of securing the option.

First Right of Purchase

This approach to acquiring parkland eliminates the need for fixing the selling price of a parcel of land, yet alerts the Department of any impending purchase

which might disrupt the parkland acquisition goals. The Department would be notified that a purchase is pending and would have the right to purchase the property before it is sold to the party requesting the purchase.

Land Trust

The role and responsibility of a Land Trust is to acquire parkland and open space while maintaining a well-balanced system of park resources ecological, representing outstanding scenic, recreational, and historical features. A Land Trust is a 501 (c)(3) not-for-profit corporation made up of key knowledgeable leaders in the area who represent a cross section of interest and experience in recreation, historic properties, conservation, preservation, land development, and environmental issues. Their goals and responsibilities are to work with landowners to acquire parkland for current and future generations. The individuals appointed to the Land Trust must have knowledge of land acquisition methods and tools used to entice land owners to sell, donate, provide easements, life estates, irrevocable trusts, or a combination of all. This includes seeking out a knowledgeable land acquisition attorney who is trained in these areas to provide the most efficient and effective processes to achieve the balance of types of land to meet the goals of the Comprehensive Recreation Master Plan.

Local Gifts

A significant, and yet often untapped, source of funding acquisition and development of local park projects is through a well-organized local gifts program. Donations of land, money, or labor can have a meaningful impact on the development of the City's park system.

The most frequently used type of gift involves the giving of land to be used for a park. The timing of such a donation can correspond with a PARTF grant application, thereby providing all or a significant portion of the local matching requirement associated with this fund. A similar use of gifts involves donated labor or materials, which become

part of an improvement project and help to reduce project costs. The value of the services or materials can, in some cases, also be used to match nonlocal grant funds.

Some agencies have developed a gift catalog as a tool for promoting a gifts program. Such a publication should explain the role and importance of the gifts program, describe its advantages, define the tax advantages that may occur to the donor, and identify various gifts (land, labor, play equipment, materials, trees, etc.) that are needed to meet local program needs. The gifts catalog should be prepared in a format that can be distributed effectively and inexpensively and should provide a clear statement of needs, typical costs associated with various gifts, and be made readily available to the public.

To aid this type of gift program, a strategy for contacting potential donors (individuals, businesses, foundations, service clubs, etc.) should be developed. An important part of this strategy should include contacting the local Bar Association, trust departments of lending institutions, and the Probate Court. Communicating with these groups regularly will make them aware of the potential for individuals to include a gift to the Parks and Recreation Department as part of their tax and estate planning.

Life Estate

A life estate is a deferred gift. Under this plan, a donor retains use of his land during his lifetime and relinquishes title to such land upon his death. In return for this gift, the owner is usually relieved of the property tax burden on the donated land.

Easement

The most common type of less-than-fee interest in land is an easement. Property ownership may be viewed as a combination of rights. With this understanding, it is possible to purchase any one or several of these rights. An easement seeks either to compensate the landholder for the right to use his land in some manner or to compensate him for the loss of one of his privileges to use the land. One advantage of this less-than-fee interest in the land is the private citizen continues to use the land while the land remains on the tax records continuing as a source of revenue for the City. Perhaps the greatest benefit lies in the fact that the community purchases only those rights that it specifically needs to execute its parkland objectives. By purchasing only rights that are needed, the Department is making more selective and efficient use of its limited financial resources.

Zoning/Subdivision Regulations

Some communities in North Carolina have zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations that require a developer to donate a portion of the property they are developing to the government agency to be used for public park land. Through these regulations zoning ordinances, subdivision regulation, and mandatory dedications may be utilized to create new parkland at no cost to the community. Regulations can require that land is dedicated and/or compensation made to the City for the development of parkland. Currently the City of Greenville's ordinances do not include provisions for the dedication of park land.

Study Committee

A study committee comprised of representatives from the Community Development and Recreation and Parks Departments, elected officials, and the development community should be established to review the various methods available for acquisition and development.

Master Plan Funding Strategy

Over the planning period (2008-2020), the City will not be able to support the growth in operational cost and the proposed capital improvement (\$53,519,500) with the current level of capital appropriations. The Department will need to use a combination of revenue sources to accomplish the recommendations of the Master Plan. There are numerous combinations of funding strategies that can be explored and implemented. Upon careful analysis of past budget documents, current practices, available resources, and national trends, an example of a funding strategy is presented as one possible strategy.

General Funds

Allocations from the General Fund will need to increase to pay for operation of future facilities. By increasing funding for park and recreation operations 10% to 15%, the City will raise this level of funding significantly. This additional per capita funding, along with the increase in population, will fund the majority of future operational costs, but will not provide the funding required for capital improvements.

In addition to this increased operational spending, the City should begin budgeting a minimum of \$750,000 for capital improvements projects on an annual basis. This level of spending over the next twelve to fifteen years will provide over \$9 to \$10 million in funds for capital projects.

General Obligation Bonds

General Obligation Bonds should be used in acquiring and developing new parks and recreation facilities. The funding strategy proposes that General Obligation Bonds be targeted to raise approximately \$30 to \$35 million. This would represent a significant portion of funds needed for the proposed capital improvements budget (\$53,519,500). The \$35 million can be dedicated to acquiring all the land for the proposed park sites, renovation of existing parks, the development of community parks and sports complexes and construction of the City's greenways. In order to raise the \$35 million in twelve to fifteen years, the City may need to present several bond referendums for park improvements to its citizens over the planning period. As noted earlier in this section (General Obligation Bonds, page 5-4), this level of bond sales will likely result in the need for additional tax revenues to pay for the debt service created by the sale of these bonds.

Revenues & User Charges

A crucial strategy to accomplish the goals of this plan is to price services based on the value and benefits received by the participants beyond those of all taxpayers. Increasing the number of participants using the facilities and programs will increase revenue opportunities. A good time to price services to their value and benefits is after new facilities are constructed or when facilities have been renovated to enhance a participant's recreational experience. A proposed user charge revenue strategy is not a quantum leap to market value pricing, but a slightly enhanced program of increasing fees based on new and renovated facilities. This will create more revenue and capacity opportunities for the growing population of the city.

Currently, revenues and user charges account for a relatively small percentage of the operating budget. This level will need to increase throughout the planning period and represents the largest challenge for the Department if new facilities are built. Likewise, the City should develop a fee structure that will allow greater net revenue to be realized. Assuming the level of funding can increase, it will generate approximately \$150,000 \$200,000 annually, providing \$2,000,000 to increased income over the next twelve to fifteen vears that can be used for operating new facilities developed as recommended in this Master Plan. To accommodate this goal, revenue from user charges must increase throughout the planning period. This goal is achievable by bringing new facilities online and making modest changes to the current fee structure for activities and programs.

Partnerships and Gifts

The City should explore ways to raise sponsorships, and partnerships should be encouraged and expanded. One avenue for expanding this effort will be establishing a Partners For Parks program. This non-profit organization should be established independent of the Department and operate as a stand alone charitable organization. This nonprofit organization allows private citizens and corporations to donate money, land, and in-kind services for use by the Recreation and Parks Department. Once established, Partners For Parks should be able to raise \$200,000 to \$250,000 in funds annually. This would generate \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 for capital improvements for the planning period.

Sponsorships/Naming Rights

Another excellent source of development capital is through project sponsorship/underwriting by corporations throughout the community. Quality facilities, properly marketed, provide an excellent venue for raising development funds. Naming rights for athletic fields, swimming facilities, playgrounds, etc. can be used to raise tens of thousands of dollars. Usually handled through the Partners for Parks organization, this form of revenue generation could raise \$100,000 to \$150,000 annually; providing as much as \$1.5 million for the twelve to fifteen year planning period.

Grants

The Parks and Recreation Department has been very successful in finding and procuring funds from state and local grants. The City should continue to explore grants such as LWCF, PARTF, SAFTEA, clean water grants, etc. Active pursuit of this funding could provide \$2,000,000 in funds for capital improvements over the next twelve to fifteen years.

Strategy for Capital Improvements Funding

Utilizing these alternatives for funding capital improvements for park development, there are infinite strategies for capital funding. With the magnitude of park improvements recommended by this master plan, it is assumed that bonds for parkland acquisition and park development will play a role in financing. One potential strategy for capital improvements funding is:

| Annual Capital Improvements Budget | \$10,000,000 |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| General Obligation Bonds | 35,000,000 |
| Revenues/User Charges | 2,000,000 |
| Partnerships/Gifts | 3,000,000 |
| Sponsorships | 1,500,000 |
| Grants | 2,000,000 |
| | |

Total

\$53,500,000
| City of Recreation and Capital Imp | ole 5-1 Greenville Parks Department rovement Plan 8-2020 | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Capital Improvement and Land Acquisition | Total Planning Period | Funding Years 2008-2013 | Funding Years 2014-2020 |
| Park Renovations | | | |
| Drew Steele Center | \$3,200,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$2,000,000 |
| South Greenville Recreation Center | \$5,700,000 | \$5,700,000 | \$2,000,000 |
| Eppes Recreation Center | \$6,500,000 | \$6,500,000 | |
| Jaycee Park Arts & Crafts Center | \$1,200,000 | + • ;= • • ;= • • | \$1,200,000 |
| Boyd Lee Park Improvements | \$3,775,000 | | |
| Parking | <i>+- j</i> | \$375,000 | |
| Multi-purpose Fields | | \$400,000 | |
| Phase III | | 4 9 | \$3,000,000 |
| River Park Improvements (parking) | \$300,000 | | \$300,000 |
| Bradford Creek Soccer Complex | \$700,000 | | |
| Lighting | | | \$550,000 |
| Restroom shelter | | \$150,000 | <i>.</i> |
| Community Center Improvements | \$1,500,000 | | \$1,500,000 |
| Park Maintenance Facility | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | |
| Spraygrounds | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Bleachers/Seating | \$100,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Park Signage | \$100,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Playground Improvements | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Equipment | \$150,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 |
| Walk/Trail Improvements | \$70,000 | \$70,000 | |
| Skate Park | \$350,000 | | \$350,000 |
| Discusion & Design | \$2,484,500 | ¢1 527 500 | ¢057.500 |
| Planning & Design | \$2,484,500 | \$1,527,500 | \$957,500 |
| Park Renovations Total | \$27,329,500 | \$16,797,000 | \$10,532,500 |
| Land Acquisition | | | |
| Community Parks (1 site) | | | |
| West Greenville-(50 acres @ \$20,000) | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | |
| Neighborhood Parks (6 sites) | | | |
| West Central-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | | \$200,000 |
| West-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | | \$200,000 |
| South West-(10 acres @ \$20,000) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | φ200,000 |











20 & #22; City of Greenville Capital Improvement Plan

- <u>The funded portion of the adopted CIP plan is a biennial budget</u> (i.e. in effect for <u>two budget</u> <u>vears</u>). This adopted budget projects capital budget requests for five (5) years (2011 to 2015) and funds CIP requests for two (2) years. It is the current capital program for the City of Greenville.
- The \$194,000 requested on the Fy 11-12 CIP budget book page RP sum-1 represents the amount requested two (2) years ago prior to Master Plan development. The amount requested in the current CIP is \$784,900, although we hope that the PARTF Grant will offset \$250,000. This CIP request will not be approved until June, 2012. <u>A waiver for documenting those funds is required until June, 2012.</u>
- The City of Greenville's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is developed and adopted as a budget for the entire city, with Recreation & Parks Capital Budget making up a portion of the overall adopted CIP budget.
- Per the enclosed documentation, the Capital Improvement Plan for the City of Greenville was adopted on June 10, 2010. Specific reference to budget adoption appears on "Official Minutes; Meeting of the City Council", page 9.
- The last four (4) pages of documentation enclosed are from the published CIP Budget Program book. This document states the date of budget adoption, provides the cover of the budget book for reference, provides the overall five (5) year CIP budget for Recreation & Parks, and provides the specific budget request for Dream Park.
- A key component in developing the CIP plan is the Capital Needs Assessment (CNA). The CNA is the long term planning document used to identify all capital needs in the park system.
- Dream Park is listed in the CNA (copy attached). While this version had to be inserted prior to completion of the final Master Plan it does reflect early community comments and is closer in project scope to the final project now identified in PARTF.







FY 2011-2015 Capital Improvement Program

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

FISCAL YEARS 2011 - 2015



Approved by City Council June 10, 2010

Mission Statement

The City of Greenville is dedicated to providing all citizens with quality services in an open, ethical manner, insuring a community of distinction for the future.

| RTMENTS |
|-----------------------------------|
| S BY DEPAI |
| T REQUESTS BY DEPARTME |
| VEMENT |
| AL IMPRO |
| ARY OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT |
| SUMMARY C |

| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------|-------------|----------|---------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| | 2010-11 | 11 | 2011 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | -13 | 201 | 2013-14 | 20 | 2014-15 | TOTAL | AL |
| e | MET | UNMET | MET | UNMET | MET | UNMET | MET | UNMET | MET | UNMET | MET | UNMET |
| | 45,000 \$ | - | \$ | ' ج | \$ | ' ج | ' \$ | ' \$ | ' \$ | ۰ ج | \$ 45,000 | ۔ ج |
| | 95,000 | | 43,010 | | 48,010 | | | | | | 146,030 95,000 | |
| | | 120 500 | 100,000 | 000 03 | | | | | | | 100,000 | - 100 500 |
| | 58.000 | 000,001 | | 00,000 | | 850.000 | | | | | 58.000 | 850.000 |
| | | 235,930 | | 4,200,000 | | | | | | | | 4,435,930 |
| | | 40,000 | | 395,000 | ' | | | | | 1 | | 435,000 |
| | 30'/ DO | 75 000 | 00'/DO | | | | | | | | - - | - 75 000 |
| | | 185,671 | | 210,652 | | 77,140 | | | | | | 473,463 |
| | 18,085 | | 58,000 | | | | | | | | 76,085 | 1 0 |
| | 000 | 53,500 | | | | | | | | | OUD BE DOD | 53,500 |
| | 000,600 | 10,000 | | 435,000 | | | | | | | | 1,149,000 445,000 |
| | | 56,900 | | | | | | | | | I | 56,900 |
| | | - 000 | 100,000 | 328,000 | | | | | | | 100,000 | 328,000 |
| | | 75,000 | | 45 000 | | 78 000 | | | | | | 194,000 |
| | | 75,000 | | 2020 | | 00010 | | | | | | 75,000 |
| | | 50,000 | | 95,000 | | | | 274,452 | | 203,600 | I | 623,052 |
| | | 40,000 | | | | 250,000 | | | | | | 290,000 |
| | | 228,000 | | | | | | | | | | 228,000 |
| | 150,000 | - | | 396,000 | | 55,000 | | | | | 150,000 | 451,000 |
| | 000 | 106,000 | | | | 1,965,000 | | | | | | 2,071,000 |
| | 35,000 | 150,000 | | | | | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | 35,000 | 4,150,000 2 200 000 |
| | | 37.000 | | 45.700 | | 318.000 | | | | 2,000,000 | | 400.700 |
| | | 40,000 | | 295,000 | | | | | | | ' | 335,000 |
| | | 72,000 | | | | | | | | | | 72,000 |
| | | 100,000 | | 238,000 | | | | | | | | 338,000 |
| | | | | 35,000 | | 300.000 | | | | | | 335,000 |
| | 100,000 | | | 202 | | 1,250,000 | | | | | 100,000 | 1,250,000 |
| | | | | | | 36,000 | | | | | | 36,000 |
| | | | | | | 100,000 | | 238,000 | | | | 338,000 |
| | | | | | | 390,000 | | 000 000 | | | | 390,000 |
| | | | | | | 000,000 2.28,000 | | 600,000 | | | | 1,200,000 228,000 |
| | | | | | | 306,143 | | | | | | 306,143 |
| | | | | | | | | 2,350,000 | | | | 2,350,000 |
| | | | | 250 000 | | | | | | 46,000 | | 46,000 250.000 |
| | C74 44E | ¢ 1 101 2014 | e 346 260 | ¢ 0 700 053 | ¢ 40.640 | COC CUO 2 \$ | ų | ¢ E ACT ACT | ų | ¢ 1 340 600 | ¢ 1 070 445 | ¢ 77,090,190 |

STORMWATER FUND VEHICLE REPLACEMENT FUND PRIORITY NUMBER SWF -VRF -P -

> GENERAL FUND POWELL BILL SANITATION FUND GF -PB -SF -

FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND

BONDS CAPITAL RESERVE GRANTS/NCDOT/OTHER

| | C | APITAL IMPI | OF GREENVIL ROVEMENT F CT WORKSH | PROGRAM | | |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| PROJECT TITLE: | DREAM PARK D | EVELOPMENT | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT: | RECREATION & | PARKS | | | PRIORITY # | 18 |
| DESCRIPTION: | This project would unit, and the insta some excessive for | llation of a multipu | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| JUSTIFICATION: | The "Dream Park the District 1 and development. | | | | | |
| OPERATING IMPACT: | Facility cleanup ca mowing schedule \$9,000 per year fo | to ensure the mu | Itipurpose field is | | | |
| | | | | | erating Savings erating Increase | |
| FUNDS APPROVED TO | DATE: | \$- | | FUNDS EXPEN | IDED TO DATE: | \$- |
| | | | APPROPRIAT | TION SCHEDULE | | |
| | BUDGET YEAR | PLAN YEAR | FUT | JRE CIP PLAN YE | EARS | SUBSEQUENT YEARS |
| FUNDING SOURCE | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | |
| UNMET | \$ 194,000 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | · · · · · · | | | TOTAL P | ROJECT COST: | \$ 194,000 |

OFFICIAL MINUTES MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL CITY OF GREENVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 2010



A regular meeting of the Greenville City Council was held on Thursday, June 10, 2010 in the Council Chambers, located on the third floor at City Hall, with Mayor Patricia C. Dunn presiding. Mayor Dunn called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Council Member Glover gave the invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Those Present:

Mayor Patricia C. Dunn; Mayor Pro Tem J. Bryant Kittrell, III; Council Member Marion Blackburn; Council Member Rose H. Glover; Council Member Max R. Joyner, Jr.; Council Member Calvin R. Mercer; Council Member Kandie Smith

Those Absent:

None

Also Present:

Wayne Bowers, City Manager; David A. Holec, City Attorney; Carol L. Barwick, City Clerk and Patricia A. Sugg, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Council Member Joyner moved to approve the agenda as presented. Council Member Blackburn seconded said motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Ronnie Purvis, Recreation and Parks Department Retiree

Mr. Bowers invited Mr. Purvis to come forward, along with Recreation and Parks Director, Gary Fenton. He congratulated Mr. Purvis on his retirement, then presented him with a plaque commemorating his 28 years of service to the City of Greenville. Mr. Fenton commended Mr. Purvis for the impact he has made on local youth during his tenure with the department.



Fair Housing Poster Contest Recognition and Award

Elaine Anderson, of the Human Relations Council, explained the poster contest, which she said was open to all students in grades K-12 at Pitt County Schools. She then introduced and congratulated Chicod Middle School students Valeria Wilson (6th grade) and Alice Lang (8th grade), who were the 2nd place and 1st place winners respectively.

APPOINTMENTS

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Board of Adjustment

Motion was made by Council Member Blackburn and seconded by Council Member Mercer to elevate Scott Shook from Alternate #1 to a regular member for a first three-year term expiring June 2013, replacing Ann Bellis who is ineligible for reappointment; to elevate Charles Ewen from Alternate #2 to a regular member for a first three-year term expiring June 2013, replacing Charles Ward who did not wish to be reappointed; to elevate Sharon Ferris from Alternate #3 to Alternate #1 for an unexpired term expiring June 2012; and to continue the replacements for Alternate #2 and #3. Motion carried unanimously.

Environmental Advisory Commission

Council Member Blackburn stated that she wished to continue her request to switch the designation of two members' slotted seats.

Greenville Utilities Commission

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Kittrell and seconded by Council Member Joyner to appoint John Minges for a first three-year term expiring June 30, 2013, replacing Lester Brown who is ineligible for reappointment; and to reappoint Don Edmonson and Vickie Joyner for second three-years term expiring June 30, 2013. Motion carried unanimously.

Housing Authority

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Kittrell and seconded by Council Member Blackburn to appoint Emanuell Brown as the Resident Commissioner for a first five-year term expiring May 31, 2015, replacing Barbara Taft who did not wish to be reappointed. Motion carried unanimously.



Human Relations Council

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Kittrell to appoint Janette Cox for a first three-year term expiring September 2013, replacing James Cox who resigned; and to continue the replacement for Ann Marie Alderman who resigned. Motion carried unanimously.

Pitt-Greenville Airport Authority

Motion was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Kittrell to reappoint Donald Taylor for a second four-year term expiring June 30, 2014. Motion carried unanimously.

Pitt-Greenville Convention and Visitors Authority

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Council Member Joyner to reappoint John Van Coutren for a second three-year term expiring July 2013; to recommend to the County Commissioners the reappointment of Candace Hollingsworth and Ivory Newborn for a first threeyear term expiring July 2013; and to continue the replacement for James Streeter who is ineligible for reappointment. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Transportation and Parking Commission

Council Member Smith stated she wished to continue the replacements for Mary Fedash who moved out of the city limits and Steven Kresch who resigned.

Recreation and Parks Commission

Council Member Blackburn stated she wished to continue the replacements for Gary Hassell who resigned and Wilson McDowell who is ineligible for reappointment.

NOMINATIONS TO THE PITT COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THREE PERSONS TO SERVE AS CHAIRPERSON OF THE PITT-GREENVILE CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Council Member Joyner to continue this item to the next City Council meeting. Motion carried unanimously.



New Business

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mayor Dunn explained procedures to be followed for each of the upcoming Public Hearings.

Ordinance requested by the Community Development Department to amend the Historic Preservation Regulations to include a new section related to the use and location of residential solar collectors on locally designated historic properties and within locally designated historic districts (Ordinance No. 10-50)

Seth Laughlin, Planner II with Community Development, stated that adoption of this ordinance would bring the City into compliance with a recent State statute on solar collectors. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:14 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed 7:14 pm.

Council Member Mercer moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Resolution to close portions of Twelfth Street and Lawrence Street

(Resolution No. 10-41)

David Brown, City Engineer, discussed steps completed in the closure process and described the area which would be impacted by the closure. He stated the purpose in the requested closing is to construct a new student living complex. Mr. Brown explained factors which the closure is contingent upon. He stated staff has no objection to the proposal.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:18 pm and invited comment from the public.

Tommy Stoughton, representing Edwards Community Development Group stated he was in favor of the proposed closing and said he is available to answer any questions the Council might have.

Hearing no further comment, Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing closed at 7:19 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the resolution. Council Member Mercer seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1224 Davenport Street (Ordinance No. 10-51)

Earl Phipps, of the Community Development Department, discussed ownership of the property and described its present condition and presented informational statistics related to complaints received, the current value of the property and estimated cost of repairs.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:20 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:21 pm.

Council Member Blackburn moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Joyner seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1117 Douglas Avenue (Ordinance No. 10-52)

Mr. Phipps discussed ownership of the property and described its present condition and presented informational statistics related to complaints received, the current value of the property and estimated cost of repairs.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:22 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:23 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 212 Manhattan Avenue (Ordinance No. 10-53)

Mr. Phipps discussed ownership of the property and described its present condition and presented informational statistics related to complaints received, the current value of the property and estimated cost of repairs.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:24 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:25 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1505 Myrtle Avenue (Ordinance No. 10-54)

Mr. Phipps discussed ownership of the property and described its present condition and presented informational statistics related to complaints received, the current value of the property and estimated cost of repairs.



Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:27 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:27 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Ordinance requiring the repair or the demolition and removal of the dwelling located at 1506 Myrtle Avenue (Ordinance No. 10-555)

Mr. Phipps discussed ownership of the property and described its present condition and presented informational statistics related to complaints received, the current value of the property and estimated cost of repairs.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:28 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:29 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Resolution authorizing the sale of City-owned property at 907 Douglas Avenue (Resolution No. 10-42)

Sandra Anderson, of the Community Development Department, explained the terms of the proposed sale.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:30 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:31 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to adopt the resolution. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Resolution authorizing an application to the Federal Transit Administration for a Section 5307 grant for federal operating and capital assistance for Greenville Area Transit (Resolution No. 10-43)

Ms. Anderson explained the application process for Federal grant funds and the proposed use of funding.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:32 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:33 pm.

Council Member Blackburn moved to adopt the resolution. Council Member Joyner seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.



Application for funds from the federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program

Chief Anderson explained the City's eligibility status for funding and the proposed use of grant funding. He stated funding would be available at the start of the Federal fiscal year, which is October.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:33 pm and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:34 pm.

Council Member Blackburn moved to approve the application. Council Member Joyner seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Updates to the Manual of Standard Designs and Details

Tim Corley, of the Public Works Department, described the history of the document and stated it is used by developers, contractors, builders and engineers to develop residential plans within the City. The update was requested by the development community and is a result of a series of meetings with work groups, stakeholders and citizens who attended a previous public meeting.

Mayor Dunn declared the Public Hearing open at 7:44 pm and invited comment from the public.

Bob Thompson - No address given

Mr. Thompson addressed the installation of new sidewalk and the elevation of driveways, particularly as relates to a concern for the maneuverability of wheelchairs.

The City Manager stated someone from Public Works would contact Mr. Thompson to get locations where problems exist.

Hearing no further comment, Mayor Dunn closed the Public Hearing at 7:52 pm.

Council Member Joyner moved to approve updates to the manual. Council Member Blackburn seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mayor Dunn opened the Public Comment Period at 7:53 pm and explained procedures to be followed by those wishing to speak. She then invited the first person registered with the City Clerk to come forward.



Bonnie Hutchinson – 400 Stantonsburg Road

Ms. Hutchinson asked that the Council consider improvements to safety at intersections around the hospital grounds where there are traffic signals. She stated she'd nearly been hit twice, and although there is a crosswalk, there seems to be no cycle for pedestrians. Ms. Hutchinson expressed a concern that the area be made safe for hospital employees, visitors and the physically challenged population as well.

<u>James Yahnnker – No address given</u>

Mr. Yahnnker added his support to Ms. Hutchinson's remarks, stating he had worked at the hospital for 25 years and had been struck by vehicles on Beasley Drive on three occasions. He stated he has learned from his mistakes and has installed lighting on his wheel chair. He asked that the City consider installation of pedestrian buttons for street crossings and that cars not be allowed to turn in front of pedestrians.

Bob Thompson - No address given

Mr. Thompson stated he uses the intersections mentioned several times a week. He stated he was recently at the intersection of Arlington and Stantonsburg on the sidewalk and when the sign came on to allow him to cross, a truck nearly hit his wheelchair. He asked whether Greenville actively enforces the state law about yielding to pedestrians.

There being no one else who wished to address the City Council, Mayor Dunn closed the Public Comment Period at 7:59 pm.

OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Resolution adopting the 2010 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (Resolution No. 10-44)

Merrill Flood, Community Development Director, explained the origin and subsequent updates to the local plan. He stated that the purpose of the plan is to identify potential hazards and an action plan in event of a disaster. The current update brings the City's plan into compliance with new State and FEMA guidelines.

Council Member Mercer moved to adopt the resolution. Council Member Glover seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Establish fair market value for the City-owned home at 604 Ford Street

Sandra Anderson explained the request to establish fair market value for a house constructed by Pitt Community College. She stated the house appraised at \$87,000 and was constructed in 1992 using Affordable Housing Bonds. Once sold, proceeds will be returned to that fund. Council Member Blackburn moved to establish fair market value for 604 Ford Street at \$87,000. Council Member Joyner seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.



<u>Ordinances adopting budgets for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year and Operating Plans for Fiscal Year 2011-2012:</u>

(Ordinance No. 10-56)

- a. <u>City of Greenville, including Sheppard Memorial Library and Pitt-Greenville</u> <u>Convention & Visitors Authority</u> (Ordinance No. 10-57)
- b. Greenville Utilities Commission (Ordinance No. 10-58)

Mr. Bowers provided additional budget information in response to questions raised by the City Council at their June 7th meeting.

During discussion on the issue of pigeon control and air conditioning for the fleet maintenance facility, Mr. Bowers explained the type of air conditioning proposed and Public Works Director Wes Anderson distributed information on temperature variations within the facility per Council Member Joyner's request at the previous meeting. Given the immediate concern for employees working in excessive heat and the time involved in the process to bid out pigeon control, Mayor Pro Tem Kittrell moved to adopt an ordinance (No. 10-56) amending Ordinance No. 9-53 to provide funding to purchase four of the proposed units with current year funding. Council Member Glover seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Bowers asked that Council consider adoption of FY 2010-2011 budget ordinances listed on the agenda as "a" and "b" above as two separate items, and that they do likewise with the financial plans for the following year.

Council Member Blackburn moved to adopt the FY 2010-2011 Budget Ordinance (No. 10-57) for City of Greenville, including Sheppard Memorial Library and Pitt-Greenville Convention & Visitors Authority. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Council Member Blackburn moved to adopt the FY 2010-2011 Budget Ordinance (No. 10-58) for Greenville Utilities Commission. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 4-2, with Council Members Glover and Joyner casting the dissenting votes.

Council Member Glover moved to approve the FY 2011-2012 Financial Plan for City of Greenville, including Sheppard Memorial Library and Pitt-Greenville Convention & Visitors Authority. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Council Member Glover moved to approve the FY 2011-2012 Financial Plan for Greenville Utilities Commission. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

Resolution supporting enactment of legislation which will enhance the enforcement of ABC laws (Resolution No. 10-45)

City Attorney, Dave Holec, presented two resolutions for consideration based on discussion of this item at the June 7th Council meeting. Option A is the resolution requested by the Special Task Force on Public Safety and it calls for enactment of a provision giving local law officers power to enforce ABC laws and calls for a 2% diversion of a local ABC Board's alcoholic beverage sales revenue. Option B calls for enactment of a provision giving local law officers power to enforce ABC laws but does not include the requested 2% diversion.

Council Member Blackburn moved to adopt the resolution based on Option B. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous vote.

COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

Council Member Blackburn thanked the citizens who came to share their concerns about crosswalk safety.

Council Member Mercer encouraged citizens to support the Tar River Jam, scheduled for Saturday, June 12th.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Bowers recommended the Council consider canceling the June 21st meeting.

Council Member Glover moved to cancel the June 21, 2010 City Council meeting. Council Member Smith seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Joyner moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Kittrell. There being no further discussion, the motion passed by unanimous vote and Mayor Dunn adjourned the meeting at 9:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol L. Barwick

Carol L. Barwick, CMC City Clerk



| Assessment |
|-----------------|
| Veeds |
| |
| apita |
| $\mathbf{\cup}$ |

Dream Park City Council District

| City Council District: 2 | :2 |
|---|--|
| Existing Park | |
| Park Profile: | Description : Dream Park currently has just a few playground items and a large, unimproved field. It receives very little use as there is nothing on the site to attract users. Individuals from the homeless shelter next door frequently spend considerable time in the park. |
| Project Scope: | Dream Park is undergoing a Master Planning effort that will involve the neighborhood in the ultimate selection of project elements and priorities. Potential major park elements will likely include an improved playground unit, a picnic shelter, a skateboard/BMX park, a splash pad, parking, and ADA accessibility to all facilities within the park. The project will be designed so that the various elements can be phased in as funds become available. |
| Project Justification: | Improvements are needed to create a functional neighborhood park. Current facility provides no amenities for users. Facility deficiencies have been highlighted in District 1 & 2 meetings & in discussions with neighborhood leaders. |
| Park Evaluation Process: | Extensive negative comments about the current condition of Dream Park were heard at the District 1 & District 2 meetings. Additional discussions with community leaders & staff input was also considered. |
| Relationship to Comprehensive Park Master Plan: | The Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plans recommends that the City invests in \$27,000,000 dollars for park renovations and improvements , \$12,760,000 targeted for New Park Development, \$2,980,000 for Land Acquisition, and \$10,450,000 for Special Use Facilities. Specific recommendations for park renovations, new development, land acquisition, & special use facilities are identified in this Capital Needs Assessment. |

Facility Deficiencies Needs

Document #: 894541

Dream Park: Park Renovation/Development City Council District: 2

| City COUNTIN DISUIS. 2 | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------|---------------|
| Asset | Work Description | Ranking | Cost Estimate |
| Park: | Install medium sized picnic shelter with associated amenities (grill, tables, water fountain, etc). Cost estimate also provides a separate shelter in conjunction with the Homeless Shelter to accommodate their clients. | HIGH | \$46,500 |
| | ADA: Install sidewalks & appropriate routes of travel for ADA accessibility on the site. | HIGH | \$25,600 |
| | Playground: Install playground that has more play value & is appropriately sized to the park. Use poured in place surfacing. | HIGH | \$105,000 |
| | Fence: Current fence component is excessive & unnecessary. Remove fencing at appropriate locations, leaving some portions up as required for safety considerations. | HIGH | \$5,000 |
| | Skateboard Park: Develop a beginner skateboard/BMX park so that area youth can learn these recreational skills. | HIGH | \$65,000 |
| | Site Lighting: Install lighting through GUC to provide site security (monthly lease fee) | HIGH | \$10,000 |
| | Splash pad: Develop a splash pad for recreational use. | MEDIUM | \$365,000 |
| | Parking: Demolish the fire tower & create a moderate sized parking area. | MEDIUM | \$68,000 |
| | | TOTAL: | \$690,100 |

Public Meetings

City of Greenville Dream Park Renovation

GREENVILLE & BEYOND

i la

.

FARMVILLE

New farmers market planned

Area produce growers soon may have a new place to ply their wares as Rod Lan-easter, owner of Parniville Hardware Co., plans to 'open a farmers' market along Wilson Street.

Wilson Street. The new market will open as part of a plan by the Pitt County Health Depart-ment to consolidate the areas, produce stand retailers and relocate them to a cen-tralized location. Lancater asid he plans to house the farmers market along the storefront of his business' warehouse, which fronts Wilson Street and the built of Earnetting Hardware

Street and is helilnd Parmville Hardware.

A farmers market once operated in Parmvilleont of storefront along Beckher Street. Lancaster said that market has been closed for at least 10 years.

- The Farmville Enterprise

I fust spent the morning sill you have to blking on the Greenway with the beautiful Tar Nic-er by any side. I naw wild-aboves; turtles and egrets. Ing is quiet from Thanks so much to those officia in our community lering and then when who made this wonderful here recentory takes six.

resource possible. I have been reading even ery day in BYH for months have been reading even to the possible been rea

HERTFORD

Town seeks funds for boat slips The town of Hertford is seeking \$100,000 in funds to create new boat slips

\$100,000 in funds to create new boat slips at the town hock. Connell members agreed to seek a \$100,000 absting infrastructive Grant to help develop the waterfront on the Per-guimias River. The BIG program pro-vides federal funds through the U.S. Flak and Wildlife Service for docking facilities and martines. The North Carolina Div-ision of Marine Fisheries handles the grant envorum in the state.

son of name reners names on goint program in the state. Town Planner Brandon Shoaf said that, if funded, eight slips could be built at the town waterfront. "If we are able to save money on con-struction costs, possibly fivo more slips could be built," he said.

Korregional Statements of the second se

BLESS YOUR HEART

coupons from evergraduate. ture because they have not bere problems. What alls the paper before These entitlements must been taught responsibility, your family is supported to it every gets to be used for only the in- respector compassion. It is be there to support family home oblevery dividually who truly need time persists step up to the members, not to tell them or the branes. It's them. Will flips wate of the plate and teach them values all stealing. It American taxparer's moa-nearly frustrating to every stop? convery or the boxes. Its called stealing. It is vary frastrating to get your Sunday edition. and open it up to find no coupons.

Bless your heart to all the recipients of college financial aid and food stamps that use this sup-port to rape the system. Some of these recipients

now your years, about the graduation completions and possible solutions. Blass your heart to the financial ad and food more than the community people who feel the need stamps that use this support boards to steel corpors from the port to rape the system. You dought not be eshaused your takes to any of that, people who feel the need stamps that use this support to rape the system. You dought not be eshaused your takes to any of that, per instead of taking item themselves to keep from the children of performs the performs to the pare to the stamp and the result of the the composite to the stamp and the tender of the the stamp and the tender of performs and the tender of the tender

ey ever stop? Bless your heart to the individuals who fail the need to steal Willow Runs regishorhood sign. I cere tailwhops that you acedi terth of the the showy the ones with had group of caregivers. tailwhops the be sahained does. What a juvenile act of yoursel. Bless your heart to the IV stations that interview Bless your heart to the Bless your hear

GREENVILLE

ECOLT DAVIS/THE DAILY REFLECTOR

The sould be the Are

make fun of us.

Bless your heart to a or call 252,329,9564, Bl family that doesn't want merves the right to edit to hear other family mem-comments.

MERRY HILL

Truck to be used for small fires. Firefighters in the Merry Hill/Midway, snew will be able to fight small and brush fires more efficiently thanks to the per-manent loan of a surplist truck from, the firefighters and the surport of local ditizen and businesses. The truck originally viss donated to the NC. Borstry Service after serving time fighting fires for the federal government in the Meditermanes. It was donated to the Merry Hill Fire Department after it had served its upfulness to the state. Jamle Coold, fire chief at the Merry Hill station, said the truck will free up bigger equipment by negooding to small lines, brush fires and car wreks.

He said the new trock has a 350-gal-lon tank and smaller boss that will allow easier use by firefighters in the field. — Berlie Ledger-Advance

Truck to be used for small fires

coin, click on the Bless Your Heart link on reflector.com or call 252-329-9564, BYH

CRIME REPORT Diamond ring reported stolen

The Daily Reflector

now, even years, about the graduation complaints and

Visit reflector.com/ news/crime_and_ rescue for a crime map, fail bookings and mug-shots and more case reports.

In the Usily Kellector A 23-year-old woman reported Saturday that here diamond ing had been missing since March, se-cooling, to a Plit County Sheriff's Office report. The ring, valued at \$1,00, reportedly was ats-len between Warch 13 and Aug. 13, the victim told deputies it, was last seen at her. home in the 1000 block of Allison Road, near. Greenville. Assaults reported 1500 block Wimble-don Dirke, 830 pm. Aug. 5-8 cm. Aug. 6 stranger assaults wyman, 35, in parking lok injuries not re-ported; no arrest. 1000 block Taberna Drive 9025 am. Aug.6 35-year- old woman assaulted Greenville

The shoriff's affice issued reports Aug. 14 with the fol-lowing details and allega-

arkest reported. 200 block Berkshire Drive, 12:40 p.m. Aug. 6; 24-year-old woman os-saulted at home; injuries Car stolen; recovered

■ 1600 block Debson. not reported. 1800 block Rosemont ■ 1600 Block Deson. Circle, near, Greenville, \$29 pm. July 30, 1994 white Toyota vehicle val-ued at \$1,000 stolen from a residence by au acquain-tance nertwered ■ 1300 block Rosemont Drive; 3 p.m. Aug. 6; 25-year-old assulted by ex-boyfriend at her home, moderate injuries; no nr-riest reported; case inac-tive. nce, recovered.

Assault reported

Break-ins, thefts ■2400 block Rebecci Dare Lane, near Green-ville, 9-9:07 p.m. Aug. 13; 42-year-old woman as-sound by her boyfriend at an. 1020 block statuona burg Road near Greenville, 2 a.m. 10:21 a.m. Aug: 7; unknown person chiered home, state hwn care tools, blocycles, fabing rod valued at \$1,151. saufied by her boyfriend at her home; no injuries re-ported \$5,000 damage to a Pord Navientur. vip.

Property damaged

nt \$1,151. ■ 200 block N.C. 102. West near Ayten, Aug. 4-Aug. 7, steel beam valued at \$300 stolen from alley behind huikling by un-troown norman. 200 block Homestead Drive, near Greenville, 11:55 p.m. Aug. 13-mid-night Aug. 14; \$100 dam-age to a residential storm door. known person. Vehicle theft

■ 4400 block N.C. 33 West near Greenville, 730 p.m. Aug. 6-1:30 p.m. Aug. 7: white Yamaha motoroy-cle valued at \$3,000 stolen The Greenville Policy Department issued reports Aug 8 with the following details and allegations:

Buying Gold Coins

Modern Eagles and Old Types 90% Silver and Old Coin Collections Greenville Dealer - Call Mike 252-702-4876

from home by stranger. Assaults

■ 400 block Pam Drive near Greeiville, 335 p.in. Aug. 7, 22-year-old woman assaulted by boyfriend at his home; no injuries re-Assaults reported Dorted. U.S. 264 East near Greenville, 4.01 a.m. Aug. 8;33-year-old man assault-ed on street by gilffriend; Low litteries reported.

ed on street by gittifiends minor injuries reported. I 1600 block Deejay Lane near Greenville, 413 a.m. Ang, 8, 28 year-old womar assailled at home by known person; no in-juries reported; arrest re-ported. by ex-spouse; no injuries;

Burglaries reported

■ 8400 block Stantons-

report says. Damage was settimated af \$300 damage; nething was stoler: ■ An ATM with \$4,000 that hind e was stoler af assulted by boyfriend; in-



the door at Emerald City 2 between 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. Saturday. 17

The police department released reports Aug. 2 with the following details and al-legations:

Break-ins thefts ■ 500 block East First Street, 3 p.m. July 22-12:21 p.m. Aug. 1; dryer, refrig-erator valued at \$1,000 sto-

emice valued at \$1,000 si6-ten from home. 100 block. Aruber Lane, 8 a.m. 5 p.m. July 22; meldeation valued at 3200 stolen from home. ■ 3300 block. Front. gate Drive, 530 p.m. July 241:30 p.m. Aug. 1; door kickel fin gaming system, laptop valued at \$1,615. ■ 210 SW. Greenville Bird, 230 p.m. Aug. 1; merchandhise valued at \$73,30 from Walmart. ■ 400 block. Hudam S740 block. Hudam

Burglaries reported Burglaries reported Burglaries reported Burglaries to three basi-ressors at the Bood Lion McC. 33, according to Greenville Police Depart-ment reports. Someone birdce elevity Into avivepstaleabusiness at 250 Ensy Stetwen 2-5 unknown amount of cur-report was stolen. Basic Someone Action and 650 pm. on Aug. 1; Someone birdce and the stored at 500 Basic Someone birdce at 500 to block Hudson Street, noon-530 pm. Aug. 1; ellphone valued at 5200. Basic Someone birdce and the melphon-tore stolen. Basic Someone birdce Basic Someone bir Basic Someone birdce Basic Someon

CITY OF GREENVILLE

Dream Park Public Input Meetin The Officership Received and Parks Department will and the public legal manifestion of decises is master plan for hear theremanning is the Denim Park Anthrit is included between Chartpul and Marks Stress was Alarred Stored; Stored;

The meeting will be held on Tupsday, Algorit 18, 2051, from 600 to 700 PM at Mound Calvery Frauent Reptal Criurch, 411 Writhigh Avenue.

Conta John City start in discussing this exciting conversionly project, For more advantation, contact Lemano Monteon & 320 -242

Rocky Mount Telegram Rocky MOUNT — but people in thôse com-troe local fleefighters ap-troe of the south A: Rocky Mount Hereins ap-troe of the south A: Rocky Mount Hereins ap-troe of the south A: Rocky Mount Hereins Rocky










BATTLEBORO FIREPIGHTER Ray Pridgen, photographer Bob Bartosz, and Rad Oak Fire Capy. John Pittman stand front of an enlarged copy of Bartosz's Shiotograph of Prid, and Pittmän battling an April house fire.

Massive photo honors **Battleboro** firefighters

Rocky Mount Telegram





ROCKY MOUNT TELEGRAM

ž)e Žie .

AЗ



P.O. Box 7207 Greenville, NC 27835-7207 Phone (252) 329-4567 Fax (252) 329-4062

| ugust 16 th , 2011 |
|-------------------------------|
| |

Time: 6:00 p.m.- 7:20 p.m.

Prepared By: Lamarco M. Morrison, Parks Planner

Location: Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church, 411 Watauga Avenue Greenville, NC 27834

Ateendees: See attached Sign-In Log

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department facilitated a public input meeting to discuss the Dream Park Master Plan. The purpose of the meeting was to get input from the community and stakeholders on what improvements are needed to the park. The following topics were discussed:

Opening Comments (County Commissioner Melvin McLawhorn)

1). Mr. McLawhorn opened the meeting with and overview of the agenda and program followed by the introduction of City Officials and stakeholders.

Introduction (Gary Fenton, Director of Recreation and Parks)

2). Mr. Fenton, Director of Recreation and Parks, introduced the project team and discussed the purpose of the parks master plan – to identify and graphically document the proposed changes for future development, phasing and cost estimating.

Project Scope (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner, and Mark Gillespie, Parks Superintendant)

- 3). Mr. Morrison gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the project scope. The following topics were discussed during the presentation:
 - Existing Conditions Site is 2.64 acres and bordered by residential, commercial, and institutional uses.
 - Park Classification By definition Dream Park is a mini park based on the acreage (1-4) but does not meet the requirements of what elements the park should have.

4). Mr. Gillespie discussed the Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) that was conducted by staff for the Dream Park. The purpose of the CNA is to identify facility deficiency needs; the initial study revealed that the probable cost to fully develop the park would be approximately \$690,100, but the study recommended a master plan to get a more accurate cost estimate.

Project Goals and Schedule (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 5). Mr. Morrison discussed the initial project goals but noted that the goals could change based on comments from the stakeholders. The initial goals discussed are as follows:
 - Maximize the use of Dream Park by providing park elements and programs for youth and seniors;
 - Provide a family friendly park that serves the neighborhood as well as the southwest Greenville community;
 - Create an oasis in the neighborhood that promotes an active lifestyle and good health, and
 - Bring Dream Park up the NRPA standard.
- 6). Mr. Morrison discussed the preliminary project schedule. The following tentative meeting dates were discussed:
 - Public Input Meeting # 2 late September 2011, Concepts Presentation (specific day in September to be determined)
 - Public Input Meeting # 4 late October 2011, Final Master Plan Presentation (specific day in October to be determined)
 - Park Commission Presentation November 9th, 2011
- 7). Mr. Morrison discussed the project deliverables; the deliverables are: rendered master plan, written master plan document, probable cost statement, and phasing plan.
- 8). Mr. McLawhorn opened up the programming session by taking questions and comments. The following comments were made by attendees:
 - Recreation and Parks should meet with middle school children to get input on the proposed playground area/ park since they would be the primary users.
 - There is a desire to make improvements to the City Pool and perhaps increase the size.
 - The Dream Park history should be detailed in the master plan and maybe commemorate Dr. King in the design in some way.
 - There is a desire to make Dream Park a high priority in order to get funding.
 - Basketball was an issue in the past and there was a consensus from the group that there is no desire to bring that park element back.
 - Mini golf should be included in the design.
 - The City should look at Greenville Police Department for park security.
 - The American Legion building should be improved so that it can serve as a community center.
 - There should be a space design, perhaps a small amphitheater, that can be used for programs, small outdoor performances/venues.

- The City should consider a design for community space at the Greenville Community Shelters to enhance the park and take advantage of shared space.
- The community garden should be further planned with input from experienced gardeners.
- Recreation and Parks should partner with grass roots organizations to run community service programs with an emphasis on getting men involved with community service.
- It was requested that the City keep the community involved in the design process and do more outreach.
- The City should explore grant opportunities from local, State, and Federal agencies e.g. Redevelopment grants.
- There should be more publicity and exposure of the park; many people in the immediate area do not know that park is there and that it is a City Park.
- Restrooms should be a programming element for the park.
- The American Legion is planning for building renovations; the City should work with them in their planning efforts.
- 9). Mr. McLawhorn and Mr. Christopher Taylor gave closing remarks followed by prayer.

The content of the above referenced meeting minutes are considered accurate, and a permanent record unless a written request for revisions are submitted within ten (10) days of issuance.

End of Meeting



CITY OF GREENVILLE

Sign-In

Recreation and Parks Department Parks Division 2000 CEDAR LANE | GREENVILLE, NC 27835 252.329.4242 | F 252.329.4062

www.greenvillenc.gov

Date: August 16, 2011

- Location: Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church 411 Watauga Avenue Greenville, NC 27834
- Project: Dream Park Master Plan
- Meeting: Public Workshop #1

| Name & Company | Address | Phone | Email |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | City, State Zip | Fax | |
| Krank V. Morgan | latter the | 322,8002 | MAPCANCI & MUDEN Para |
| Contraction to the A Long | | | MADE - TENAR MIL AL ANDALA |
| Doux Frisur | . 4 | 00 951 8799 | A) and Green a Merican or Bry 8799. 7 215 9 3 212 5 1 151 |
| (ADT Det HARdy (Det) | 224 allendale Dr. Green P. | (252) 531-Gn71 | a/e Dr. Green 11, (22) 521 Gr 7) dar 1 av 5 r 7 EC Rusher 1 |
| Fal Donzid Chiz/1-1 | 30) SI Frenville NC | 12-0-005 (22 | 107 - 10 m + 10 - 00 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 |
| Reveal Huga, we | 319 E SALANT ANORTHING PM | 256.235 | 26.735 Rover Hudiol 21 P. 2011. (2) 2) |
| Michel Malwert Price St | | | Children and a service |
| | ONEEWIK, NC 27833 | 912 01.24 | With Charles Charles 10 1400 5 m |
| Lynne James | Ereenville, Community She Here P.O. Pax 687 | 1 | 10 med avery 16 100 Sugar 14, che 140 - 50 |
| | Greenville, NC 27835-0287 | 1 | |
| Mary Lowise Fothschild | 3751 Lanaston Rivol Winterville 28590 | 252-756-2624 | mory@mikerathechild het |
| JoH SEVAGE | POB 632 Greenvill NCMR3 | K 12-642 3 | Greenville NCMRX 247-81 21 10/ 2010/00 00 |
| attor Lewind | 1204 4th 5t GREENWILLE 231 1268 | 220 1298 | Leuns D. + C |
| CARI CAMPGELI | 608 B / HUNSEN She wat 1. 960 hom de No | 20010000 | |
| Chris Godley | RICALTER DU ALE ATOPUNITO IN TRADUNCTION | 227-1273 | 1090 Aller Burle on 11m |
| - | | | 1 man and an and a |

Page ___ of ___

| 52 | | | : |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name & Company | Address | Phone | Email |
| CI. I. Kiloatrick Miles da ble to | <i>etur</i> ∳City, State Zip | Fax | |
| WA Care | h St. | 252-558-3151 | CK-HK: 1Pa CKipatnick@ PCC. FU |
| 4 | ST Prendille NC TREES | 222-715-269 | Mr. Johner Charbo, com |
| Le No | 20152 CAREWINE | Q. | Dhendrinson Di |
| | Jures hr. | · · · 355-7382 | |
| 12 KEID | SPRUFF ST 1 | 2. 13 alle 2738 363- 7.2 4341 | 11/1re, 235 @ amp. 1. Com |
| Patricia Harrington | ST Andrews 1 | 0.521 353-710 | • |
| PR A 10×1 73/4 PANIES | P. L. BNX 8281 (| 1202-547-9924 | L BARNES 760 Valor Com |
| 0 31 | 519 W. I YAVE Greenville NU. 27834 | | atternebles @ Hotmail, com |
| Shan Redmend | Brenville NC 27834 | | Sha mridmend Orpho. com |
| Lesse Rechmon C | 2 | EPB-38-ER | Salman Souting com |
| Sahine Rocers | 238.3 | 9450-326 G26 | gutter essenceof animahigametics |
| 1 | NUCE St. CW | 252 -916-0237 | 252 -916-0237 PE/lis a hat man , com |
| 1 N N N | N. Skinner St. Br | 4 531-5010 | tami. 10 cust @ amail.com |
| 0 | LEEN Annes Rd 27 | $ \chi $ | ask@iaskaod2.org |
| HRWIG 4+4: NOON | e hit | 4 752-7841 |) |
| Melvist, NIC / as hor a | 100 Allendale Dr. Gille V. DB | ~~ | King Lond MACCO Khos Cem |
| | TIN NANA 10 | Ũ |) |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | - - | · · · · |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Page 2



THE GREENVILLE CITY PAGE WEEK OF OCTOBER 17 - 23, 2011

The City of Greenville is dedicated to providing all citizens with quality services in an open, ethical manner, insuring a community of distinction for the future.

Board and Commission Meetings

- Planning and Zoning Commission will meet on Tuesday, Colober 18, at 6:30 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers, 200 West Fifth Street.
- Public Transportation and Parking Commission will most on Wednesday, October 19, at 9:15 AM in the Public Works Conference Room, 1600 Boatty Street.
- Keep Greenvillo Beautiful Board Neeting will be held on Thursday, October 20, at 10:30 AM in the Public Works Conference Room, 1500 Beatiy Street.
- Greenville Utilifies Commission will most on Thursday, October 20, at 12:00 PM in the Greenville Utilities Commission Building, 401 South Greene Street.
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission will meet on Thursday, October 20, at 6:00 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers, 200 West Fifth Street.
- Noighborhood Advisory Board will hold a special meeting on Thursday, October 20, at 6:30 PM at The Boye and Gbts Club of Pilt County, 621 West Fire Tower Road.

Public Notice

Amendment to the 2012-2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

The Greenville Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) proposes an emendment to the 12-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). TIP contains all transportation projects programmed

TIP contains all transportation projects programmed the upcoming seven year period, including all regionally significant transportation projects regardless of funding source (such as transit, highway; rail, wakways, bicycle, enhancement projects, and etc.) within the MPO's boundary.

The proposed amendment would provide for the inclusion of project Y-6500 in the TIP in the Statewida portion of the TIP in the Passenger Rail Project section. Project V-5500 provides a project for NCDOT to fund implementation of the traffic separation study and closure. NCDOT will be responsible for determining which projects will be funded through project Y-5500. Until the project is selected, it is not known where it will be located. However, until the TIP is amended for the inclusion of project Y-5500, no potential projects can be performed within the Urbanized Area.

The proposed TIP motification is available for review at the City of Greenville Public Works Facility, 1500 Boatly Street. It may also be viewed via the Greenville Urban Area MPO wab page under the Public Works Department of the City of Greenville's web site:

http://www.greenvillenc.gov/departments/public_works_ dept

Written commente will be accepted for 15 calendar days beginning Monday, October 17, 2011. Comments may be mailed to The Greenville Urban Aras MPQ, 1500 Beatty Streat, Greenville, NC 27834, faxed to (252) 329-4535; or e-mailed to Mr. Daryl Vreeland, Transportation Planner, at dvreeland@greenvillenc.gov.

Pitt-Greenville Crime Stoppers Telethon

Tune in to cable channels 9 and 13 all weekend long to help take a bite out of crime!

Public Hearings

- NOTICE IS HEREBY given that the Greenville Board of Adjustment will hold public hearings on the 27th day of October 2011, at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 200 West Fifth Street. In order to consider the following:
 - 1) A request by T.A. Loving Construction services for a variance from Section 9-3-6 of the City Code (Aligent Zone Height Limitations) to temporarity exceed the height limits for a structure in the Aligont Overlay Zone. The proposed use is located at 2100 Stantonsburg Road. The property is further identified as being tax percel number 29132.
 - 2) A request by Hazel Hardwick, LLC for a special use permit to operate a private convention center pursuent to Appendix A, Use (8), of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 330 S. Evans Street: The property is further identified as being tex parcel number 01781.
 - 3) A request by Sam Huraid for a special use permit to operate retail sales not otherwise listed (tobacco pipe sales) pursuant to Appendix A, Use (15)d, of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 703 SE Greenville Boulevard. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 33737.
 - 4) A request by I-One Business Centers, LLC for a special use permit to operate a game center pursuant to Appendix A, Use (6)d. of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 4052-A S. Memorial Drive. The property is further identified as being tax parcel number 62278.
 - 5) A request by Biltmore Venture Group II, LLC for a special use permit to operate a game center purcuant to Appendix A, Use (6)d. of the Greenville City Code. The proposed use is located at 240-B SW Greenville Boulevard. The property is further identified as being tax percel number 63737.
- Copies of the applications relating to the requests are on flic at the Community Development Department located at 201 West Fifth Street and are available for public inspection during normal working hours Monday Ibrough Fiday.

On the basis of objections, debate and discussion at the hearings, changes may be made from what has been proposed. Persons having interest in these mellers and desiring to speak either for or against the requests are invited to be present and will be given an opportunity to be heard.

Special Meeting

The City of Greenville Neighborhood Advisory Board and The Oaks Neighborhood Association Invite all residents of District 5 to a community meeting on Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 630 PM at the Boys and Gins Club of Pitt County (621 West Fire Tower Rd.).

Please join your neighbore to discuss concerns and brainstorm ways to improve your neighborhoods!

pranetoru waża o inibiosa żost riegnoornooga

Park Public Input Meeting

The Greenville Recreation and Parka Department will sollitate its second public input meeting to discuss the Dream Park improvements Master Plan, if you want to be a part of the planning process for what improvements are needed, then this is a meeting you do not went to miss.

visit us online: www.greenvillenc.gov

The meeting will be held on October 20, 2011. from 6-7 PM at MJ, Celvary Free Will Beptist Church, 411 Watauga Avenue, For more information, contact Lamarco Momison, Parks Planner, et (252) 323-4242.

Special Notice

The City of Greenville Recreation and Parks Department will accept proposals from qualified firms until 4:00 PM local time on Nov. 1, 2011 for building assessments to identify ADA deficiencies in departmental buildings.

The Request for Quelifications (RFQ) can be viewed on the City of Greenville Financial Services Department's weppage under the Purchasing Division, and on the Greenville Recreation and Parks webpage. Parties Interasted may obtain a copy of the RFQ from the Recreation and Parks Department by written request. Requests should be directed to Mark Gillespid, Parks Superintendent, PO Box 7207; 2000 Cedar Lane, Greenville, NC 27835, or by e-mailing mgillespid@greenvillenc.gov. Requests can also be faxed to (252) 328-4662, Attn. Mark Gillespie. Any proposel not prepared in conformance with the procedures and format as requested in the RFQ will not be considered.

Propossis shall be submitted (four copies) by mall or hand delivered to the attention of Mark Gillespie at the Recreation and Parks Department Administrative Office, PO Box 7207; 2000 Ceder Lane, Greenville, NC 27835.

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received.





P.O. Box 7207 Greenville, NC 27835-7207

Phone (252) 329-4567 Fax (252) 329-4062

Date:October 20, 2011Time:6:00 p.m.- 7:20 p.m.Prepared By:Lamarco M. Morrison, Parks PlannerLocation:Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church, 411 Watauga Avenue
Greenville, NC 27834Ateendees:See attached Sign-In Log

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department facilitated a second public input meeting to discuss concepts generated for the Dream Park Master Plan. The purpose of the meeting was to get input from the community and stakeholders on the two concepts. The following topics were discussed:

Opening Comments (Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton)

- 1). Bishop Henry Brown, Sr. gave opening remarks and prayer.
- 2). Mr. Fenton gave acknowledgments to City Council Member, City staff and guest.
- 3). Mr. Fenton discussed the justification of a master plan and its importance in developing the park in the future.

Conceptual Phase (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 4). Mr. Morrison gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the project scope and concepts. The following topics were discussed during the presentation:
 - Existing Conditions Site is 2.64 acres and bordered by residential, commercial, and institutional uses.
 - Original Park Master Plan The original master plan was completed in 2001 but did not address key site issues: 1). did not meet NRPA Standards; 2). Plan is over 10 years old and outdated; 3). The needs of the community changed, and 3). Site conditions have changed.

- Initial Project Goals: 1). Bring Dream Park up to the NRPA Standard; 2). Maximize the use of Dream Park; 3). Provide a family friendly park that serves the neighborhood and the surround southwest Greenville community.
- Stakeholder Project Goals: a). maximize programming space by exploring shared land use with Greenville Community Shelters; b). partner with grass roots organizations to run community programs; c). seek community involvement with the design process; d). explore grant opportunities from local, State and Federal agencies, and e). get input from middle school aged children.
- Program Elements were discussed; they include new playground, spray ground / splash pad, multi-purpose field, extreme Park, community garden, picnic shelter, outdoor restrooms, memorial plaza / walk, sand volleyball, outdoor performance space, shared program space w/ GCS & American Legion, improvements to City Pool and miniature gold

Master Plan Process (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 5). Mr. Morrison discussed the master plan process and project schedule
- 6). Mr. Morrison presented the Greenfield Terrace Master Plan and the Phase I construction to demonstrate how the master plan yields development.

Questions and Comments

7). Recreation and Parks staff opened the floor for questions and comments from stakeholders. The following details questions and comments:

Q. How long is the process going to take before all of the renovations in the master plans are complete?

A. Development of the park depends on funding from the City and grants, but some phases of the project could happen immediately after the master plan is approved if funding is available.

Q. Will there be a fee for entrance to the proposed sprayground?

A. Initially there would be no charge for entrance, but there could be a fee in the future to support seasonal staff.

- 8). Stakeholders gave the following suggestions for the final master plan:
 - Bring a priority list and phasing plan to the next meeting.
 - Look at additional funding sources such as CBDG funding for parks and open space.
 - Solicit donations of equipment from area stakeholders.
 - Install a sign for the park

- Promote family gatherings with park elements such as shelters and family oriented programming.

Programming Session (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

9). Mr. Morrison provided program element ranking and comment sheets to get input from stakeholders on the concept plans.

Closing Remarks

len en len

10). Bishop Henry Brown, Sr. gave closing remarks and prayer.

The content of the above referenced meeting minutes are considered accurate, and a permanent record unless a written request for revisions are submitted within ten (10) days of issuance.

End of Meeting


(IIT OF GREENVIILE Recreation and Parks Department Parks Division 2000 CEDAR LANE | GREENVILLE, NC 27835 252.329.4242 | F 252.329.4062

()

L

1

www.greenvillenc.gov

Date: October 20, 2011

Location: Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church 411 Wataugua Ave Greenville, NC 27834

Project: Dream Park Master Plan

Meeting: 2nd Public Input Meeting – Concepts Presentation

| Name & Company | Address | Phone | Email |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| | City, State Zip | Eax | |
| ARISTOPHER TO ALLOC | PO KAN 20605 - 6-111/2 21 7745 | 766 2120 | Multi a distribution of the |
| | | es e ot 19 | WOULD TASK COUNT & BION |
| Tami Locust | 403. A N 2870- " C 21 JA26 621 6010 | 621 6210 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| [| 1010 - 101 121 121 - 1011 | 0100 -100 | tamilocustdistrict & gmail.eem |
| Johan Bleichel | R | 100/102 | |
| 4 | 1 - 10/0 /2 Mark Micho | 204-102-76 | Pleiche) & Jahos .com |
| | | | 1 |
| Allen I ho mas | 300 Cotanche St. 27858 | 1296-290 | attacione oinail Banail Land |
| rose glover | 21155. UillAgeDo 2783U | 114-3001 | A LEAST AND LEAD MULLING |
| HOURN C CONNER | 1.1. | | - |
| Wayloo Bourder | C | 2512-125 | It he en ren to hut mall bas |
| | 1 AT A CAREMULIC | 329-4432 | Whowers a repenvillenc. nov |
| Lennis Mirtany | 101 KIVKIONA (X, 2785 8 | 321-2005 | DJW 1007 0 and com |
| LEG EQUIPTION | 110% helvoir Nery | 367-7403 | |
| Henry Basen 32 | HI LAMAR QUE 1 9 DETA | 752.95-03 | |
| Kosetted Stricklan | 33 Each | NC CV - NIX | |
| | | 01 00 110 | |

H:\Dream Part\Concepts\Sign in sheet.doc rev 09/19/2006 Page ____ of

| Email | 3 MOREN EV CONTOUN ITACVIDUTANE HATAN CON | rspirterson Sc33@me.con | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Phone Fax | | 916-6593 | | | | | | | |
| Address City, State Zip | 1907 Dickinsan AV brownin mc 10 MANHATTAN AVE 00 GOR VIEW DAVE | 107 Wathaves Kal | | | | | | - | |
| & Comp | 1. Mill Commilynums | HANDE D. TOTERON DI | | | | | | | |

Page 2

| | Church, 411 Watauga Avenue. For more information, contact Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner, at 329-4242. |
|--|--|
| Sale the Later Name of the 2012 The City of Greenville will soon be accepting applications for the 2012 Citizens' Academy. This is your chance to learn about how the City works and how you can make a difference. Students of the Academy will spend six evenings and one Saturday learning about the City's programs and services, its staff, and how and when they can shape our city's future. | PUDJICTIN DU MERING NOTICE The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department will facilitate the third and final public input meeting to present the master plan for improvements at Dream Park. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 13, 2011 at 6:00 PM at Mount Calvary Freewill Baptist Church, 411 Watauga Avenue. For more informing Baptist contact Lamatco Morrison. Parks Planner at 329.4340 |
| Meching Notice Keep Greenville Beautiful Board will meet on Thursday, December 15, at 10:30 AM in the Public Works Conference Room, 1500 Beatty Street. | Neignoonood Advisory Board will meet on Thursday, December 15, at 6:30 PM in Conference Room 337 of City Hall, 200 West Fifth Street. Board of Adjustment meeting scheduled for Thursday, December 15, has been CANCELED. |
| The Mayor and City Council will soon be considering appointments to the Affordable Housing Loan Committee, Community Appearance Commission, Firefighters Relief Fund Committee, Greenville Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Human Relations Council (Pitt Community College and East Carolina University students needed), Police Community Relations Committee (seeking candidates who reside in Districts 1 & 2), and the Public Transportation and Parking Commission. If you live inside the city limits of Greenville and would like to be considered for an form on the web at http://www.greenvillenc.gov. | Council Chambers, 200 West Fifth Street. Police Community Relations Committee will meet on Wednesday, December 14, at 7:00 PM in the Police Department's Third Floor Conference Room, 500 South Greene Street. Greenville Utilities Commission will meet on Thursday, December 15, at 12:00 PM in the Greenville Utilities Commission Board Room, 401 South Greene Street. |
| The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department will hold a second public input meeting for the West Greenville Basketball Complex Feasibility Study: The meeting will be held on Monday, December 12, at 6:00 PM at the Eppes Recreation Center Multi-Purpose Room, 400 Nash Street. For more information, contact Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner, at 329-4242. AdVeritsement | Greenville Climate Protection Partnership will meet on Tuesday, December 13, at 5:30 PM in the the Public Works Conference Room, 1500 Beatty Street Affordable Housing Loan Committee will meet on Wednesday, December 14, at 3:00 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers, 200 West Fifth Street. Recreation and Parks Commission will meet on Wednesday, December 14, at 5:30 PM in the City Hall Council Schambers, 200 West Fifth Street. |
| Public Inp | Board c |
| GREENVILLE CITY PAGE OF DECEMBER 12 - DECEMBER 18, 2011 | THE GREENVILLE WEEK OF DECEMBER 12 The City of Greenville is dedicated to providing all criticans |
| ce a trade." herald-sun.com 207 E. Artington Buya Greenveite 237 736 10005 | in the country, by Somers' mas. Grandmas have |



MEETING AGENDA

P.O Box 7207 | Greenville, NC 27835-7207 | tel 252-329-4567 | fax 252-329-5062 | www.greenvillenc.gov

| PROJECT: | Dream Park Master Plan |
|-----------------|---|
| LOCATION: | Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church, 411 Watauga Avenue |
| | Greenville, NC 27834 |
| PROJECT NUMBER: | CIP - 18 |
| | |
| MEETING #: | Third and Final Public Input Meeting |
| MEETING DATE: | December 13, 2011 |
| | |

- I. Introduction (Director Gary Fenton)
 - a. Opening Remarks and Acknowledgements
 - b. Project Team
 - c. Purpose of Master Plan
- II. Project Goals Project Team (PowerPoint Presentation)
 - a. Recreation and Parks goals
 - b. Goals set by stakeholders
- III. Project Phases (Lamarco Morrison)
 - a. Public Workshops
 - b. Project Deliverables
- IV. Programming Elements (Lamarco Morrison)
 - a. Suggestions from stakeholders
 - b. Program element priorities
- V. Concepts and Final Master Plan (Lamarco Morrison)
 - a. Concepts A and B
 - b. Final Master Plan
- VI. Questions and Comments
- VII. Closing Remarks (Director Gary Fenton)

1



MEETING MINTUES

P.O Box 7207 | Greenville, NC 27835-7207 | tel 252-329-4567 | fax 252-329-5062 | www.greenvillenc.gov

Program Elements (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 4). Mr. Morrison discussed the program elements that were generated at the second public input meeting. The program elements are as follows:
 - new playground, spray - ground / splash pad,
 - multi-purpose field
- extreme Park
- community garden
- outdoor restrooms
- -sand volleyball
- shared program space
- picnic shelter
- memorial plaza / walk
- outdoor performance space
- City Pool improvements
- miniature golf

Concepts and Final Master Plan (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 5). Mr. Morrison reviewed two concept plans with stakeholders. The concepts were based on the most popular program elements.
- The final master plan was presented; this plan was based on the most popular program elements 6). from each concept - paved parking, community garden, multi-purpose field, medium and small shelter, public restrooms, new playground area, sprayground, park signage, and memorial promenade walk.

Questions and Comments (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- The project team was asked why basketball and the extreme park was not part of the final master 7). plan. City staff responded that it was not a priority based on the surveys taken; however these are elements that could be added to the park in the future if it is something that stakeholders want.
- A question was raised regarding walking trails in the park; Parks staff responded that 8' 8). sidewalks were designed to double as walking trails on the perimeter of the park.
- The Weeds organization (a non-profit) committed to providing programming and volunteers for 9). the maintenance of the park. They agreed to team with the area church organizations.

The content of the above referenced meeting minutes are considered accurate, and a permanent record unless a written request for revisions are submitted within ten (10) days of issuance.

End of Meeting

12/13/2011

Créenville Recreation & Parts

1.1

i

ł

Clify of GREENVILLE Recreation and Parks Department Parks Division 2000 CEDAR LANE | GREENVILLE, NC 27835 252.329.4242 | F 252.329.4062

www.greenvillenc.gov

Date: December 13, 2011

Location: Mt. Calvary Freewill Baptist Church 411 Wataugua Ave Greenville, NC 27834

Project: Dream Park Master Plan

Meeting: Final Public Input Meeting – Master Plan Presentation

| Name & Company | Address | Phone | Email |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | City, State Zip | Fax | |
| Kichad S. takerson | is niced huber for | | MAN |
| | , O | 222,916659 | WE 27834 1 <2, 9/66733 resultantion 27 9 10 12 |
| MUN LAUN | 2115 SVILLAND TV | | |
| | meenuru ve 272334 | X11-0-2-25 | |
| MILISSAN HIII | The way that was | | |
| | Collemente Work 1824 | AND AND | |
| WAYNE BOWERS | city of Greenville | 252-324-4422 | where we channed where a series |
| He. Donald Cherzy | WEEL dean part of CUAN | 122- 902- 9) VI | 532-922-9) VI JON. (45 20010) DATI ON |
| Leo & Examples) | 1690 60 voir Hwy/ Greenville | 20.36-12-203 | |
| Devinder Culuer | Creenville Police Dent. | 252-329-4180 | 352-329-4180 deutuer Bareaultine cal |
| Allen Thomas | - E | | amthomas @ grown: 11 on and |
| Kai Jagad | action 2 act 4th " of anormalle ha | | al altally vinned and it and |
| Ceci H Hard | 224 allender Dr. Green !!! | | 252) 521-9m/ 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. |
| (James Meeth) | 503 Pittmen Dr. 9 wille | 1219-212-252 | Theree. up and and |
| | | | |

H:\Dream Park\Concepts\Sign in sheet.doc rev 09/19/2006 Page of

| Address City, State Zip Fax So 3 selected Da So 3 selected Da Isod Dene It Isod Dene It Isod Dene It Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax Fax |
|---|
| |

 \square

 $\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array}\right)$

Page 2

Survey of Recreational Needs

City of Greenville

Dream Park Renovation

#21 (8.B.2); Recreational Needs Survey; <u>Survey Methodology</u>

Project: Dream Park Renovation; Greenville Recreation & Parks

Documents provided:

- The Study Questionnaire
- The raw survey results

Survey Description:

The recreational needs survey was conducted as a part of the Comprehensive Recreation & Parks Master Plan. This survey was contracted through Site Solutions, the consultant, to Clark & Chase Research, the sub-contractor. The survey was conducted on April 17-29, 2008.

· .)]

Survey Type: The Survey Type used is consistent with the PARTF instructions found in the 11-12 Grant Application instructions on Page 30, Item #6, Survey of Recreational Needs. These instructions allow a "...system wide comprehensive park and recreation plan for the entire jurisdiction. The local government uses the survey's results to establish recreational priorities for the jurisdiction." The survey the City of Greenville conducted allowed citizens to give "their preferences for different types of recreation & facilities".

Survey Methodology: The survey was conducted April 2008 by random phone calls to 401 interviewees. The initial question asked on Page 1 of the Study Questionnaire (enclosed) ensures a "Representative Mix" of the survey is achieved. This "representative mix" enables the representative sampling of demographics to be achieved. Based on the methodology used, this scientific sampling resulted in a maximum sampling error of + or -4.9%, or a 95% confidence level. This methodology is statically sound and, due to the scientifically based methodology of the sample, it is sufficiently large to ensure that the results are "representative of the population in the jurisdiction".

Survey Questions: The Survey Questions are provided, as is the raw data results of the survey. A survey summary of results that interprets the raw data is provided on Page 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, and 2-7 of the "Comprehensive Recreation & Parks Master Plan" provided. Survey information generally, and survey results specifically, are found in the Comprehensive Recreation & Parks Master Plan; sections 2-4 to 2-18.

Results of Survey:

In summary, the survey conducted is statistically sound and meets all of the requirements of the 2011-2012 PARTF application as provided.

Study Questionnaire

Site Solutions

2008 Greenville and Pitt County Parks and Recreation Survey

Job # 08009

Clark & Chase Research, INC., P.O. BOX 49215, CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28277, 704 998.9664

NOTE: DO NOT READ RESPONSE CHOICES THAT ARE ALL IN CAPS

Hello. I am with Clark & Chase Research. Let me assure you we are <u>not</u> selling anything. We are conducting a short opinion poll about recreation and park services in your area. Your phone number was selected at random.

I. In what county is this household located? (DO NOT READ)

| PTTT | |
|---------|-------------|
| OTHER2 | (END – TE1) |
| DK/REF3 | (END – TE1) |

Is this household located within the Greenville city limits? (DO NOT READ) 11. (QUOTA = 100)

DK/REFUSED......3 (END - TE2)

Because this is a scientific survey, I need to speak with a specific person in this household. (USE THE RESPONDENT SELECTION BELOW FOR A REPRESENTATIVE MIX. START BY ASKING FOR MEN 2/3 OF THE TIME, AND ADJUST RATIO AS NEEDED.)

- A. May I speak to the youngest man age 18 or older currently living in this household? IF NO MEN LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK AA AA. May I speak to the youngest woman age 18 or older currently living in this household?
- B. May I speak to the oldest man age 18 or older currently living in this household? IF NO MEN LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK BB BB. May I speak to the oldest woman age 18 or older currently living in this household?
- C. May I speak to the oldest woman age 18 or older currently living in this household? IF NO WOMEN LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK CC CC. May I speak to the oldest man age 18 or older currently living in this household?
- D. May I speak to the youngest woman age 18 or older currently living in this household? IF NO WOMEN LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK DD
 - DD. May I speak to the youngest man age 18 or older currently living in this household?

(IF PERSON DIFFERENT FROM PERSON WHO ANSWERED PHONE, REINTRODUCE)

| llf. | RECORD GENDER | |
|------|---------------|---|
| | MALE | 1 |
| | FEMALE | 2 |



1/5/2009 4:10 PM

This survey is about the public recreation services, parks, and trails in Greenville and Pitt County, including your city, town, or community.

1. The following statements concern the recreation, park, and trail facilities in your area. After I read each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. How about ...? (READ LIST. RANDOMIZE.)

| | | STRONGLY AGREE | Strongly DK/ Disagree Ref |
|----|---|---|------------------------------|
| | Additional public recreation and park facilities would benefit my community | | 3 4 5 |
| | b) Public recreation areas and parks enhance the economic health of a community. | | |
| | c) Public recreation areas and parks enhance the physical and mental well-being of the community. | | |
| | d) Public recreation and park activities in my community would help reduce crime. | | |
| 2. | Based on what you know or have heard, would you say there is a great need, some need, little need, or no need for <u>additional</u> public recreation, park, and trail facilities in your area? | SOME NEED LITTLE NEED NO NEED | |
| 3. | Have you used a public recreation area, park, or trail in Greenville or Pitt County within the past year? | NO (SKIP TO Q | |
| 4. | About how many times have you visited or used a public recreation area, park, or trail in the last year? (DO NOT READ LIST) | 2-5 MORE THAN 5 ⁻ NOT AT ALL (S | |

What public recreation or park facility did you visit most often? (DO NOT READ CHOICES. ONE RESPONSE 5. ONLY. IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT KNOW NAME OF PARK, ENTER AS MUCH INFORMATION AS POSSIBLE - LOCATION, ETC.)

| BOYD LEE PARK | 4 |
|--|----|
| BKAUFURU CREEK GOLF COURSE | • |
| BRADFORD CREEK SOCCER COMPLEX | - |
| ELM STREET PARK | Л |
| EVANS PARK | 5 |
| GREEN MILL RUN GREENWAY | |
| GREENSPRINGS PARK | 7 |
| GREENVILLE AQUATICS AND FITNESS CENTER | 0 |
| GREENVILLE'S OFF LEASH DOG ARFA | 0 |
| GUY SIVILI H PARK | 40 |
| | 44 |
| RIVER PARK NORTH | 19 |
| THOMAS FORMAN PARK | 13 |
| TOWN COMMON | 1/ |
| | |
| DK/REFUSED | |
| | |



2

| (IF Q3 = 1, SKIP TO Q7) What prevents you from using a public recreation or park facility? (ACCEPT UP TO 3 RESPONSES ~ DO NOT READ LIST) | MY AGE CRIME/SAFETY ISSUES HANDICAP – NOT ACCESSIBLE HEALTH REASONS MONEY – CANNOT AFFORD NO DESIRE/DOES NOT WANT TO NOT SURE WHAT IS AVAILABLE PARKS IN AREA - DO NOT EXIST PARKS IN AREA - DO NOT LIKE TIME – NOT ENOUGH/TOO BUSY | |
|--|--|--|
| | TRANSPORTATION ISSUES | |
| | DK/REFUSED | |

(ASK EVERYONE) 7. I am going to

7o.

8.

9.

I am going to read a list of features that may be available at a public recreation or park facility. For each, please tell me if you or someone in your household is interested in that facility or activity. How about...? (READ LIST. RANDOMIZE.)

| a) Walking, jogging, or bicycling? | YES 1 | NO | DK/REF |
|--|--|---------------------|--------|
| b) Swimming? | | ۲ ר | |
| c) Arts & Crafts? | | ····· 2 ·····. 2 | |
| d) Performing Arts? | | 2 | |
| e) Nature Activities? | | 2 | 2 |
| f) Festivals & Concerts? | | 2 | 3 |
| g) Fishing? | | 2 | 2 |
| | | · 2 | 2 |
| i) River Activities? | | 2 | 3 |
| j) Baseball? | | | |
| k) Basketbali? | | | 3 |
| l) Soccer? | | | 3 |
| m) Fitness Activities? | | | 3 |
| n) Activities for teenagers? | ····· 1 | 2 | |
| Are there any other activities or facilities you would like to see offered at a recreation area or park? | YES (SPECIFY) NO DK/REFUSED | | 2 |
| Do you like to use public swimming pools for swimming or other aquatic activities? | YES NO DK/REF | | . 2 |
| Have you ever used or swam in City Pool in Guy Smith Park? | Yes (skip to q1 No DK/Ref (skip to | | |



1/5/2009 4:10 PM

| 10. | What prevents you from using City Pool in Guy Smith Park? |
|-----|--|
| | (ACCEPT UP TO 3 RESPONSES - DO NOT READ LIST) |

| | • |
|----------------------------|---|
| MY AGE | 1 |
| CRIME/SAFETY ISSUES | |
| DID NOT KNOW ABOUT IT | |
| HANDICAP – NOT ACCESSIBLE | |
| HEALTH REASONS | 5 |
| LOCATION - TOO FAR AWAY | |
| MONEY – CANNOT AFFORD | |
| NO DESIRE/DOES NOT WANT TO | |
| TIME - NOT ENOUGH/TOO BUSY | |
| TRANSPORTATION ISSUES | |
| OTHER (SPECIFY) | |
| DK/REFUSED | |
| | |

4

(ASK EVERYONE)

11. Have you ever made use of the Tar River for boating, fishing, or walking?

| YES (SKIP TO Q13) | 1 |
|----------------------|---|
| NO | |
| DK/REF (SKIP TO Q13) | 3 |

12. What is the main reason you have not used the Tar River for recreation activities? (ENTER DK FOR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED)

(ASK EVERYONE)

I am now going to read a list of recreational facilities that are available in your area. For each, please tell me whether or not you'd like to see more of those facilities in the city of Greenville and Pitt County. How about ...? (READ LIST. RANDOMIZE.)

| | a) | Greenways, which are public walking or bicycle trails? | YES | NO | DK/REF |
|-----|-----|--|--|--|--------|
| | b) | Open space, an undeveloped land for wildlife, informal recreation, or passive activities? | | | |
| | c) | Athletic fields? | 1 | ······ 2 ····· | |
| | d) | Water-based recreation? | 1 | ····· イ ······························ | ა ი |
| | e) | Community Recreation Centers? | | | |
| ALV | f) | Ask LAST: Are there any other types of recreational facilities you would like to see provided or expanded by the city of Greenville or Pitt County? (SPECIFY) | . 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 14. | WIT | ed on what you know or have heard, how satisfied are you the public recreation services, parks, and trails in your area? you? (READ LIST) | Satisfied Somewhat S Or Not at all | atisfied Satisfied? | |



1/5/2009 4:10 PM

15. How should public recreation and park facilities in your area be funded? (READ LIST. RANDOMIZE. ITEMS IN BRACKETS ARE TO REMAIN TOGETHER.)

| a) Current taxes? | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | DK/REF |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| (b) New taxes? | 4 | 2 | · • |
| c) Usage fees and charges?d) Motabing arout 0 | 1 | ······ 4 ······ | ა. ი |
| u) watching grants? | 4 | • | • |
| (DEFINITION, IF NEEDED: Where funding comes from two sour taxes, bonds, or donations, and that is proportionally "matched" b investor.) | ces – one traditio / another source (| nal-fundraising such as a Fede | source such as |
| investor.) | | | |
| e) Government bonds? | | | |
| e) Government bonds? | 1 hat a public agen riod.) YES (SPI NO | 2 cy sells to an i ECIFY) | 3 nvestor in |

16. On an annual basis, to improve recreation and park facilities in your area, would your household be willing to spend...? (READ LIST)

| ONE HALF THIS WAY: ASCENDING SCALE | a) 25 dollars or less? | YES (IF YES, ASK b) 2 (IF YES, ASK c) 2 1 (IF YES, ASK d) 1 (IF YES, ASK e) 1 (IF YES, ASK e) 1 (IF OT | (IF NO, GO TO QA) (IF NO, GO TO QA) 2 (IF NO, GO TO QA) 2 (IF NO, GO TO QA) 2 (IF NO, GO TO QA) |
|--|---|--|---|
| ONE HALF THIS WAY: DESCENDING SCALE | e) More than 200 doilars? 1 d) 200 doilars? 1 c) 100 doilars? b) 50 doilars? a) 25 doilars or less? | (IF YES, GO TO QA) | (IF NO, ASK c) 2 (IF NO, ASK b) |

A. Now I would like to get a little information about you and your household for statistical purposes only.

Including yourself, how many adults, age 18 and older,

live in your household?

| 1 | 1 |
|------------|--------|
| 2 | ······ |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 OR MORE | |
| DK/REFUSED | |
| | IJ |



5

1/5/2009 4:10 PM B. How many of

|) . | How many children, 17 years of age or younger, |
|------------|--|
| | live in your household? |

| | 6 |
|------------|---------|
| None | C |
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | 7 |
| 8 OR MORE | |
| DK/REFUSED | Q |
| | ******* |

| C. | What is your age? | AGE: | _ |
|----|---|---|--------|
| | | DK/REFUSED | 99 |
| C1 | (IF DK OR REFUSED SAY:) I don't need to k | now exactly. Could you tell me if you are (READ LIST) | ? |
| · | | 18 to 24 25 to 34 | 2 |
| | | 35 to 44 45 to 54 55 to 64 | 4 5 |
| | | or 65 or older? DK/REF | 6 |
| D. | What is your race? (DO NOT READ. ONE RESPONSE ONLY.) | WHITE | 1 |
| | (SO NOT READ. ONE RESPONSE ONLY.) | BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE ASIAN | |
| | | NATIVE HAWAIIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER SOME OTHER RACE | 5 6 |
| | | MIXED/TWO OR MORE RACES DK/REFUSED | |
| E. | What was the last grade of school | 8TH GRADE OR LESS | 1 |
| | you completed? (DO NOT READ. ONE RESPONSE ONLY.) | SOME HIGH SCHOOL (NOT H.S. GRADUATE) HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE | 2 |
| | , | SPECIAL/TECHNICAL TRAINING (NOT COLLEGE) SOME COLLEGE | 4 |
| | | (NOT GRAD FROM 4-YEAR COLLEGE) COLLEGE GRADUATE (FROM 4-YEAR COLLEGE) POST GRADUATE STUDY | 6 |
| | | POST-GRADUATE STUDY ADVANCED DEGREE (MS, MBA, PHD) DON'T KNOW/REFUSED | 8 |
| | | | |

F. What is the ZIP Code of this household? (ENTER 99999 FOR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED)

THANK RESPONDENT AND END INTERVIEW



Greenville and Pitt County recreation, park, and trail facility agreement ratings: Mean and median scores (Strongly agree = 2, Agree = 1, Disagree = -1, Strongly disagree = -2) and Parks Survey ..Amount household willing to spend annually to improve recreation and park facilities to see more of in Greenville and Fitt County Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables ...Have used recreation area, park, or trail in Greenville or Pitt County, past year swimming or other aquatic activities Additional recreation and park facilities would benefit community. .. Need for additional recreation and park facilities in your area Recreation areas and parks enhance community economic health ..Number of times have used recreation area in the last year ...What prevents you from using recreation or park facilities Main reason you have not used the Tar River for recreation ..Recreation and park facilities should be funded through ...Would support bond referendum to develop and improve parks ever used Tar River for boating, fishing, or walking .Recreation areas and parks enhance community well-being activities would help reduce crime ..Have ever used or swam in City Pool in Guy Smith Park ..Household interest in recreation and park activities .. Satisfaction with recreation and parks in your area ..Recreation or park facility you visit most often Greenville and Pitt County recreation, park, Recreational facilities you would like ..What prevents you from using City Pool Like to use public swimming pools for Number of children in household ..Number of adults in household .Regreation and park Ascribed age .Education ...Geography ZIP Code Table CENDER Page $35\ldots$ Gender . Have .Race Table QF Page 34.... Table Q7 Page 13... Table Q8 Page 16... Table Q16 Page 28... Table Q9 Page 17... Table Q13 Page 23... Table Q14 Page 25... Table QE Page 33.... Table AREA Page 36.. Table QA Page 29... Table Q3 Page 7... Table Q6 Page 11.. Table Q12 Page 21.. Table Q15 Page 26.. TABLE OF CONTENTS Table Q2 Page 6... Table Q5 Page 9... Table Q15G Page 27. Table QD Page 32... Table Q1 Page 1.. Table QIC Page 4. Table Q1D Fage 5.. Table Q4 Fage 8... Table Q1A Page 2. Table QB Page 30.. Table Q1B Page 3. Table Q10 Page 18. Table Q11 Page 20. Table QC Page 31.. Banner

Table Q1 Fage 1 May 14, 2008

. . .

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Greenville and Pitt County recreation, park, and trail facility agreement ratings: Mean and median scores (Strongly agree = 2, Agree = 1, Disagree = -1, Strongly disagree = -2)

| | | GEOGE | GEOGRAPHY | GENT | NDER | . AS(| ASCRIBED AGE | - EE | EDC | EDUCATITON | - | | - | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| | Total | Total G'ville Balance Men | Balance | Men | Women | 1 18-44 | 45-64 | | SH=> | Some | Coll Brad+ | White | b Other | CHILDREN IN HH Yes Nr | | PARK US | USER 1 | PUBL | 2 2 |
| Total Adults (000s) | 113.4 | 56.3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | | | | - | | | | | | | | - | Xes | ON I |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 0'TOE | 100.0 | | Ċ | F | | 0.01 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 69.6 | 39.8 | 53°2 | 59.0 | 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| Parks enhance community well- | 1.43 | 57 L | n v | • | | - | - | 0.111 | 125.0 | 86.0 | 178.O | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 2 | 267.0 2 | 245.0 1 | 156,0 1 | 151.0 24 | 245.0 |
| being | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2,00 | 4. U | 2.00 | 1.55 2.00 | 1.30 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.26 1.00 | 1.45 | 1.59 00 | 1.41 | ц.44 2 | 1.52 | 1.36 | 1.58 | 1.14 | | . 30 |
| Additional parks would benefit commutated | 1.25 | 1.31 | 1,19 | | 1.29 | 1 20 | | 0 | | | | 7. OO | 1.00 | 2.00 | | 2.00 | | 2.00] | I.00 |
| | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1,00 | 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 | 1.34 2.00 | н. 36 1.00 | 1.17 | 1.34 100 | 1.41 | 1.11 | 1.36 | 1.03 | 1.41 | 1.10 |
| rarks enhance community economic health | 1.15 1.00 | 1.13 1.00 | 1,16 | 1.23 1.00 | 1.08 | 1.13 1.00 | 1.15 | 00 T | 0.83 | 1.29 | 1.38 | 1.11 | 1.21 1.21 | л т те.т | | 0 0 F | | | 8 ; 8 |
| Parks would help reduce crime | I.02 | 1.10 | 0.95 | | 1.11 | 1 05 | | | | n | T.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1,00 1,00 | 1.00 | 8.1 | 1.00 | 1,01 |
| | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.31 2.00 | 1.02 | 0,93 1,00 | 1.10 1.00 | 1.15 | 6.00.T | - 00 | 0.86 1.00 | 1.20 1 | 0.85 1.00 |

Table QIA Page 2 May 14, 2008

.

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Additional recreation and park facilities would benefit community

| GEOGRAPHIN Total i GIVILLe GENOERATION Annue (000a) GENOERATION (000a) ASCRILED AGE (000a) INUCATION (000a) RUCATION (000a) RUCATION RUCATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------|---------|--------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Total i G'ville Balance i Man Women 13-4 45-64 65+ i came coll Gadit i Matte OC 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 401.0 301.0 100.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 41.0 25.8 65.0 35.0 36.0 178.0 258.0 | | | CEOG | BAPEY | l GEN |) SER | ASC | RIBED A | - 13 | ED | JCATION | _ | RACE | - | | - | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | Total | G'ville | | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | SH=> | | | | 0ther | | | S | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | ប្រ |
| | 30s) | 113.4 | | | | 60.4 | 64.3 | | | | | , t | - | - | | | | | Yea | NO |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 401.0 | | | | 230.0 | 110.0 | 180.0 | | | | | 69.6 | 39 . 65 | 53.5 | 59.0 | 75.7 | 37.7 5 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| $ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | (F | 103.6 91% | | | | 55.5 928 | 62.0 968 | 30.8 808 | 10.8 10.8 | 37.1 | | | 258.0 61.8 | - | | 267.0 24 52.4 | 245.0 1! 72.6 | 156.0 15 31.0 4 | 151.0 24 | 245.0 |
| | e (+2) | 45.4 40% | | | | 26.2 | 29.6 | 12.1 | 6 F. 1 | 315 11.4 | 12.6 | 95% 21.0 | 89% 25.3 | | 95 8 27 A | | | | | 888 |
| T) $B_{1,2}$ $B_{1,2}$ $B_{1,4}$ $B_{1,6}$ 55 48 50 55 47 63 57 37 49 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 | | 58.1 718 | | | | 29.3 | 404 32.4 | 36 3 18.7 | 25 % 7.1 | 28 8 25 7 | 528 0 8 | 458 03 0 | 368 21 | | | | | ง ระสะ พ.ศ. | 26.4 288 | 19.7 338 |
| 7% 6% 8% 8% 5% 2.8 2.3 2.9 3.1 3.4 2.2 2.1 5.4 9% 9% 9% 5% 9% 5% 9% 5% 7% 8% 8% 6% 4% 5% 20% 8% 20% 8% 9% 5% 9% 9% 9% 5% 1.3 5.3 1.5 3.0 2.4 2.0 2.1 5.3 1.5 1.3 0.3 1.0 0.0 1.3 -1.2 0.1 1.0 0.2 0.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 | (NET) | 8 7 8 | | | 47 V 17 V | 488 9 | 50% | 55% | 47& | 638 | 378 | 367 767 | 528 528 | 528 | 2 - E Z 7 4 8 | 34.6 4 598 4 | 40.1 538 538 | 18.1 2 48% | 24.6 488 | 33.0 55% |
| 6.9 3.2 3.7 4.4 2.5 2.3 1.6 3.0 2.4 2.0 2.1 5.3 6% 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 </td <td></td> <td>86</td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td>4 - 60 4 %</td> <td>9.8 68</td> <td>2.3 48</td> <td>12.9 8.8</td> <td>3.1 208</td> <td>6) 4 4 8 7 8</td> <td>2.2 98</td> <td>2.1 58</td> <td>6,4 98</td> <td>1.8 48</td> <td>2.7 5e</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>2.7</td> <td></td> <td>1.7</td> <td>6.4</td> | | 86 | , | | 4 - 60 4 % | 9.8 68 | 2.3 48 | 12.9 8.8 | 3.1 208 | 6) 4 4 8 7 8 | 2.2 98 | 2.1 58 | 6,4 98 | 1.8 48 | 2.7 5e | 5.0 | 2.7 | | 1.7 | 6.4 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 6.9 68 | | | 4.4 2.4 88 | 2.5 48 | 2.3 48 | ម ម ម | 3.0 208 | 2.4 | 2.0 88 | ۲. ۲. | с. Э | н. Б | 2.5 | ະ ກີ່ ທີ | 2.5 5.5 | | 38 1.7 | 118 5-1 |
| 1.6 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.2 - 0.4 1.2 0.5 0.4 0.4 1.3 1% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 1% 2% 2% 1.25 1.31 1.20 1.29 1.39 1.15 0.82 1.09 1.34 1.36 1.17 1.00 | gree (-2) | ि १ न | | 1.0 2% | 0.4 0.8 | 59 59 17 | ' | 1.2 48 | 1,0 1,1 | 2 0. ₽ | | ; T-0 | 1.1 1.1 | 4. 6.2 | 5% 0.2 | | 38 0.2 | 128 | ም 1 ጥ | 1 ap 0 |
| 1.31 1.19 1.20 1.29 1.39 1.15 0.82 1.09 1.34 1.36 1.17 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1 | Sed | 1.6 18 | | 1.1 28 | 0.4 4 | 1.2 | I | 0.4 | ° ∩ ∺ | 5.0 5.0 | ₽ 7 0.4 | ** ** | 2& 1.3 | di ^{go} * | d7 ∣ ★ | | de • * | | | - 12 - 12 - |
| 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 | | 1.25 | τH | 1.19 1.19 | 1.20 | 1.29 | 95 1 | н - Г - | ap co co co | ar o ri | | 40 90 | 28 | | | 0 de - 67) -1 | | | 5 19 19 | 1 1 2% |
| | | 1 00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.36 1.00 | 1.17 1.00 | 1.00 1 | 1.41 | 1.12 1.00 1.00 | 1.36 J 1.00 J | д. 03 1.00 д. | 1.41 1.00 1 | 1.10 1.00 |

NOTE: If percentages are based on fewer than 100 respondents, interpret with caution. Conducted by Clark & Chase Research, Inc., Job #08009

ſ

Table Q1B Page 3 May 14, 2008

.

-

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Recreation areas and parks enhance community economic health

| | | GEOGRAPHY | APEY | GENDER | DER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | | Ŭ | EDUCATION | - | 4 4 4 | - | | | - | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|---|------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--|---|
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Momen | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | SH=≻ | Some Call 6 | Coll Grad+] | White . | 4 .0 | CHILDREN IN HE | 8 m ³ | PARK USER | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | LIC L |
| Total Adults (000s) | 113 4 | 22 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | Kes | | Yes | No No |
| | | n 20 | 1.10 | 52.9 | 60.4 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 69.6 | a 07 | н Ц | c L | | | | |
| SMRTATERATING | 401.0 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 0.011 | 180.0 | 0 11 0 | 0 30 1 | c L | | | | 0.00 | 0.60 | 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.l |
| TOTAL AGREE (NET) | 101.3 | 50.4 | 50.9 | 6 87 | ŝ | e L | | | 0.044 | 90.0 | 178.0 | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 2 | 267.0 2 | 245.0 1 | 156.0 1 | 151.0 | 245,0 |
| | 898 | 898 | 868 | 92 8 | #-10 #-10 | 908 908 | 30.6 908 | 13.7 918 | 34.4 14.4 | 21.9 00e | 44.2 | 58.9 | 38.6 | 49.6 | 51.2 | 68.9 | 32. 4 | 7 79 | 5 |
| Strongly agree (+2) | 37. 3 | 18.2 | 101 | 6 6 7 | | | | | | 8 7 7 | *)) | 858 | 97 8 | 8 10 1 | 87% | 816 | 868 | 918 918 | a. 70 878 |
| | 398 | 32% | 1948 1948 | 318 | 87E | 20.2 318 | 12.7 378 | 4.4 | 6,9 | 8.9 6.3 | 22.0 | 25.9 | 10.7 | 21.4 | | 27.2 | 101 | | и 0 т |
| Agree (+1) | 64.0 | 20 0E | 5 | 1 4 6 | | | | 9 | 82 - | *** | 478 | 378 | 278 | 40% | 278 | 368 | 278 | 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 0. PT |
| | 568 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 210% 210% | 47.5 618 | 31.6 52% | 36.7 578 | 17.9 534 | 9.4 4.7 | 27.5 | 13.6 | 22.2 | 33.0 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 35.3 | 7 7 | E 66 | | |
| TOTAL DISAGREE (NET) | 0.0 | с К | | | 1 | |) | - | 6/0 | ю 0 | 488 | 478 | 70% | 8 63 | 60 8 | 55% | 86S | 588 588 | 1. 1 |
| | 8 6 | 366 9 | 0.4 8 8 | A . A | 7.5 128 | ດ. ທີ່ | ы. С. 1 9 | 0.8 7.8 | 9.6 | 0, 8 | 2.1 | 8.6 | 1.2 | 2,5 | 7.1 | u v | * | | |
| Disagree (-1) | 9.8 9 | er Lr | ц С | • | • 1 |) 1 | 2 1 | P | 80 T | 8 | ар ГЛ | 12% | 8 0 | 58 | 128 | , 12) , 16) | * # • 61 | 4 0 0 2 2 | 4. 1 1 |
| | 88 | - P - D | 2 2 9 1 | 7 dP - 10 V | 118 118 | ດ ສ ດ ທີ | 0.12 8 | 0,8 1,8 | 5. 5.0 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 7.6 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 5 | v c | 2 | |
| Strongly disagree (-2) | 1.0 | J | C 12 | | , , | | 5 | ĥ | P D T | # 1 | de A | 1.1.8 | å | 58 | 10% |) 49 1 | - 6 - 6 | 0.80 10 11 | 4 1 % |
| | 8T | | 2.8 | r | л - С - Т | I | 1.0 38 | 1 | о.н 9 | ſ | ı | 1.0 | F | ı | 1.0 | . 1 | 1.0 | I | c - |
| Don't know/Refused | 2.2 | 0.6 | 7.5 | 1.6 | с С | 11 7- | 6 | 4 |) . | | | ap rf | | | 28 | | 1.00 | | 73% 73% |
| | 28 | 18 | 9£ | ee m | 9 | | , % * | 0 9 9 9 | 0.2 18 | н С. 8 | 0.3 81 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.8 | E.0 | д.д | 1 | 2,2 |
| NELLAN | 1.15 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.23 | 1.08 | 1.13 | 1.15 | 1.19 | 68 U | 06 1 | - - | י נ י נ | | # う | af H | a₽ * | ц В | | 48 |
| | | 2 - - | 00.1 | т.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1, 21 | 1.00.1 | 1.01 | 1.19 | 1.06 | 1.16 | 1,12 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTE: If percentages are based on fewer than 100 respondents, interpret with caution. Conducted by Clark & Chase Research, Inc., Job #08009

~

Table Q1C Page 4 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

•

Recreation areas and parks enhance community well-being

| | | 15035 | GEOGRAPHY | NED I | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | - | DCE | EDUCATION | | 9749 1 | - | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|---------------------|---|
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ 1 | SH=> | Some C Coll G | Coll Grad+ V | White (| | | _ — - | PARK USER | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | PI |
| Total Adults (000s) | 113.4 | 56.3 | 57.1 | 6.22 | 60.4 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | | | | | | ~ | н 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | - i 92 | Yea | 0% |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 0.104 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 110.0 | 180.0 | 0.111 | 125.0 | | 178.0 | | | | | | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| TOTAL AGREE (NET) | 109.7 978 | 54.4 978 | 55.3 97% | 51.1 97& | 58.6 97% | 63.5 99% | 32.2 95% | 14.0 93% | 38.5 948 | | 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 | 6.9 66.9 | 0.921 | 127.0 2 52.7 009 | 0 | | | | 245.0 57.2 |
| Strongly agree (+2) | 56.1 498 | 26.7 478 | 29.4 52% | 21.9 418 | 34.2 578 | 36.4 57% | 14.8 448 | 4.9 328 | 16.2 398 | 11.8 498 | 28.1 608 | 34.2 498 | 19.3 48% | 12 4 12 4 14 5 14 5 14 5 14 5 14 5 14 5 14 5 14 | 96% 27.1 | 444 446 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 | 8 6 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 | 988 30.7 20.7 | 958 24.1 |
| Agree (+1) | 53.6 478 | 27.8 49 8 | 25.8 45\$ | 29.1 558 | 24.4 408 | 27.1 42% | 17.4 518 | 9.1 618 | 22.4 558 | 12.1 50% | 18.3 398 | 32.7 478 | 19.7 49 8 | 23.8 448 | - | | 23.8 23.8 | 19.8 19.8 | 40% 33.2 |
| TOTAL DISAGRAE (NET) | с. 1. че 1. че | 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 | 1.8 38 | 1.5 38 | 1.6 38 | 0.6 1.8 | 1.7 5% | 0 5.8 8.8 | 2.1 58 | 0.4 2.4 | 0 . 4 0 % | 2.2 38 | 0 *8 | 0 .0 4 | | | 6 5 5 6 7 7 7 7 | * 9 7 0 | 2 2 8 |
| Disagree (-1) | 1.8 28 | 1.2 28 | 0.6 18 | 1 28 1 | 0.5 18 | 0.6 1.8 | 0.6 28 | 0.6 48 | 0.9 28 | е.н О | 0 0 | 1.0 | 60 A | ې ۱۰۰ | 8 8 8 7 0 | ، ب ۲ - ۲ | 1.2 2.2 | 0 18 0 9 | 1 48 1 48 |
| Strongly disagree (-2) | 년 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | ц. , * ц. | 1.2 24 | 0 . * 51 % | 1.1 28 | 1 | 1.1 | 0.3 2% | 1.2 38 | 1.9 8.4 | | 1.3 28 | 7 1 8 4 . + 0 | 6 I 1 | 1.3 28 | * : * - · * | 1 35 1 35 | 98 I H | н 28 29 29 29 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 |
| von't know/Refused MEAN | ຍີ່ ເ | 0.5 1.8 | I | 0.3 44 | 0 ** 0 | 0.2 ** | 0.1 \$\$ | 8 13 28 13 0 | 0.9 1.8 0 | ı | 1 | 0 년 8 | ı | 01 08 • • 0 • | 0 6.1 8 | 0.4 18 | יין איי ס | 0.2 * 0 | a, 0, 4 1, 1, 4 0 |
| | 100 | 1.00 1.00 | 1.43 2.00 | 1.36 | 1.49 2.00 | 1.55 | 1.30 | 1.20 | 1.26 1.00 | 1.45 1.00 | 1.59 2.00 | 1.41 1.00 | 1.44 | 1.52 | 1,36 1,00 2 | 1.58 | 1.00 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.30 1.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table Q1D Page 5 May 14, 2008

-

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Recreation and park activities would help reduce grime

| | . – | | GEOGRAPHY | National | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | | | z | - | RACE | — 贸 | CHILDREN | - NEN | РАКК 11 | 1 AASI | tant Tant | t |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---|-------------------|----------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|---|--------------|--------------|--|-------------------------|
| Å | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ 1 | SH=> | Some Coll (| Grad+ | White | Other | Yes IN 1 | HH No No | | | POOLS NO | y c |
| 4 | 1 13.4 | 56.3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 90 - | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 401.0 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 110.0 | 180.0 | 111.0 | 125.0 | 86,0 | 178.0 | 258.0 | a, 67 6 0 0 1 | | 0.40 | | | | 60.1 |
| | 90.2 808 | 44.7 798 | 45.5 80% | 42.5 80% | 47.7 79 8 | 52.6 828 | 25.6 75% | 12.0 80% | 31.1 76% | 21.5 89% | 36.8 798 | 52.6 768 | 9. 8. 66 9. 8. 66 9. 8. 9 | 43.0 | 407.0 46.9 | 62.3 62.3 | 27.9 | | 245.0 45.9 |
| (7) | 32.0 28% | 18.3 32% | 13.7 248 | 9, 6 18% | 22.4 378 | 16.8 26% | 10.8 328 | 4.4 29% | 7 6 184 | 12.0 50% | 12.2 26% | 17.1 17.1 | 50.0 12.0 | 500 7.71 | 14.1 | 82% 22.2 | 9.7 | 83 8 17.9 | 76% 12.8 |
| ം | 58.2 514 | 26.4 478 | 31.8 56% | 32.9 628 | 25.3 42% | 35.9 56% | 14.8 438 | 7.6 50% | 23.6 57% | 9.5 9.5 9.5 | 24.6 53% | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 21.7 21.7 | 25.3 475 | 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1 | 40.0 | 26% 18.2 | 35% 24.6 | 21 8 33.1 |
| н | 14.0 128 | 6.5 118 | 7.5 138 | 6.4 128 | 7.6 138 | 6.8 118 | ក កុស កុស | 2.2 158 | 5.6 14* | 5, 3 6, 3 | 5. 2. 2. | | ר ה 1 קר 1 קר | е Т. - | 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1 | 5.5 7.5 | 48% 6.6 | 48& 4.2 | 558 9.7 |
| н | 12.3 118 | 6.1 18 | ю. С. ч | 5. J | ، و • و | 9 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 2.1 | ь 1 2.4 | 4 4 1 8 | 10% | 10% 4_A | 148 V 148 | 9 8 1 108 | 178 178 | #8 (80 - | 168 |
| | | 6.0 | | | * 0 T - | *01 1 | 128 | 128 | 108 | dî Dî | 128 | 12% | 10% | | 128 | 108 | 1.38 | 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1.38 1.38 |
| (| ан Т | ੇ ਹੋਏ ਜ | | т а | 9 6 7 7 1 | 7 P - * 0 | н н н | 4.0 4.0 | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | 0.1 18 | 0 * | 1.7 28 | 0.0 ** | м ж П С | 1.4 | 0 8 0 | 1.5 48 | I | 1.7 38 |
| _, | г. 86 6 | 5.2 98 98 | 4.0 78 | 4.1 88 | տ 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 | 4 8 8 | 3.4 108 | 0.8 68 | 4.3 108 | 0.4 28 | 4.3 98 | 7.2 108 | 2.0 58 | 5.3 108 | 3.8 68 | 5.9 85 | 3.2 84 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| નન | 1.02 | 1.10 1.00 | 0.95 1.00 | 0.92 | 11.00 1.00 | 1.05 1.00 | 00'T | 0.97 1.00 | 0.87 1.00 | 1.31 | 1.02 | 0,93 1,00 | 1.10 1.00 | 1.15 1.00 | 00.43 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.86 1.00 | | 0.85 |

Table 02 Page 6 May 14, 2008

--- Site Sclutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Need for additional recreation and park facilities in your area

| | | (GEOG | GEOGRAPHY | 8 | GENDER | Lo K | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------------|---|---|----------------|
| | | _ | | _ | | 2 | NOW ABEL NOW | 1 | | EDUCATION | _ | RACE | - 2 | CHTTDDW | - | | | | |
| | Total | Total { G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | SH=> | Some Colle | Coll Grad+ y | White | Other | HH NI | | 4 | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | OH |
| Total Adults (000s) | , , , | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | | Yes | No |
| | ¥. C.L.L. | 56.3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 04.2 | 96 6 | v S | : | | | | | | |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 110.0 | | (; ; | | | | 0, 40 | 8.95 | 53.5 | 59.0 | 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| Great need (3) | . 56.0 | | | | | • | 7.704 | 0.111 | 125.0 | 86.0 | 178.0 | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 2 | 267.0 24 | 245.0 19 | 156.0 1 | 151.0 2 | 245.0 |
| | 498 | 518 | 812 | 449 | 548 | 36.2 56% | 13.9 | 0.0 0.0 | 22.3 640 | 15.3 | 17.8 | 25.2 | 27.5 | | | | | | |
| Some need (2) | 45.7 | 21.7 | 0 62 | | 5 | | | 9 1 | P 7 | ¥ 10 | 88F | 36% | 869 | 56% | 448 | 528 | 448 | 1 503 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 418 |
| | 408 | 86E | 428 | 478 | 358 358 | 277.7 388 | 15.6 46% | 10.00 10.00 10.00 | 12.8 | 6.6 272 | 25.8 | 35.4 | 10.0 | | | | | | |
| Little need (1) | Э.7 | .1.7 | 0.5 | | с С | | , | 2 | 6 1 1 | */* | 55% | 51% | 258 | 398 | 428 | 418 | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | - - | 20.02 44.8 |
| | Эв | 8 F) | 98- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- | - m - m | 87 | 8. Å . n | 1.3 | 0.6 48 | н В.5 | 0.6 2* | 4. L 95 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 1.1 | | ~ |
| No need (0) | 6.5 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 9.6 | - (* | 9 1 | ç | ť | | , I | р Р | 4 19 | % 7 | 28 | | 8 m | å | ar m | 2 49 1 1 |
| Don't know/bothered | 68 | 8 | 68 | 68 | ና ልቅ • ይን 1 | 128 | 7. 165 1 | 2.0 138 | т. 8 | 1.4 68 | 1.6 38 | 5.1 78 | ም- ደ ም- ደ | д.8 1.8 | 4.4 | 2.3 | с. 1 | 0.6 | 5.9 |
| | н 1- 1- | 1 8 2 8 7 | 0.5 | 0.3 1.8 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 9.0 | E.O | 0,1 | 1.4 | ; ' | e 7 | | ¥۹ آ | 118 | de Fi | 10% |
| MEAN Metan | 2.35 | 2.39 | LE C | | р ч т с | 19 1 1 1 | 8- | ц ф | 28 | 59 75 | 8° * | 89 27 | | . - | - | m æ | п. 86. 1 | 0.5 18 | 1.0 28 |
| | 3.00 | 3,00 | 2.00 | 00 | 100 °C | 94.N | 2.20 | 2.09 | 2.35 3.00 | 2.50 3.00 | 2.29 | 2.1B 2.00 | 2.59 3.00 | 3.00 2 | 2.26 2. | 2.43 2.300 2 | 2.19 | 2.53 3.00 2 | 2.18 2.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table Q3 Page 7 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

1

÷

Have used recreation area, park, or trail in Greenville or Fitt County, past year

| | | | | | | | ÷ | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| | UBLIC | No | | 60.1 | | 245.0 | | 33.3 | | 26,8 | 458 |
| : | USE PUBLIC POOLS | Yes | | 51.3 | - | 151.0 | | 41.7 | 8 T A | 9.5 | 198 |
| | - Harr | No | | 75.7 37.7 | 1 | 156.O | | ı | · | 37.7 | 100% |
| | | Yes | | | | E 0 657 | | 2.00 | e 2224 | ı | |
| - Mar | HH | | | 59.0 | | 0.102 | , | 0 d 1 1 | 2 | 25.4 | 8 H P |
| Maguring | Ä | res | | 53.5 | 0 666 | n., 7t | | 78. | 2 | 11.7 | \$Z2 |
| | | | I | 39.8 53.5 | 0.001 | | 7. 26 | 628 | | 15.1 | * 5 |
| RACE | tile i te | | | 69.6 | 258.0 | | 47.9 | 698 | | 21.6 218 | 6 1 1 |
| _ | Coll Gradt F | - ' | | 46.5 | 178.0 | | 37.3 | 808 | | 9.4 90.4 | 5 |
| EDUCATION | Some C | | | 7.47 | 86.0 | | 15.5 | 648 | 4 | 9.7 36.8 | 2 |
| | S田井> | ÷ | 0.14 | | 125.0 | | 22.2 | 548 | ((| 10.5 468 | 1 |
| - 8 | 65+ 65+ | | с г | | 111.0 | | 5.1 | 348 | 0 0 7 | 40.U | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | | 0.0B1 | | 17.9 | 538 | 1 4 | 478 | |
| ASCE | 18-44 45-64 | | 64.3 | | 110.0 | | 52.7 | 828 | 11 6 | 881 | |
| — - е | Women [| | 60.4 | | 230.0 | | 39,1 1 | *00 | 21.4 | 35% | |
| GENDER | | | 52.9 | | 171.0 | | 36.6 408 | 600 | 16.3 | 31% | |
| Л | alance | | 57.1 | | T00.0 | | 47.77 4.91 1.91 | 0 7 } | 27.7 | 494 | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville Balance Men | | 56.3 | 0,000 | 0 - TNS | 5 70 | | | 10.01 | 18% | |
| | Total 0 | | 113.4 | 0 201 | | 75.7 | 678 | | 37.7 | 8 8 1 1 1 | |
| | | | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTERVIEWS | | Tes . | | | | | |

Table Q4 Page B May 14, 2008 Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Number of times have used recreation area in the last year

| Men 18-44 45-e4 65+ EDCCATION RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE FUBLIC Men 18-44 45-e4 65+ <=HS Coll Grad+ White CHLLDREN PARK USER USE FUBLIC 39.1 52.7 17.9 5.1 22.2 15.5 37.3 47.9 24.7 41.8 33.6 75.7 41.7 33. 135.0 92.0 107.0 46.0 58.0 52.0 129.0 163.0 72.0 106.0 136.0 245.7 41.7 33. 113 58 1.0 78 108 18 21.9 0.9 40.0 1.10 130. 113 58 1.0 72.0 106.0 136.0 245.0 10.10 30. 113.4 157 2.4 9.5 1.8 2.6 0.9 41.7 33. 113.4 157 2.4 9.5 1.4 2.6 2.1 1.1 1. | 5.1 5.1 *8 |
|---|--|
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHILDREN EARK USER 18-44 45-64 65+ <-HS | 8°11 8°11 8°11 8°11 8°11 8°11 |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHILDREN PANK 18-44 45-64 65+ <-HS | I |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHILDR 18-44 45-64 65+ <-HS | * m * * 0 0 |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCANTON RACE 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS | k ⊢1a 2 .* 4 O |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCANTION RACE 19-44 45-64 65+ <=HS | е г. * ;* • О |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RAU 18-44 45-64 65+ Some Coll Mhite 1 52.7 17.9 5.1 22.2 15.5 37.3 47.9 0 92.0 107.0 46.0 58.0 52.0 129.0 163.0 2 2.8 1.7 0.4 2.3 2.0 1.63.0 2 2.8 1.0 7% 10% 1.3% 1.6 4% 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 13.2 2.4 9.5 15.0 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 10.9 27.2 31.1 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 10.9 27.2 31.1 | - |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION 19-44 45-64 65+ Some Coll 1 52.7 17.9 5.1 22.2 0 92.0 107.0 46.0 59.0 52.0 2 1.7 0.4 2.3 2.9 4 15.7 17.9 5.1 22.2 15.5 3 2.4 108 1.3 1.8 4 15.7 104 78 1.8 5 107 0.4 2.3 2.0 6 30.4 218 608 168 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 10.9 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 10.9 | 0.1 *8 |
| ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION 18-44 45-64 65+ C-HS Some C 1 52.7 17.9 5.1 22.2 15.5 0 92.0 107.0 46.0 58.0 52.0 2 2.8 1.7 0.4 2.3 2.0 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 13.2 2.4 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 13.2 2.4 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 10.9 65% 41% 72% 30% 71% | с .* С |
| ASCRIBED AGE ASCRIBED AGE ASCRIBED AGE AB-44 45-64 65+ <=HS 1 52.7 17.9 5.1 22.9 0 92.0 107.0 46.0 58.0 2 2.8 1.7 0.4 22.1 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 13.2 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 13.2 3 34.2 7.4 3.6 6.7 6 53 413 728 308 | 0.1 18 |
| ASCRIBED AGE 1 18-44 45-64 65+ 1 18-44 45-64 65+ 1 152.7 17.9 5.1 0 92.0 107.0 46.0 2 2.8 1.7 0.4 4 15.7 8.5 1.1 8 15.7 8.5 1.1 8 304 488 218 8 305 418 218 8 655 413 728 | i |
| ASCRIBED AG 18-44 45-64 18-44 45-64 152.7 17.9 0 92.0 107.0 2 2.8 1.7 8 15.7 8.5 4 15.7 8.5 8 304 48 8 304 28 8 304 28 8 304 21 8 5 8 304 28 8 5 8 108 8 5 8 108 8 5 8 108 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 | 3 |
| 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 9 | 0.18 1.18 1.18 |
| ~' ! ⊢ ⊂ Ni& sta ma | ı |
| ER Women 135. 131. 13. 21. 55. 55. | 0 . 4 & |
| E I | гі ф° • * О |
| | ı |
| GEOGRADHY GEOGRADHY Total GEOGRADHY 75.7 46.3 29.4 75.7 46.3 29.4 75.0 203.0 42.0 4.8 2.8 2.0 6% 6% 7% 25.3 13.5 11.8 33% 29.7 45.5 45.3 29.7 15.5 60% 64% 53% | 0.3 1.8 |
| Total (10 tal (75.7 4.8 6.8 33.3 55.0 25.3 33.3 6.0 9 33.5 25.0 | ოქირ ** დ |
| Visited past year (000s) # OF INTERVIEWS 1 2 to 5 More than 5 Don't know/Refised | |

Table Q5 Page 9 May 14, 2008

1. .

. .

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

121

_

Recreation or park facility you visit most often

`,

| | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| | | CEOGRAPHY | APHY | GEN | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | - 35 | BDUC | BDIJCATTON | - | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 55+ | SH=> | Some C | Coll | RACE | | 記記 | | Park User | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | Ъ, |
| Visited past year (000s) | 75 7 | | | | | | | | 1 | | - : | | Other | Yes | No I | Yes Y | ON | | No |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | | | 29.4 | 36.6 | 39.I | 52.7 | 17.9 | 5.1 | 22.2 | 15.5 | 37.3 | 47.9 | 24.7 | a 11 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | 245.0 | 203.0 | 42.0 | 0.011 | 135.0 | 92.0 | 0.70L | 46.0 | 58.0 | 52 0 | 0 961 | 5 1 5 | | | | 1.6) | 1 | 41.7 | 33.3 |
| ALM STREET Park | 18.1 | 10.9 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 10.7 | 1 7 E | C | | | | A-044 | D. COT | 12.0 | 106.0 1 | 136.0 24 | 245.0 | 1 | 11.0 1 | 130.0 |
| | 4 7 7 | 248 | 248 | 20% | 278 | 248 | 2.9 2.9 8 | 118 118 | 0.0 84 | 0.4 0.5 8 | 11.6 318 | 12.6 264 | დ. ო. | 12.3 | 5.7 1 | 18.1 | | 1.0 | 6.8 |
| ULION XIEI TAATA | 7.8 108 | 5.5 128 | 61 61 96 | а.б 4 С | 4 | 9.5 - | 3.1 | 0,8 | 1.9 | 1,5 | 7 | , c 2 c | е , 7 , | ቶ. ት. የ | | 24% | | 26% | 208 |
| Boyd Lee Park | 6.7 | 7 E | | 6 I 1 9 | 27 - 1 - 1 | 842 | 178 | 1.6% | 8° 61 | 10% | 128 | 9 18 17 8 | 9 80 1 0 8 | к.н 58-н | 5.7 178 | 7.8 10% | ı | Э.4 88 | ት ተ የ |
| | 8 6 | 78 | 0 % 1 1 1 8 | 10% | 0.0 8 | ы. 10-8 10-8 | 0.0 9.0 | 1.1 272 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 0.5 | л 9 | 4.4 | r 4 | | י ג ג | , j |
| Ayden Park | 5.1 | , | Ľ | 5 0 | | | , | P 1 1 | 5 | 8 R | 148 | 9°C 1 | 28 | 3 61 | | , de 101 | I | 3. r 98 | 8. 80 8. 80 8. 80 |
| | 78 | | 178 | 108 | с.т 48 | 4 .07 .07 | 0.6 38 | ŧ | 5.1 23 | r | ı | 1.5 | 3.7 | 0.9 | | г. - | i | | |
| Jaycee Park | 3.7 | 3.1 | 90 | • • | 6 1 | | , | | 5 | | | æ | 15% | 2 8 | 13% | 78 | | | 3.7 118 |
| | 56 | - 78 | 9 99 • (N | 1-1- 1-1-1- 1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1 | m đ | 0. 0 1 1 | 0 5.2 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 0.E | 0.6 | 5 | | L | | | 1 |
| Greenville Aquatics and | 5 | c | 1 | | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 8 | 78 | 48 | 48 | 68 | 28 | , 10 19 | 0 aP • G • | ່ ສະ ກ | 1 | n. 2 | 2.3 |
| Fitness Center | | 9 9 9 | 0.5 28 | 2.2 68 | 0.8 | 2.6 5.6 | 1.0 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Winterville Recreation Park | | 1 | | | , | י ק ר | ж к | 8 8 8 | 1.18 | 58 T | 8 * | 28 | - 69 - | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | 5.U 44 | 1 | | 2.0 |
| | 98- 7- 7- | . 7 * * | 1.4 5e | I | 1.6 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 | I | 0.6 | 1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0 | | | | | # 7 | 89 96 |
| Green Mill Run Greenway | 1.6 | c | | | P # | ₩ V | ¢۹ ۳ | | ÷ | | 38 | 28 | 1 aP (T) | vid⊓ •* € | 4.4 | 1.6 28 | 1 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.7 |
| | 28 | 28 | 28 | 7 a | e, 4 | 0.2 | н 1. 1. | 0.2 | н | ı | 1.6 | 1.6 | , | | | • | | | р 4 |
| Town Common | с. <u>г</u> | ې ۲ | | | р т | P | ¥.0 | de La | | | 48 | å | | 28 | 5°5 | 1,6 28 | 1 | 0.7 2.5 | 0.8 1 |
| | 2.8 | i en | 3 | 9.0 7.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 6.0 | I | 0.9 | ę.0 | 0.9 | | | C | | | 6 |
| Paramore Park | 1.2 | 1.0 | - | | | P | 0 19 | ¥P ⊣i | 18 | | 28 | 28 | 1-8- 1-8- | स्त | າ ກໍາ ວ | 1 1 1 1 1 | ŀ | 0, u 1, u 1, u | 0.9 |
| | 28 | i dP ** | 1 d0 1 1 1 | а - н - | 0.8 3* | 0 8 1 | н. о | с. о | | 9.6 | ı | 0.8 | E.0 | | , , , | e | | | e T |
| South Greenville Park and | 1.0 | 1.0 | I | 0 | | 9 | (P −f | 9 8 | 8° F | 58 9 | | 28 | 18 | / #P / (7) / | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 | 0.8 * | 0.4 1.6 |
| recreation Center | ъ. В. | 28 | | 6 73 # | 1.0 ** | 0.0 19.0 | 1 | 0.1 28 | 0.9 4 | п | 1.0 | I | 1.0 | | | c | | | P H |
| West Meadowbrook Park | 0. F | 1.0 | I | ı | - | c + | | 9 | 4 | | ъ * | | 48 | d0 * | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | 1 | 1.0 28 | F |
| | 8 T | 28 | | | - 60 - 67 | т. 28- | I | ſ | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | T | 1.0 | 1 | - | ċ | | | |
| Ferkins Complex | 1.0 1.1 | 1.0 | ı | I | 1,0 | C | I | | | ж 0 | | | 48 | | | | 1 | 1.U 28 | ł |
| | ¥P −ĭ | 28 | | | ар (Г) | 96 0 171 - | r | I | 1.0 48 | ı | , | ı | 1.0 | 1.0 | н 1 | 1.0 | ा ा | 0 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.4 | 5 | | 18 | I | 54 | |

Table Q5 Page 10 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

.

•

| | | | | Recree | eation or park facility you visit most often | Park fa | cility y | raiv uoy | it most | often | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--|-------------------|-----------|---|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|------------------|----------------|
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | I XHAYA | CENI | DER | ASCI | KIBED AG | - | DCE | ICALTON | _ | RAC | 1 | ad l TH J | - Ng | | • | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | | | | oll rad+ | | Cther [| Kes N | | Yes Y | | SE PUBI POOLS | j J |
| | 75.7 | 46.3 | | 36.6 | 39.1 | 52.7 | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | - 1 | | No I |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 245.0 | 0 602 | | | | | Ì | 4 4 | 1 | n.01 | 5.15 | 47.9 | 24.7 | 41.8 | 33.6 | 75.7 | | 41.7 | 3 3.3 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 7 6 | | | 0.011 | 135.0 | 92.0 | 0.701 | 46.0 | 58.0 | | 129.0 | 163.0 | 72.0 | 106.0 | | 45.0 | | | 0.05 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | - # | 0.4 18 | 0.3 18 | 0.4 | 0.5 18 | сі * * О | 0.3 28 | 0,2 4,8 | 0 1, 1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | ı | е.o | 0.5 | 0.7 | | | 7 0 |
| 0.4 - 0.1 0.4 - 0.2 0.1 - 0.4 <td>0.7 18</td> <td>0.7 18</td> <td>I</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>2 I</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>₽ ₹ -</td> <td>2.4 0.1</td> <td>ч С</td> <td>유 명 다</td> <td>8 - - -</td> <td>ар I П</td> <td></td> <td>89 171</td> <td>æ</td> | 0.7 18 | 0.7 18 | I | 0.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.1 | 2 I | 0.7 | ₽ ₹ - | 2.4 0.1 | ч С | 유 명 다 | 8 - - - | ар I П | | 89 171 | æ |
| $ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 &$ | 0 | c | | ۹ ۱ | | * | | 28 | | 48 | | ыр + | 28 | ъ. г. | - + - + - + | , % , % | ł | 0.6 18 | ۲. * - |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 7 8 | 4 4 - H | I | 0.1 | 0.4 18 | I | 0.2 18 | 0.2 58 | 0,1 ** | I | 0.4 19 | 4 | r | T | 0.4 | 0.4 | I | 0.1 | , e.o |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | гі, С | 6.0 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | I | 0.2 | с С | ł | р Н | | | ар П | 14 | | dp ¥ | 18 1 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | ρ i | * 1 | | | ਲ ਜ | 8 * | 8 F | | 18 | | I | I | с. 1.8-1 1.8-1 | 0.1 1.8 | ı | იე მ ⁶ ი | 1 | 2.5 • | 0,2 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | C7 6₽ | 0 0 0 | T | r | 0.13 | I | 0.2 1* | 1 | 0,1 | I | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | ۲.0 | 0.2 | ſ | ۹ I | р с с |
| 0:2 - 0:2 - 0:1 </td <td>0.2</td> <td>0</td> <td>I</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>. 1</td> <td>۱ ^ج</td> <td>-</td> <td>* - * c</td> <td>a≯ (* ⊂</td> <td>ар *</td> <td>ыр *</td> <td>d₽ ★</td> <td>¢° *</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>, 1</td> | 0.2 | 0 | I | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.2 | . 1 | ۱ ^ج | - | * - * c | a≯ (* ⊂ | ар * | ыр * | d₽ ★ | ¢° * | | | , 1 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | , c | е с * с | | ₽ ₽ | d₽ ≠ | | e₽ r-f | | | त्र न | -1 d=7 ; +:) | V dP •≠ ⊃ | 1 | 0.1 * | 년 42 년 42 년 | C) 49 . * O | ŧ | 0.1 ** | 1, # 0 |
| 0.1 1 1 0.1 | ча - * О | 7. de - * - | I | * 5 * 0 | r | ŀ | 0.2 18 | Ĭ | ı | I | 0.2 | Т .0 | 0,1 | 0.2 | ı | 0.2 | ī | - | , <u>-</u> |
| ** ** 0.1 1.1 0.1 0.1 1.1 0.1 0.1 1.1 0.1 1.1 0.1 1.1 1.1 0.1 1.1 1.1 0.1 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1 | 1.0 | I | ŗ | | | | | ie ie | d¶⊐ * | ઈ* | ар * | | de * | | 40 * | i dP ; * |
| 0;1 0;1 0;1 0;1 0;1 0;1 0;1 - 0;1 0;1 - 0;1 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 - 0;1 | ₽ * | d [₽] ¥ | | of≎ ≠ | | 1 d* . * | I | I | 1 | 1.0 1 | ı | I | | 0.1 | I | 1.0 | ı | 0.1 | ı |
| ** ** ** 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 1.1 0.1 1.1< | T 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 4 | - C | Ċ | | | | | | | ÷ | # * | | ۹۵ ۴ | | 8° * | |
| 0.1 0.1 - 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 | * * | 8* * | | | i d¤ ;* | -1 dP - + - | I | 1 | ч. • | I | J | I | 0.1 | 0.1 | ŗ | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| ** ** ** ** 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 1.1 - 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | ĩ | ı | 1.0 | ן י | I | r | , I | | | | d₽ ¥ | ₽ * | | *# * | | a₽ * | |
| 4.5 4.0 5.1 2.3 6.9 1.2 0.3 0.9 2.0 5.4 5.2 3.2 6.2 2.2 8.4 - 3.9 10% 13% 17% 5% 13% 7% 11% 13% 15% 7% 11% 9% 8.1 3.0 4.0 7.1 7.6 3.2 0.3 5.2 1.4 4.5 7.6 2.9 5.5 5.6 11.1 - 8.6 | # # | d₽ ★ | | | id⊅ .+≭ | | - | - # | 1 | ł | -1 * - * 0 | с 1. 4. | ſ | r | 0.1 | 1.0 | ī | 1 | 1.0 |
| 9.1 3.0 4.0 7.1 7.6 3.2 0.3 5.2 1.4 4.5 7.6 13.6 7.8 11.8 3.9 18.1 3.0 4.0 7.1 7.6 3.2 0.3 5.2 1.4 4.5 7.6 2.9 5.5 5.6 11.1 - 8.6 188 108 118 189 158 188 68 233 94 179 66 2.9 5.5 5.6 11.1 - 8.6 | 8.4 118 | 4.5 10% | 4.0 13% | 6.1 178 | 2.3 6* | 6.9 138 | 1.2 | ε.o | 6.0 | 2.0 | 5.4 | 2.2 | с. С. | 6.2 | 0 8 0 | ** * * 0 | | | 49 * |
| 188 108 119 189 158 188 68 233 98 128 128 128 121 - 8.6 | 11.1 | 8.1 | 5 | | ; ; | | ¢ | ÷ | 48 9 | 13% | 148 | 118 | 13% | 15% | 18 | 118 118 | ı | | 4.5 138 |
| | 158 | 18% | 108 | 11.8 11.8 | 1.8 1.88 | 1.5% | | 0.3 99 | 2.5 73 73 | 1.4 94 | 4.5 128 | 7.6 | 2.9 | 5,5 | | 3.1 | | | 2.5 |

Table Q6 Page 11 May 14, 2008

1

-

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

What prevents you from using recreation or park facilities

| | | GEOGRAPHY | АРВУ | GENDER | ER | ASCR | ASCRIBED AGE | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| | Total | ellin's | | | - | | | | 101 | CATUN Some Coll | | RACE | | CHILDREN | - | PARK USER | ~ | USE PUBLIC | |
| | | | HALANCe { | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ < | SH≓> | | | White Ot | Other Y | IN HH Yes N | No J Yes | ςΝ ε | | POOLS | |
| Haven't used past year (000s) | 37.7 | 10.01 | 27.7 | 16.3 | 21.4 | 11.6 | 16.1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | - | | ļ |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 156.0 | 98.0 | 58.0 | 61.0 | 95.0 | 18.0 | 0.67 | | | | | | | 11.7 2 | 25.4 | 1 37 | 37.7 9 | 5 26 | 26.8 |
| No desire/Do not want to | 7.6 208 | 2.4 | 1) 1, 1 1, 2 | 4.9 0.7 | ດ. ເບັ | 2.2 | Э.7 Е | 1.7 | | | | 92.0 7 7 | | el El | 131.0 | - 156.0 | .0 40.0 | 0 115.0 | 0. |
| Not enough time/Too busy | 0.0 0.0 | 1.8 | 5 F - 5 | 4 7 7 7 | 1.5% 2.7 | 198 2.5 | 42 M | 871 · | 86 F | 218 | 218 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | 4.5 188 | - 0 | 7,6 208 9, | 0.0 14 14 14 14 14 | 4.3 16% |
| Transportation issues | та 1.4.4 1.4.4 | 168 0.2 28 | 10 1- 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - | -10 10 -10 16 -10 16 | 1.3 P. 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1. | 218 | 218 | 11 % * 1 % | 4 78 4.2 | 278 278 0.7 | а. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | 1 10 14 10 14 10 14 | 2.4 1.6% 2.4 | 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2 | 3.2 138 | 9 H 1 | | | 6.0 22% |
| Age . | 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1 | 1.9 198 |) (0.4 ነ ነ በ ጠ ተ | າ 1.01 ມີ.11 | н С С С Г С С | * 다。 다 다 | 1.0 1.0 | 12% 3.1 | 228 2.4 | 8% 0.8 | 68 1.7 | 158 | | | n 1961 11 1961 | | | | 5.2 208 |
| No parks in area | 98 ຍ | 0,8 8,8 | 7 .7 108 | ; in ar ; in i ri | 6 (1) 7 (1) 7 (1) | 5 T T | * "; N 1 | 8.18 0.7 | 90 H 90 H | 98 0,0 | 18% 1.2 | 19 1 .7 | | | 1 - 17 - 17 - 17 | ភំភំ (រ | | | 4.5 178 |
| Location | 2.8 78 | 0.2 28 | 2.8 5.8 5.8 7.8 8 7.8 8 | 2.3 148 | 4 C | • 03 a - 1 - | 4 Ci 6 | * °. | 23 88 5.3 | * ! 0 | 138 0.4 | 88 0.0 | | | 960 C | | | | r a₽ |
| Not sure what is available | 2.7 78 | 0 28 2 | 2.5 98 | 0.1 4,8 | 2.7 | 6 17 17 10 17 10 17 | ਿ ਜ ਜ | * N. | 128 1.3 | | 5% 0.1 | 48 2.6 | | | , 1 60 - | и 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | 60 aP |
| dealth reasons | 96 73 6 - 73 73 | 138 138 1 | 0.9 38 | 0.8 58 | 1.4 68 | 0.5 4.5 4.8 | 6 6 7 8 7 8 | 11 X 12 X 12 X | 1.5 2.5 8. | 15% 0.1 | | 128 1.7 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | 5 7 7 8 5 7 8 | - 48 N | | пара с С |
| Not handicap accessible Cannot attain | 2.1 68 | 0.0 5* 8 | 1.7 68 | 1.7 108 | 0.5 28 | I | 108 108 | 0.6 6% | 1-15 68-1-1 | | | 1 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 | | | 80 19 80 19 | - 75 G | | , 4 | sate est |
| vauure arrord Not enough available | ئ0 640 ئ • 177 - ⊷† − | 1,8 1,8 1,8 1,0 0,0 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 0,6 48 | 1.0 58 | 0.0 88 | : 2 1 0 | 0.6 68 | 0.3 28 | 0.4 | 0.9 801 | 1.2 68 | | 0 6 ° 0 8 8 | | 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | μ γ. Ω γ. Ω | ar 10 a |
| Crime/safety issues | 98 47 89 77 - 77 11 - | 40 % 40 % | 4 4 8 28 28 | 0 0 • * 1 • * * | 1. 7.4 6.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9 | 0.2 0.6 % | 1.3 88 0.2 | 0.4 0.4 0.5 | | | | | , | • | | H | | н | സംഭ |
| Do not like parks in area | н. 38 38 | 0. 5. 5. | 6 # 0 | , , | е С. 9 9 9 | ิ ⊓ & ถ่า ถ่า เช | 유 태양. | មុក ស្រ | - - | 0 78 0 0 | 87 184 184 | 14 0 49 14 14 | 0 0 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 1-7 | | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 8 0 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 | 0 1 7 7 8 0 8 | N A A |

Table Q6 Page 12 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

......

1.

What prevents you from using recreation or park facilities

| | | GEOGRAPHY | I XEAV | GEND | UDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | | EDU | EDUCATION | - | RACE | - | NedCitri | - | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ 1 | SH=> | Some Cc Coll Gr | Coll Grad+ W | White C | Cther Cther | TN EH | | 85 2 | <u> </u> | DUBI | ដ |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 04 | 169 | | Yea | No |
| Haven't used past year (000s) | 37.7 | 10.0 | 27.7 | 16.3 | 21.4 | 11.6 | 16.1 | 10.0 | 18.B | B. 7 | 7 0 | i E | , L | | | | | | [|
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 156.0 | 98.0 | 58.0 | 61.0 | 95.0 | 18.0 | 0.67 | , 19 | 0 | | | | 7.01 | | 4.62 | I | 37.7 | ц П | 26.8 |
| Recently moved to area | 1.0 | 0.7 | ~ C | م د | 1 0 | 1 | | | | 0.40 | 1. A | 0.48 | 57.0 | 21.0 1 | 131.0 | H I | 156.0 4 | 40.0 1 | 115.0 |
| | в М | 78 | 1 49 1 49 | 2.5 | 360 1 | 0.7 | 0.4 28 | 3 | 0.8 4 | 0.0 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.8 44 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | ı | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Use other facilities | 0.5 | 0.1 | Ċ | | 4 | | | | ÷ | | , r | , | р Н | р к | 44 | | en M | 118 | 8 * |
| | 18 | 4 4 1 | 28 | -id≎ •+* ⊅ | 24 | t | 0 - * | 0.4 | 0.3 28 | I | 0.2 2# | 0.2 | E 0 | r | 0.5 | ł | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| No children in household | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1 | Ċ | Ċ | | , (| | | | ļ | Å | 2.7 | | 8 | | de Fri | 28 | 45 |
| | 8° * | 18 | | dP * | -1. aP - * - | I | -1 % | с. 5 С. | н. * 0 | I | | 1.0 1.0 | 1 | ı | 1.0 | ı | 0.1 | ı | 0.1 |
| Other | 0.5 | 0.3 | е. О | 1,0 | 0.4 | 1 | ç | Ţ | | | ì | e t | | | a₽ ★ | | 8+ | · | в + |
| | 1\$ | 38 | 18 | 18 | 2% | I | 1 e 0 | | ч. * С | n. 9 | 0.2 28 | 0 4, * | 0.4 25 | I | 5.0 0 | ı | 0.5 | 0,2 | 0.4 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2.1 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.6 | С | c | U | (7 | 6 | | • . | 5 | | 6.7 | | ж Т | 28 | 18 |
| | 6.9 | 8 6 | 78 | њ С | 88 8 | 78 | - 2 - | , 10 1 % | 0.9 9 9 | 2.0 2.95 | 1 | 0,4 28 | 1.8 128 | 0.8 7# | 1.3 5.3 | ı | 2.1 | 8.0 | ы. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ŝ | | P | # D | 58 |

Table Q7 Page 13 May 14, 2008

-

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Household interest in recreation and park activities

| | | GEOGRAPHY | APEY J | GENDER | 1 NER | ASCI | ASCRIBED AGE | - | EDU | EDUCATION | | RACE | - | Section 21 BC | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 65+ 65+ | - SH=> | Some Coll G | Coll Grad+ W | White O | dther - | | | В М | | DIS | U |
| Total Aduits (000s) | 113.4 | 56,3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | - | Kes I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | No - 76 | Yes | No |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 110.0 | | 0.51 | 4.L.C | | | | | | 59.0 7 | 75.7 3 | 37.7 51 | 51.3 6 | £0.1 |
| Walking, jogging, or bicycling | 102.5 | 51.9 078 | 50.5 | 47.4 | 55.0 | 61.1 | 30.9 | 10.4 | 36.4 | | | 258.0 63 0 | 129.0 1 25 0 1 | | 2 | м | - | | 245.0 |
| Fitness activities | 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 | 49 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 | 46.3 | 45.3 | 918 49.6 | 95% 56.0 | 918 29.6 | 69% 9.4 | 868 869 | 928 928 9 | 92 8 | 5 48 0 5 47 0 5 | 7 40 0 0 0 | | | 71.6 3 95% | 30.9 49 82% 5 | 49.1 51 968 6 | 51.3 85% |
| Festivals and concerts | 88.9 78% | 80% 47.4 848 | 818 41.5 73% | 86% 39.1 74* | 82% 49.8 | 878 50.4 | 87% 29.1 | 2 \$ 6 65 | 848 848 28.5 | | 40.0 858 39.2 | 55.1 | 36.9 938 30.1 | 46.0 86% 47 4 | 48.6 828 9 7 | | • | | 45.8 76% |
| Swimming | 79.2 | 6. 9.6 9.5 | 39.3 600 | 35.8 | 43.4 | 49.2 | 22.9 | 4°0.0 | 69 8 28.3 | 85% 17.3 | 848 32.9 | 79% 46 3 | | | | | | | 39.8 66 8 |
| Nature activities | 77.8 69% | 39.1 698 | 38.8 38.8 8.8 | 33.0 33.0 62e | 44.9 44.9 | 44.6 | 67 8 24.7 | 47% 8,6 | 69% 25.8 | 72% 14.1 | 718 7.7 | 52.2 | 148 | | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | | | | 28.1 478 |
| Basketball | 71.0 63% | 39.0 608 | 32.0 | 36.7 | 6 76 7 | 46.4 | 13% 17.9 | 578 6.7 | 63 8 27.8 | 588 14.8 | В1& 27 я | 75% | | | | | | | 34.3 578 |
| Fishing | 70.6 62% | ы 4 6.28 6.28 | 203 25,7 638 | 698 698 | 34 578 34 0 568 | 728 45.5 718 | 15.3% 16.9 | 448 8,2 8 9,2 8 | 266 68 266 88 2 44 88 | | | 37.4 | | 10,000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,0000 10,00000000 | | | 16.9 35.8 458 70% 21 6 25 1 | | 33.7 568. |
| Activities for teenagers | 70.3 62% | 36.1 64% | 34.1 608 | 33.6 63% | 36.7 61% | 43.2 678 | 20.6 60% | י איסה ני גיני אי | 035 27.7 68% | | | 35.6 35.6 | | | | | - | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| Arts and crafts | 69.3 618 | 38.2 68% | 31.1 548 | 28.9 55% | 40.4 678 | 42.4 66% | 19.3 578 | 1. 1. 1. 6. 1. 6. | | | | 90 D | | Ψî. | | | 53% 72% | | 55% 55% |
| Performing arts | 69.1 61% | 35.8 648 | 33.3 58% | 28.4 548 | 40.6 678 | 37 2 588 | 23.4 698 | 8,5 578 | | | | 55% 40.5 50% | | | 54% 6 33.1 47 | | | | 42% |
| Baseball River activities | 62,6 55% | 32.7 58& | 29.9 52% | 31.2 598 | 31.4 52% | ₹19 19 | 16.7 498 | ណ៍ត. ស្រុះ ស្រុះ | | | | | 22 63% 56% | 678 34.4 28 648 4 | 4 | കനം | 598 738 14.7 28.8 398 56.8 | 8 32 518 | 4 N 9 |
| Soccer | 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | ט נו 19-19 חיקיים | 27.8 498 | 31.0 58% | 30.3 508 | 37.8 59& | 17.4 518 | 6.1 418 | 15.5 388 | 15.4 648 | 29.7 648 | 38.8 56% | 19.2 | 33.4 21 62% 4 | 27.6 47 47% 6 | ч | | | 10 11 10 12 10 13 |
| | 448 | 7 88 7 77 7 | 448 | 22.6 43.8 43.8 | 26.8 | 34.7 548 | 11.7 348 | 3.0 20% | 18,8 46% | с. 80 6 С | 20.9 458 | 29.1 42% | 18.9 48% | 29,4 15 55% | .9.7 36 33% 4 | 36.8 12 49% 3 | | rf. | <u>م</u> و |

Table Q7 Page 14 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Household interest in recreation and park activities

| | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|--------------|------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---|---------------|
| | | GEOG | GEOGRAPHY | GENDER | ER | ASCI | ASCRIBED AGE | - | CLUM | EDITOR INT CAL | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | G'ville | Ballance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 55+ - | 20 20 21 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | Some Coll Coll Grad+ | | RAC | | | PARK | USER | USE PUBLIC POOLS | aric |
| Total Aduits (000s) | 113.4 | 56.3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 5 | | | | I I | | - ¦ | | EF Yes | S I I | Yes | | Yes | No No |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 301.0 | Ŧ | | | | | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 4 | 46.66 | 69.6 J | 39.8 53 | 3.5 59.0 | 1 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| Golf | 38.5 | 73 4 | | | 0.052 | 0.011 | | 111.0 1 | 125.0 | 86.0 17 | 178.0 25 | 258.0 12 | 129.0 127.0 | .0 267.0 | 0 245.0 | 156.0 | 151 0 | 248.0 |
| | 348 | 8 1 1 1 1 1 | | 10.1 348 | 348 | 22.4 35% | 11.8 358 | 4.3 28# | 7.0 178 | 12.7 11 53% | 18.3 308 | 28.3 | 8.1 20 | 20.4 17.9 | | 12.3 | 18.7 | 0 0 0 0 |
| | л 58 8 | 1.7 38 | 4.1 78 | 5.7 118 | 0 . 2 4 | 5 1.1 | 0.7 | ۲.0 | | | | | | | | 9 3 8 | 378 | 30% |
| Playgrounds | ю а т П | т.е В | 0.6 | 0.8 | 5.8 7.8 | 6 n | * r! > 0 | ar I H | 80 U 80 U | | ` | | | 1.1 4.17 38 78 | 7.2 | 0,7 28 | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | 4.1 78 |
| Tennis | 5 F. | έα 'n ¢ | 8 U 1 8 | 38 | ар ГЛ | ар Li | d₽ ★ | | 1.8 | 0 % | -1 -8 -1 -8 -1 -8 | н. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. | 0.6 1.8 1.9 | 3.6 78 | с, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, С, | ł | 6.2 8 | 1.0 |
| | 3 ε |) აթ • სე | 0 40 - FT | 1.U 28 | 01 19 19 19 19 | 17 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 | 0.7 28 | 0.1 1.4 | о. 1, 1 | 1.8 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.5 0.9 | | 0 | с 1 | 4 6 0 |
| Skating/Skatéboarding/ Rollerblading | 2.2 | 0.5 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.1 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 6,1 | 1 | רי היו דיו | | | | | | 48 | 1 aP 1 - | 7.49 .17 1 | 2.8 2.8 |
| Picnic/grill areas | 1.1 | 0 | የ ተ ጎ ተ | * • V | 89 CV | di¤ * | 68 | | ÷ | | 3 | - 42 - 61 - 71 | 0"" | 0.9 J.3 28 J.3 | 0 # • | 2.0 19 19 | о | 1.7 3e |
| | 18 | - de + | 82 7-1 | т. т 28 | 0.4 0.4 | I | н 8 1 | ı | 1.1 38 | 1 | 0.0 | | ਦਾ - ਦ | - ±.1 | | 0.5 | , ı | ° • • |
| Park maintenance/facilities | 0.7 18 | 0 4.0 | 0.3 9. | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | - | | | | | de r-í | ae T | | н С. Т. |
| Batting cages | 0.6 | 0.6 | р <i>у</i> | 8 9 0 | 4° - | d≎ 4 * C | 49 49 | an cy | a≎ ⊢i | | י הי הי גרו | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 9.7 18 18 | 0.7 18 | I | 0 ** | 0.6 18 |
| Fet areas | 9 0 0 | 28 V H O | | 8 T | 1 oP • * | е ае - Н - О | 1 | 1.4° * | 0.6 18 | 1 | 0.1 ** | 0.1 ** | 0.6 0.6 18 1.8 | -1* * 0 9 | 0.6 18 | ł | ц. • | 0.6 |
| Educational programs/classes | ар (1) * - С | гар и | V # * O | 1 | 0.6 1* | F. | 0.4 1% | 0.2 18 | 8-13 1-1-13 0-13 | D I | 0.3 28 | 0.6 18 | 0.% 0.* 1 | * - 2 0 . 3 * 8 1 2 4 | 0.4 1* | 0.2 0 | 2 3 7 | ۰.4 0.4 |
| Dancinq | - + - + | с ай - н о | 1 | 1 8 8 9 | 0.4 18 | 0 .* 0/ % | 0.3 18 | 0.1 8* | г.0 *8 | 0.2 18 | 0.2 ** | 0.2 *8 | 0.3 14 +e | 0 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | * e. | 0 T# |
| | | 0. 4.4 4.5 | ł | 0 + 1 % | °°≉ '⊤ 0 | 0 * * | 0,1 \$\$ | 0.1 18 | 0.1 #* | 0.1 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | | | * n | * + * - | ი ფი * ე | d≎ + * t |
| Arter school/summer activities | с. * О | 0'0 18 | I | i | 6 6 7 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | | | | | | |) d ^q * | 1 dP - + | ግ ልዩ • • • | -1 % * |
| Activities for the elderly | 0.4 0 | 0 | · | 0.1 | , u , | , , | * 0 .1 | 5 T& | | | | | v.* | | €7.4ª • | 0 1.* 1.% | 0.9 1.8 | 0.0 * |
| | | P 1 | | æ * | * * | | 4P * | 28 | - - - + - + | 4.5 *8 *8 *8 | | 0.7 %* | | - 0.3 18 | 0 * 2 | 0.1 *8 | °,2 ** 0 | ۰ ** 0 |

Table Q7 Page 15 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Household interest in recreation and park activities

| | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|---|-----------|---------------------|------------|
| | BLIC | No | | 60.1 | 0 1 0 | 0.042 | ı | | 0.2 | 8¥ | 0.9 | ар СЧ - |
| | USE PUBLIC POOLS | Yes | | 51.3 | с гиг | 0.404 | е.0 | т. Э | ſ | | 2.1 | 48 |
| | SER | Ŋ | | 37.7 | 156 0 | | I | | 1 | | 6.0 | ₽ -1 |
| | PARK USER | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 1 | | 6.0 | ар * | 0.2 | аР * | 2.7 | 9 9 |
| | | 8 | | 59.0 | 267.0 | | 1.0 | * * | 0.1 | sP ⊨ | 0.9 40 | 1 |
| | CELLDREN IN HE | Yes | i i | 5.5 | 127.0 | | 0.7 | к К | 0.1 | ie E | 5.1 4 4 7 | ; |
| - | | Other - | | ם. רקיים | 129.0 | | -1 a - - | P | I | | 0.5 18 | |
| , e c | | | נסיי | | 258.0 | с С | v of * | , | 0,2 ** | • | 2.5 48 | |
| - | LIOD Tract | | 46.6 | - | 178.0 | 0.2 | 0° ; +) | | сі % сі % | | ст ж 19 19 | |
| EDUCATION | Some Coll | | 24.2 | | 86.0 | I | | | -1 a* - * O | ć | л њ 2 | |
| ndia | S⊞=> | 1 | 41.0 | | 125.0 | 0.1 | 8 * | | I | ç | о њ С | |
| | 65+ | | 15.0 | | 0-777 | r | | • | 1.8 | ر د | 1 dP - 11 | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | - 0 0ar | | 0.1 | ₽ * | · | fol ^p • +) | 1.6 | 58 | |
| | 16-44 4 | | 64.3 | 110 0 1 | | 0.2 | d9 ₩ | I | | 1.2 | 28 | |
| OER 1 | Women | | 60.4 | 230.0 | | E 9 | * | , | | 2.6 | 48 | |
| GENE | Men | | 52.9 | 171.0 | | 0 (1 1 | P | 0.2 | * * | 0.4 | ч 8 Г | |
| Ляа | Balance | | 57.1 52.9 | 100.0 | | I | | 1 | | 1.6 | ň | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville Balance Men | د • د د | р, вс | 0'TOE | ((| 0.48 7.11 | | 0.2 | d₽ ¥ | 1.4 | *7 | |
| | Total] | 112 4 | F - D - T - T | 401.0 | е С |) e ^e * | | 0.2 | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | с, с а | 6 | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | | SWALVALE AV | Activities for people with | disabilities | Hunting | | Other | | | |

Table 08 Page 16 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables Like to use public swimming pools for swimming or other aquatic activities

| | | TBLIC | No | | 60.1 | • | 245.0 | I | | , L US | 1008 | 1 | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------|--------|---|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | Yes | | 51.3 | | 151.0 | 51 2 | 1008 | - t | | I | |
| | | USER | No | | 37.7 | | 156.0 | 9 5 | 25% | 26.8 | 718 | 1.3 | 48 |
| | | FARK | Yes | | 75.7 | | 245.0 | 41.7 | 55% | 33.3 | 448 | 0.7 | г |
| | | | - No | | 59.0 | | Z47.0 | 23.7 | 40% | 35.0 | 598 | E.0 | 8° 11 |
| | | CHILDREN IN EE Yes No | | 53.5 | | 0 201 | n - / 77 | 27.5 | 518 | 24.3 | 45% | 1.7 | ም |
| | - P | RACE White Other | | | 39,8 | 0 001 | U. 641 | 20.6 | 52% | 19.3 | 488 | I | |
| • | | | | | 69.6 | 25R D | | 28.1 | 408 | 39.5 | 57 8 | 2.0 | |
| | | Coli Gradi | - ! | | 40.6 | 1.78.0 | | 20.3 | 448 | 25.8 | * 0 | 5.0 * | , 1 |
| r | EDUCATION | Some Colle Colle | | | 2.42 | 86.0 1 | | 14.8 516 | \$T0 | 7.9 275 | ۴ 1 | 1.5 6% | |
| | nca | SH=-> | | ç | 0.15 | 1.25.0 | | 15.8 308 | р ђ | 25.2 · 614 | | ł | |
| | | 65+ 65+ | | с к | | 111.0 | | 3.5 | | 11.3 75# |) | 0.2 18 | |
| | ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | | 180.0 | | 10.1 908 | | 23.8 70% | - | -' # ' * 0 | |
| | ASCE | l } 18-44 | - | 64.3 | | 110.0 | 1 | 37.6 59% | | 25.0 39 8 | 1 | л.7 Эв | |
| | | Women } | | 60.4 | | 230.0 | | 50% · | | 28.4 | 6 | 0.8° | |
| | GENDER | | | 52.9 | | 171.0 | | 807 1708 | | 31.7 60% | | 1 | |
| | | ⊓ce | | 57.1 | | T00.0 | | , 196 196 196 196 | | 45.4 628 | и - | | |
| | GEOGRAPHY | Bala | | | | • | | | | | 10 | 1 de | |
| | CE:D | G'ville | | 56.3 | -00 | 0.100 | 90 | 5.5% | ac | 4.4.8 4.4.8 | o | - - - - | |
| | | Total G'ville Balance | | 113.4 | 0 100 | | 51.3 | 45% | 60 1 | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | 2.0 | 28 | |
| | | - I | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ts (000s | SWATV | | | | | | /Refused | | |
| | | | | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTERVIEWS | | _ | | | | Don't know/Refused | | |
| | | | i | TOT | 0 # | | Yes | | ΟN | | Don | | |

Table Q9 Page 17 May 14, 2008

· · · ·

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Have ever used or swam in City Pool in Guy Smith Park

| | USE PUBLIC POOLS | No | | 60.1 | | 245.0 | | 168 | | 848 | | ١. |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|
| USE PUBL POOLS Yes | | | 51.3 | | 151.0 19 0 | | 86E | 20 6 | 5.6.5 | 0 + | - 4 - (7) - (7) | |
| USER No | | | 37.7 | | 156.0 | 4.3 | 318 | 7 ° EE | 1 68 | i | | |
| | PARK | 202 | | 75.7 | | 245.0 | 25.2 | 338 | 48.7 | 648 | 1.8 | 28 |
| | | _ | | 59.0 | | 401.U | 11.9 | 20% | 46.7 | 8 67 | 4.0 | d₽ r~í |
| | CHILDREN IN HH | | | 53.5 | 0 201 | N. 194 | 17.6 | 338 | 34.5 | 65% | 1.4 | ар ГЪ |
| RACE White Other | | ۰. | | 39.8 | 120.0 | 0.044 | 15.1 | 80 100 111 | 24.4 | 618 | 0.4 | 1- 1- 1- |
| | | | | 67.6 | 258.0 | | 12.5 | 89T | 55.7 | 808 | 1.4 | 28 |
| _ | Coll Grad+ W | | | a.a. | 178.0 | | ჩ. მ | 19 14 14 | 35.6 72 | ۶Q | 1.8 | 48 |
| EDUCATION | Some Co Coll Gr | | | 1 | 86.0 1 | | 9.0 7.0 | P | 15.7 252 | | ı | |
| EDUC | SH=> | | 41 D | | 125.0 | | 11.4 28% | | 29.6 | | I | |
| - | 65+ < | | 15.0 | | 111.0 1 | | 2.1 148 | | 12.9 Rfæ | | ı | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | | | 34.0 | | 180.0 1 | | 4.9 44.1 | | 29.1 86% | | ı | |
| | 1 18-44 45-64 | | 64.3 | | 110.0 | - | 277 P | | 40.0 628 | | н. 138 С | |
| _ | . — | | 60.4 | | I 0.0EZ | | 13.3 228 | | 46.9 78% | | r · | |
| GENDER | Women | | | | | | | | | 0 | പം | • |
| 6 | Men | | 52.9 | | 7.11.0 | | 306 | | 499 968 | | - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | |
| ХНАТ | Balance | | 57.1 | 0 001 | 2.224 | 1 01 | 218 | 0.09 | 768 | V L | 53 | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville Balance Men | | 56.3 | 301 0 | | 17.5 | 318 | V AF | | 0.4 | 49 19 | |
| | Total | | 113.4 | 401.0 | | 29.5 | 26% | 82.1 | 728 | 1.8 | 28 | |
| | | | (SOOO) STATES TRACT | BRVIEWS | | | | | μ. | Don't know/Refused | | |
| | | 4 F - 1 - 4 - 4 4 F | | # OF INTERVIEWS | | res | | No | | Don't kn | | |

Table 210 Page 18 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2006 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

. . . .

-

-

What prevents you from using City Pool

| GEOGRAPHY Genille Bargere |
|--|
| Balance [Men Women 18-44 |
| 38.4 43.6 35.1 46.9 40.0 |
| 233.0 81.0 126.0 188.0 69.0 |
| 10.8 |
| |
| 7.4 5.0 3.5 8.5 6.3 198 118 118 188 168 |
| 5.4 6.3 6.1 5.7 1 |
| 148 I78 |
| 108 128 178 68 118 |
| 1.1 4.0 0.6 4.5 0.9 38 as 25 - 20 |
| 2. 28 108 1.7 3.3 1.1 |
| 48 |
| 1.1 2.4 2.0 2.3 0.6 5 58 18 18 |
| 2.4 1.2 1.0 2.7 1.6 |
| 1.8 38 0.9 0.5 3.0 |
| 1.9 0.6 68 1.9 0.6 2.3 1.8 24 5.3 |
| 5.0 5.1 5.1 |
| 2.1 0.2 5% |
| 1.3 0.9 1.4 |
| 89 80 9 1 |

Table Q10 Page 19 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

What prevents you from using City Pool

| | BLIC | No. | | 50.5 | 216.0 | | -1 &* - * - * | | 51 a 35 f | | 0.4 4.4 | | -1 # - * | 1 | | е.0 | р -та - та - К |
|--------------|---------------------|---|-------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|
| · | USE PUBLIC POOLS | Yea | - | 29.6 | 0,66 | | 4 49 1 1 | | ı | ۱ ۲۰ | | c c | 2 - 14 - 0 | 0.1 | 8 * | 1.0 4.0 | 9 9 1 7 7 7 7 7 7 |
| | USER | No I | | 33.4 | 141.0 | đ | , w | 0 | 28.0 | , C | -1 % - * - * | ŗ | 1 de • * > | ı | | 0.5 2.9 | 2.5 78:5 |
| | PARK | Yes | | 48.7 | 173.0 | , 0.3 | 8 | - | d¤ ; # | Ċ | * a? • r-1 > | 0 | , + , + | 0.1 | d [₽] * | 0.7 18 | 6.0 6.0 |
| | REN | No No | | 46.7 | 223.0 | 1.2 | 38 | 6.0 | 28 | 4 | | 0.2 | e Fl | 0.1 | ф * | 0.8 2% | 1.7 48 |
| | CHILDREN IN AH | Yes | | 197.C | 84.0 | I | | F | | I | | 1.0 | ₽. * | 0.1 | ₽ | 0.5 1.8 | Э.5 10% |
| | | Other | | 74-42 | 85.0 | 0.8 | 40 40 | 1.0 | # # | 0.1 | 8° * | 1 | | 1.0 1.0 | in K | F | 1.6 7% |
| i | RACE | | ר ע ע | | 218.0 | 0.4 | е Н | 0.7 | 18 | 0.4 | д 8 | 0.3 | 18 | 7, 1 | р (: 1 | L.3 28 | а 9.9 П |
| - | Coll - | - ¦ | U U F |) } | 142.0 | 0.4 | 7 | 0.3 | & H | 0.1 | d₽ ¥ | 0,2 | ж Н | 1.9 * | , c c | 5 5 6 | 0.9 38 |
| RDUCATION | Some Coll | 1 | 15.7 | | 65.0 | I | | 0.4 | * 1 | 1.0 | ар * | 0.1 | ₽ ĸ | ı | 4 | | ດ. ເມືອ |
| RD1 | SH=> | | 29.6 | | 98.0 | 8.0 95 | P 7 | 0.1 | ę. | с, о , | ¥° ⊣ | r | | t | 5 | 9 CV | 3.6 128 |
| 8 | 65+ | , | 12.9 | 6 | 0.12 | ' | | ດ ເວັ | , 1 | ı | | 0.1 1 | P 1 | 1 | I | | 0.9 87 |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 29.1 | 0 871 | | ч* • | | 4.0 | ì | 0 7 4 | 9 1 | 0.5 1 | | г; * • | 0.2 | 18 1 | 1.2 48 |
| ASC | 18-44 | | 40.0 | 69 | | ч . 9 . 9 | | ı | | 1 | | ı | | I | 1.1 | ۳ ۳ | ы. 2. 98 |
| GENDER | Women | | 46.9 | 188.0 | | 0.0 18 | ч с | 0.8 18 0 | | 9 - 1 - 8 | | × ₽ * | | J . | 1.2 | 28 | 51 42 21 42 |
| NED | Σ | | 35.1 | 126.0 | Ċ | 7 a 7 7 8 | | 7 aP | Ċ | # - * | ç | -1 a? ' *) | - | dP (*) | T.0 | dip fe | 58 98 98 |
| AHA | Balance | | 43.6 | 81.0 | I | I | 0.5 | 1 2 | ہ ح |) - H | i | | ı | | 1 | 1 | - 80 7 |
| GEOGRAPHY | G'ville | | 38.4 | 233.0 | 1.2 | тр С | 0.4 | 38 | 0.1 | 6 ¹² * | 0.3 | 1% | 0.1 | 8 * | ц. 1.3 | , r , | - 89 - 17 - |
| | Total | 1 | 82.1 | 314.0 | 1.2 | - 유 단 | 0.9 | æ ₩ | 0.4 | 18 | 0.3 | ы9 * | 0.1 | * | 1.3 | ្រា | 842 |
| | , | | (snon) | | | | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Haven't used city bool voor. | | SMETANELINT AN # | No particular reason | | Not handicap accessible | | Cannot afford | | Prefer indoor pool | | Not ideal for exercise | | | Don't know/Refused | |
| | | Haver | 1 | 5 | No pa | | Not h | | Canno | | Prefe | | Not i | 10440 | | Don't | |

Table Q11 Fage 20 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Have ever used Tar River for boating, fishing, or walking

| | USE PUBLIC | LS | | 60.1 | 245 0 | | 34.9 588 | | 428 428 | | ⊣ a¢ `* ⊃ |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | USE P | Yes | | 51.3 | 151 | | 36.1 708 | | 14 298 298 | Ċ | 1 |
| | USER | No | | 37.7 | 156.0 | | 44.0 378 | 2 60 | 638 | - C | dP * |
| | PARK | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 | с <u>г</u> э | 76% | 181 | 248 | 0.4 | 96 1*1 |
| | - ~ | % | | 59.0 | 267.0 | 37. B | 648 | 20.7 | 358 | 0.5 | 38 |
| | CHILDREN IN HP | | | 53.5 | 127.0 | 33,0 | 628 | 20.5 | 38\$ | 1 | |
| | Fi | Other | | 39.8 | 129.0 | 22.5 | 57& | 16.9 | 428 | . 0.4 | вр гі |
| | RACE | White | | 69.6 | 258,0 | 45.1 | 65% | 24.4 | ង ភូមិ ភូមិ | 1.0 | ₩ ₩ |
| - | Coll | Grad+ | 1 | 46.0 | 178.0 | 31.6 | 68% | 14.7 | \$ 7 | 0.4 | р Т |
| EDITO | Sone | | | 7.77 | 86.0 | 13.0 | 54 8 | 11.2 | ₽ D ₽ | 1 | |
| ŘD1 | | | 0 | | 125.0 | 26.0 525 | 19 0 | 15.0 378 | 2 | 1 | |
| - 8 | 122 | | 15 0 | | 0.111 | 7.2 | e F | 7.8 524 | | 1.0 *8 | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | | | . 865 598 | | 14.1 418 | | I | |
| ASCR | j 18~44 45−64 | | 64.3 | 110 0 1 | | 44 3 698 | ((| ыч. а 31.8- | Č | 1 % | |
| - | Women]] | | 60.4 | 1 0.052 | | 58% 58% | , 10, | 428 | 1.0 | 1 d₽ • ★) | |
| GENDER | | 1 | | | | , | | | 4 | 18 | |
| | | | 1 52.9 | 0 171.0 | | 8 583 | | 8 31.8 | . ' | Η | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Balance | | 57.1 | 100.0 | ب د | 860) 860) | 23. | 418 | | | |
| GEOGI | 'ville | | 56.3 | 301.O | 37.3 | 66% | 18.5 | 338 | 0.5 | 18 | |
| | Total (G'ville Balance Men | | ð.517 | 401.0 | 71.2 | 638 | 41.7 | 378 | 0.5 | a≏ ¥ | |
| | i | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | | SVIEWS | | | | 1 | LON'T KNOW/Refused | | |
| | | tal Adul | i | # OF THIERVIEWS | * | | | | т. т. клом | | |
| | | 10H | - | # | Yes | ; | No | ć | | | |
Table Q12 Page 21 May 14, 2008 Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

_

-

. . . .

. . . .

-

Main reason you have not used the Tar River for recreation

| | | | | GEOGI | GEOGRAPHY | GEN | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | . 13 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | | Total [| G'ville | Ballance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | | | CATTON Some C | | RACE | | CHILDREN TN #4 | IFA | XK DSER | a asu | OBLIC |
| | | Haven't used Tar River (non-) | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | H Z | | | 004 | LS |
| F ADDENCIDE 18.0 13.0 6.0 10.0 | T MERNATION 18.0 11.0 15.0 11.0 15.0 10.0 | | 41.7 1008 | 18.5 100% | 23.2 | 16.4 100e | 25.3 | 19.8 | 14.1 | 7.8 | 15.0 | ہ ۲ | | | | | | 1 | | ON I |
| Attach $7,7$ < | Attach 7_{11} | # OF INTERVIEWS | 158.0 | 112 0 | | | * 0 0 1 | 100% | 100£ | 100% | 100% | 1008 | 100 8 | 24.4 1008 | | | | | | 25.1 |
| The state is a state | $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$ | Location | r c | | 40.0 | 0.14 | 104.0 | 38.0 | 64.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 38.0 | | 0 | | | | | | 100% |
| If yes If yes< | [V [Fortextrand in the form of the constraints of the constraints in the constraints reason in the constraint reason reason reason in | | /./ 18% | 0,5 38 | 318 | а.5 2.5 | 4 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 0.8 | ່ ດີ. ຕ | L C | | | | | | | | 103.0 |
| | $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$ | Non't participate in boating/ | 4.8 | 2.8 | 6 | 1 9 1 1 | \$ /. T | 46T | 228 | 118 | 268 | 24.8 | 888 T | 5.1 218 | 2.6 158 | | | | | 4.8 |
| Anticular reason 3 2 0 2 13 | | estivite activities | 118 | 158 | 0.95 80 1/ | ມ ມີ | 6) F () | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0 | ć | | | | | | 198 |
| | Mathiae with it 3^{3} 14^{3} 3^{3} 13^{3} 3^{3} 14^{3} 3^{3} 14^{3} 3^{3} 14^{3} 3^{3} 14^{3} 3^{3} 14^{3} | o particular reason | 6. 6 | 2.0 | | | 49 17 | 80 | 148 | 21.8 | 158 | чь (0) | 136 | 2.5 1.2% | 2.9 118 | | | | | 0.E |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | | å | 1.1% | 86 7 | 7.4° 9 | ы. 128- | н. 9,6 8,8 | 1.8 136 | 0.5 1 | 8. | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | с С | | | | | 12% |
| | Affine 1^{4} 104 74 73 124 13 24 0.7 25 13 24 0.7 25 13 24 13 25 13 24 13 25 13 24 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 13 25 <th25< th=""> <th25< th=""> 25</th25<></th25<> | ot familiar with it | 3.6 | 1.9 | 1.7 | ч С | , (| | 8 1 | \$ | 128 | 138 | 48 | - 69 - 69 | 19 8 | | | | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 86 8 | 10% | 78 | ι α | л.н 128 | ч. о 15% | 0.5 48 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 1.1 | | | | * 7 | 108 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mbox{matrix} (Does not wart to $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$ | | ц. С. | 2.9 | 0.6 | 1.0 | . 2 | с 1 | c C | ì | P | #77 | ar in | 10% | 78 | | | | 10.4 10.4 | 0.4 2e |
| The function of the function | The formation of the f | desire/location | р 0 | 10% | 38 | 68 | 10% | 1 6 10 17 | n 90 0 | I | л. 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | | | | р 1 |
| the other places/facilities 2: 1: 0: 1: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: 0: | the other places/factilities 2, 1, 3, 0, 9, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, | merter notes not want to | 2.7 6% | 0.9 5 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | α ⊢ | Ċ | р I | ie K | 178 | 10% | | | | | 1.5 10% | 2.0 8* |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccc} conditional product fractities 2: 1:3 0:9 1:6 0:6 0:8 0:1 1: 2: 0:4 0:7 1:1 1:9 0:3 1:3 0:9 1:6 0:8 0:4 0:4 0:3 0:9 0:3 0:3 0:9 0:9 0:3 0:3 0:9 0:3 0:3 0:9 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3 0:3$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccc} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | | 0 | * 5 | 88 89 | 13 % | 2% | 28 | 0.4 13* | 4.0 2.5 | 0.2 5 | ۳. 0 | 1.6 | 0.9 | | | | | 1 | P 3 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | *** other places/facilities | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.6 | بو 0 | c | | P | 7 | er m | 118 | 4.8 | | | | | 0.5 48 | 2.2 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | ĥ | 78 | 48 | 10% | 2.8 | 0.9 19-0 | 2.2 78 | л.2 1 1 2 | 0.4 | | | 6.1 | | | | • | • | P |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | · U AFGA | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.1 | ſ | ¢ | 0 | ì | P T | *2 | | | 88 88 | | | | | в. О | 1.4 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 50 40 | 58 | 5% | | ה היי 100- | 8.9 ¶* | 1.4 8 | ı | 1.6 | 0.4 | | 0.5 | | | | 5 | £ | ŝ |
| abily accessible 1.7 0.1 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.0 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 0.2 1.1 1.2 0.2 1.1 1.2 1.2 1.2 <th1.2< th=""> <th1.2< th=""> 1.2 <th1.2< th=""></th1.2<></th1.2<></th1.2<> | 4% 5% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 1% 0.1 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.0 1.8 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.1 1.7 1.7 1.8 0.0 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.9 0.2 1.7 1.7 1.8 0.1 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.1 1.7 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 | 0 0 | 1.8 | 6.0 | а 0 | 5 | | ł | 2 2 | | 3178 | 38 | | 28 | | | 0 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| The reactive the field of the | astrix accessible 1.7 0.1 1.5 0.8 0.9 0.8 1.0 0.2 1 2 1 | : | 48 | 5 8 | 48 | 648 7 | -1 aP | ı | 0.0 | 1.8 201 | 0.9 | | | | | | | * | 89 | 48 |
| The second of the law random relation of the law random rando | 4^{6} 1^{6} 7^{6} 5^{6} 6^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 5^{6} 1^{7} | easily accessible | 1.7 | 0.1 | и г | a c | | | i i | *57 | 68 | | | | Ç.4₽ + | | | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Y concerna 1:4 0.2 1:2 1:2 0.2 1:2 0.2 1:1 0.1 1:5 0.1 1:7 7 1:5 0.1 1:7 7 1:5 0.1 1:7 7 1:5 0.1 1:7 7 1:5 0.1 1:7 7 1:7 7 1:7 7 1:7 7 1:8 7 1:8 7 1:8 7 1:8 1:7 7 7 1:8 7 7 1:9 0.1 1:7 7 7 1:8 7 | $ \begin{array}{cccccc} T_{1}^{2} & T_{1}$ | | 48 | 1.8 | 18 | о "е с ці | 0.5 7 | ۰.0 م | 0.8 1.8 | 1 | , | | | r | | | | 8 7 | ₽ H | 78 |
| Autory time/Too busy 1:2 0.4 0:9 0.1 1.0 0.7 0.9 0.5 1.0 0.6 3* 2* 4* 5* 3* 7* 5* 3* 1.0 0.7 0.9 0.5 1.0 0.6 0.6 3* 2* 4* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 5* 4* 0.6< | nough time/Too busy 1:2 0.4 1.8 74 55 33 7 7 0.7 0.9 0.5 1.0 0.6 0.5 0.6 | cy concerns | 1.4 38 | 0.2 1* | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | P I J | *0 T | V U | c | | | 78 | | | | 1.7 78 | I | 1.7 78 |
| h reasons 1:2 0:5 0.8 - 0.5 0.8 - 0.5 0.8 - 0.5 0.8 - 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 1.4 28 | h reasons 0:2 0:4 0:9 0.1 1.2 0.5 0.8 - 0.5 0.3 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.1 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.4 2% 1% 1% 1% | encugh time/Too busv | с - | ; | 19 17 | * | 48 84 | | ÷., | ар 10 | * * • • | | | | | | | Ċ | ۱ د | |
| h reasons 1 reasons 1 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 1 0.2 0.3 0.1 0.2 2 0.2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.2 1 0.2 0.1 0.2 2 0.3 0.1 2 0.2 1 0.2 2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 | h reasons 0.3 0.4 0.8 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.4 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.3 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.8 0.3 0.4 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 13 0 0 28 13 0 0 28 13 0 28 13 13 0 13 13 0 13 13 0 13 13 0 13 < | T | 98 - 17 - 17 | 0.4 9.5 | 6,0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 8.0 | I | | | - | le nj | | | | 5 | 0.4 0.4 | 8.8 8.8 |
| If Percentages are based on formation for the late of | 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 28 <td< td=""><td>th reasons</td><td>6</td><td>р Ч</td><td>4.8</td><td>d¤ ₩</td><td>ង</td><td>8</td><td>) ອະ - ເຖິງ)</td><td>r</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>c</td><td></td><td>, 1</td></td<> | th reasons | 6 | р Ч | 4.8 | d¤ ₩ | ង | 8 |) ອະ - ເຖິງ) | r | | | | | | | | c | | , 1 |
| 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 0.2 0.3 - | 8 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 0.3 - 1% < | | ກ & - π1 ວ | 0.2 | 0.2 18 | ۲.0 1.0 | 0.2 | ı | r | | | | | | | | | , 4 , 4) | 28 | 1.0 48 |
| ** 1% - 0.2 - 0.2 - 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 - 0.2 - 0.2 - 0.2 - 0.2 - 18 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1 | ** 18 If percentages are based on fewer than 100 respondents, interpret with caution. Conducted by r_{1} = 0.2 0.2 0.2 - 0.2 Conducted by r_{1} = 0.2 0.2 1.8 + 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 | e B | 0.2 | 0.2 | | s f | ₽ I | | | | d₽ + | | | 1. N 18 N | ł | | 1 | £.0 | 1 | 0.3 |
| If percentages are based on former interval 1^{4} 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 | If percentages are based on fewer than 100 respondents, interpret with caution. Conducted by cnarry, and caution. | | ም * | 18 | r | | 0.2 | ł | 0.2 J# | ı | | | | | • | | | 18 | | 18 18 |
| | by thick cantion. | | | | | | | | 5 I | | | | | | · + | | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | r |
| diage research, Inc., Job #08009 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

_

Table Q12 Fage 22 May 14, 2008 (Continued) Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Main reason you have not used the Tar River for recreation

| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | | ÷ | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--------------|------|--------------|-------------|-------|----------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Total Grouter GEOGRAPHY GENUER ASCRIBED AGE ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHILDERN PARK USER UNE NO Total Gruil Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <=HS | | SLIC | No | 25.1 | 1005 | 103.0 | . 0 | | 0.5 28 | |
| Total GENCRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHLIDERN PARK Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ers< td=""> Coll Ante I IN HH IN IN</ers<> | | USE PUI | | 14.8 | 100% | 52.0 | 8 | 9 - 407 - 107 | 1.7 118 | |
| Total GENCRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RACE CHLIDERN PARK Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ers< td=""> Coll Ante I IN HH IN IN</ers<> | | USER | | 23.6 | 100% | 88.0 | 1.5 | 89 | 1.2 5 8 | |
| Total GENDERY GENDER ASCHIBED AGE BUCATION RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total 1008 1004 1006 1006 1006 1006 1009 10 10 10 1 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>PARK 1</td><td></td><td>18.1</td><td>100%</td><td>70.0</td><td>1.1</td><td>68</td><td>1.0 68</td><td></td></td<></ebncation<></ebncation<></ebncation<> | | PARK 1 | | 18.1 | 100% | 70.0 | 1.1 | 68 | 1.0 68 | |
| Total GENDERY GENDER ASCHIBED AGE BUCATION RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <ebncation< td=""> RACE CHILD Total 1008 1004 1006 1006 1006 1006 1009 10 10 10 1 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>REN EH</td><td>08</td><td>20.7</td><td>1008</td><td>110.0</td><td>1.2</td><td>68</td><td>1.8 9%</td><td></td></td<></ebncation<></ebncation<></ebncation<> | | REN EH | 08 | 20.7 | 1008 | 110.0 | 1.2 | 68 | 1.8 9% | |
| Jotal GEOGRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION ENCLATION EACE Jotal G'villa Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Some Coll Mite Other ed Tax River 1004 1014 104 104 104 104 104 10 10 < | | CELLO | | 20.5 | ROOT | 46.0 | 1.3 | 69 | 0.4 2.8 | |
| Tetal GEOGRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION RM Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 COLI Grad+ Minte Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <=ms | 1 | | | 16.9 100e | #000T | 55.0 | 1.1 | 68 | 1.0 68 | |
| Cotal GEOGRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Some Edma Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Some Edma 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% VIEWS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% VIEWS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 38.0 64.0 54.0 38.0 C 2.5 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 1.9 0.1 0.5 0.5 C 2.5 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 0.4 28 48 Z 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.4 78 10 0.1 0.5 0.5 C 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 0.4 1.8 0.1 0.9 0.5 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.8 0.4 28 28 28 0 | i | KAK Whiti | | 24.4 | | 100.0 | 1.5 | 17 19 19 | 2 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| Cotal GEOGRAPHY GENDER ASCRIBED AGE ASCRIBED AGE EDUCATION Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Some Edma Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Some Edma 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% VIEWS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% VIEWS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 38.0 64.0 54.0 38.0 C 2.5 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 1.9 0.1 0.5 0.5 C 2.5 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 0.4 28 48 Z 2.2 2.2 2.2 1.4 78 10 0.1 0.5 0.5 C 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 0.4 1.8 0.1 0.9 0.5 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.8 0.4 28 28 28 0 | - | | | 14.7 100% | | 0'29 | 5 - F | 8 7 | 0.1 28 28 | |
| Junctal GENDER GENDER ASCRIBED AGE Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1<<<=ES | CATTON | Some Coll | | 11.2 100% | | 0.00 | 0.5 | • | 0.8 7 8 | |
| Techal GENDER GENDER ASCRIBED AGE Total GYVI11e Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Total GYVI11e Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Total GYVI11e Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 Tar 1008 1004 1008 1006 1006 1006 1006 1008 1008 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 38.0 64.0 56.0 2:5 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 1.9 0.1 0.5 2:5 1.2 2.2 1.8 0.4 1.9 0.1 0.5 2:5 1.2 2.2 1.8 0.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 5% 12% 1.1% 2% 2% 2% 2% 2% | EDG | <=#S | | 15.0 100% | 0 | - | ດ ເງິຍ ເ | | 0.9 68 | |
| Total GEOGRAPHY GENUER ASC Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 Tax River 1003 41.7 18.5 23.2 16.4 25.3 19.8 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 115WS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 38.0 25 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 1.9 25 123 123 113 0.4 1.8 | | | | 100% | 56.0 | | 0.5 78 | Ţ | | |
| Total GEOGRAPHY GENUER ASC Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 Tax River 1003 41.7 18.5 23.2 16.4 25.3 19.8 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 1003 115WS 158.0 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 38.0 25 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 1.9 25 123 123 113 0.4 1.8 | IBED AG | 45-64 | | 100% | 64.0 | | 1.0 1.8 | | 39.5 | |
| Tetal GEOGRAPHY GENDER Total GYUIIS Balance Men Total G'vills Balance Men Momen 1004 1004 1004 25:3 JISHO 1004 1004 1004 1004 JISHO 1004 1004 1004 1004 JISHO 112.0 46.0 54.0 104.0 C 1.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 C 2.5 1.2 2.2 1.8 78 C 2.2 2.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 C 2.2 1.2 1.3 0.7 1.8 C 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.8 2.8 | ASCR | 18-44 | | 100% | 38.0 | • | 108 108 | 8 | aP Ch | |
| Induction Induction Induction Induction Induction Induction Induction Induction Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Induction Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc Indoc < | | | 1 " | 100% | 104.0 | | 9 | 0.4 | 28 | |
| ed Tar River (000s) /IEWS | GENDER | 24 | | 90% | 4.0 | 5 | 48 | L.8 | 4T. | |
| ed Tar River (000s) /IEWS | | ز تک ا | | | | | | 1 | - | |
| ed Tar River (000s) /IEWS | RAPEY | Balano | 23 | Ä | 46 | - | | | | |
| ed Tar River (000s) /IEWS | GEOGI | 7'ville | 18.5 | 100% | 112.0 | 1.2 | 78 | 2.2 | 128 | |
| ed Tar River (000s) /IEWS | | Total 0 | 41.7 | *00T | 158.0 | 2.5 | 68 | 2.2 | r D | |
| | | - i | | | SWALLY IN . | Other | | DOD'T KNOW | | |

Table Q13 Page 23 May 14, 2008

-

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Recreational facilities you would like to see more of in Greenville and Fitt County

| | _ | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|----------------|
| - | | UO HO HO | THATWHORN | | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | 1 | EDT | EDUCATION | - | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | G'ville | Halance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | | <=HS ≤=HS | Some Coll 6 | Coll E Grad+ E | RACE White | | | | PARK USER | | USE PUBLIC POOLS | |
| Total Aduits (000s) | 113.4 | 56.3 | 57 t | 500 | | | | | | | - 1 | | | Yes N | No (Yes | No l | ן א | No | |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 0.IOE | | . • | 5.04 5.04 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 69,6 | 39.8 | 53.5 5 | 59.0 75. | 7.37.7 | .7 51.3 | - U9 | . - |
| Greenways | 103.2 978 | 50.6 | | | | 60.0 | 31.0 31.0 | 12.0 | 125.0 | 86.0 | | 258.0 | 129.0 1 | 127.0 26 | 67.0 245.0 | н | H | 17 | 1 0 |
| Open space | 93 ° 7 | 7.7A | 928 45 6 | 916 7 1 | 918 | 80 80 | \$16 \$16 | 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 1-00 938 | 21.2 87% | 43.4 938 | 64.1 928 | 35.3 898 | 49.2 | 53.6 69.7 918 928 | 19.7 33.5 928 894 | 48 | 4 52.8 | ω, |
| Coumunity Recreation Conter- | 828 | 858 | 808 | | 4 9 9 9 9 9 9 | 54.8 85% | 27.2 80% | 11.2 758 | 34.6 848 | 19.3 80% | 38.3 82% | 54.7 708 | 14.9 24.9 | | 50.3 64.3 | | 4 | 4 | ہ م |
| | 92.7 828 | 48.0 85% | 44.7 78% | 43.9 | 48.7 | 56.8 | 26.0 | 9.9 | 34.2 | 20 B | 0 75 | | | | | 19 778 | 7 8 88% | | ap. |
| Water-based recreation | 84.6 752 | 4 3.3 | 41.3 | | 47 F | 50 88 50 8 | 76 8 23 0 | 664 0 | ያ ር 8 | 86% | 362 | 882 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 37.8 95% | 47.4 45 89% | 45.0 65.4 768 86% | 4 27.2 8 728 | 2 48.4 8 948 | 4 42.3 8 708 | സംഭ |
| Athletic fields | 62.0 82.0 | 77% 42.1 | 728 | | 8£2 | 01. 1928 1928 | 108 | а.2 558 | 31.1 76% | 19.1 798 | 34.0 738 | 47.3 68% | 34.0 4 85% | 43.1 41 818 7 | 41.3 62.4 70% 82% | 4 22,2 8 509 | 2 45.4 900 | | 0 |
| | 728 | 75% | 708 | 40.L | 42.0 698 | 48.2 75% | 24.8 738 | 9.0 60% | 31.7 77\$ | 19.4 POP | 30.5 | 43.4 | | | | c | | | -0 |
| z raygrounds | ប ភ.4 ខ្មុំ | 4 0 78 | 1.4 | ı | 5.4 | 4.6 | 9.9 | i | 2.0 | | ж П С | 62 8 | | | 718 748 | | 9 40.U | 1 40.6 578 | 1 |
| Fitness centers | स्त है इन्हें - | 1.2 | 0. m | 1.2 | * 6. * 0. | 47 1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1- | 5 % 7 75 | | ង ហ | 48 | #ар . ГЛ | 7.8° 19: ₹ | 1.2 3# | 5.1 10% | 0.3 5.2 *8 78 | 8 ** * | 2 4 9 8 108 | 0.5 | |
| Basketbail courts | ម ហេដ ។ ំពី ហ | 3 7 7 7 7 8 | ας I ας | 28 1.4 | 5 P | 1 de 1 1 de 1 1 de 1 | v 46 - | I | 1 89 1 2 89 1 | 0 1 2 8 | 1.9 | 12 14 18 19 | ы. Зв С. В. С. В. | 1.7 3e 3e | 2,5 2.0 48 38 |) 2.2 68 | 2 | 2.5 48 | |
| Skating/skateboarding park | ? ጣæ ነ ነጣ ጣ | 6 0) 6 10 7 10 8 11 8 11 8 | I | # n; n .n | 1.58 1.9 | 3 1,1 1,1 | ** ** | | Nia≎ I •m; -l | -1 ° 8.8 ¢ | 0 7 1 7 | 0.5 18 | | | 0.553.5 18358 | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1. 2.8 2.8 | |
| Facilities/activities for senior citizens | 2.9 38 | 0 6.0 | 2.0 | ÷ 0 | 3 8 2.7 | 58 0.3 | 1.6 1.6 | 0.0 | V 0 | 1 ap a 1 ap a 1 ap | ⊣o¦≎ (** 7 - C | 1 | | о с, е, г. | 0.2 3.2 *8 48 | -1-8- | -1-2 -1-2 | 1 | |
| Parks | 2.1 28 | 1.6 1.6 | 6 5 6 7 | %P −1 (¥ () ¥ () | 1.1 | а 8 в 9 | т 5° | 6 8 0.1 | 1 8 1 8 | 1) ak 1, at 2) c | 0.60 1.51 1. | 19 19 19 19 19 | | н., 8.% 1. | 1.1 2.0 28 38 | 0.8 | 0.8 28 | 2.0 38 | |
| Performance venues | 2.1 28 | 2 F 8 F 7 F 8 | е і Т | * T * | 238 2.0 | 18 1.8 | 48 0.2 | 8°0. | | , 12 12 12 | ₽ a₽ - M - H - C | 1.4 28 | | 1.7 0. 38 1 | 0.5 1.5 18 2.8 | 0.6 2% | 1,0 2,6 0,8 | , 1.2 28 | |
| Wildlife/zoo areas | 1.6 1.6 | | 1.3 28 | ч 1 1 1 1 | 8 E - 0 | 38 1.5 | 18 1.0 | d¤ l ≁ | ар ар * - | n ar - - 00 - | 1 ap (;* > c | | | 1.9 0.2 48 *8 | *8 2.0 | ч. • • | ц. 9.9. | 0 * '3 | |
| | | 3 | 4 6 | # N | ч 8 | 8 () | ሰዋ * | |) de ເຕີ | H &P 5 * | 2 49 1-1-1 D | 년 4년 1 년 1 년 | 1.5 | 0.3 1.3 18 28 | С) ф ** С) | 1.3 38 | -1 * ·* O | л. 3% 3% | |

Table Q13 Page 24 May 14, 2008 (Continued)

T:

. Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Frojected Data Tables

9 Recreational facilities you would like to see more o

| | | | | | | | | | | | and P.(| The structure and Fift County | N 2 | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | | | GEOGRAPHY | UED - | GENDER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | 1 | EDU | EDUCATON | - | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | G'ville | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | 654 | SHEN N | Some C | Coll Coll Gradt W | RACE | | CHILDREN IN HH | | PARK USER | · | USE PUBLIC POOLS | r) |
| Total Adults (000s) | 113.4 | с у <u>г</u> | Ĺ | | | | | | 1 | 1 | - : | | Other | Yes | No No | Yes N | No I X | Yes No | 0 |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | | 2 | 1./c | 52.9 | 60.4 | . 64. 3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 69.6 | 8 65 | ц 1 1 | | | | | ł |
| | 401.0 | 0.10E | 100.0 | 171.0 | 230.0 | 110.0 | 180.0 | 112.0 | 125 0 | , , , , , | | | | | L 11.60 | 75.7 3 | 37.7 5: | 51.3 60 | 60.1 |
| Tennis courts | 0,° H | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | n C | Ċ | | | | T/8.0 | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 20 | 267.0 24 | 245.0 15 | 156.0 151.0 | .0 245.0 | 0.1 |
| Dereston. | ¢ T | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 9 9 8 | 7 68 · ~~) | 1 % 1 % | N 49 * | ı | 6.0 a, | 0.1 1 | r | 9.0 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | د م | G |
| | 1.0 | 1.0 | ī | 1.0 | I | - | | | | | P N | ₽ | | 28 | 48 +8 | | | | |
| | -4 *2 | 28 | | 28 | | 8 7 7 | I | r | ч.* о | ı | 6 0 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | I | | |
| ret area | 1.0 | 1.0 | o C | Ċ | | | | | • | | \$ 1 | # 1 | d9 ≯ | 28 | | - 69 - 64 - | t | ≓` i | D. 2 |
| | 18 | æ ≢ | 24 | 1 aP • # > | 2.5 28 | 0.9 41 | с. 4 С | 1 | Ι. | ı | 1.0 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 5 | | 4 | | | 6 1 |
| Arts/Music | 8 U | | | 1 | | ì | P | | | | 28 | 6 * | 28 | - + | | | • | Ö | н. |
| | 18 | 4, 1, * 2 | 0.6 1% | 0.4 4.4 | 0.4 | ł | н. | 0.7 | с.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | ų C | , c | | | - | | * *7 | ₽ ₩ |
| Activities for children | с с | | | 1 | 4 1 | | d₽ ≢ | 5% | 18 | 8 * | 80 171 | 2.5 1.8 | -1 oř • + - | ı | 8,0 | ' | | 0.6 0. | 2 |
| | 0.0 1.4 | 9.0 1 | ł | ' | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | ç | · | | | , | | | ж к | 128 | L8 ×8 | 8° |
| Sidewalks/Rive lance | , | Р 1 | | | 1-8- 1-8- | 18 | ев * | 3₽ * |) # • ••1 | 1 ae . * > | 7.4 7.8 | -1 # -1 # | 0.7 | · | | | 0.3 0 | | e7. |
| | m,# 0 | 6.0 | 1 | 0.2 | 1,0 | 1 | 0,2 | - | I | | | | P N | 유 거 | 8-T | де Т | | 1.8 +8 | 10 ¹⁰ |
| Golf | I | р 1 | | фа * | a₽ ¥ | | 8* | । म | | 1 | יי היי ר | ი. • | 3 | | 0.2 0 | 0.2 0 | 0.1 0 | | • |
| | 1.0 * | 0.1 | ł | 0.1 | 0.1 | ı | - C | | | | , I | p | | a₽ ¥ | | | | *** *** | • • |
| Other | ÷ | dP + | | d₽ ★ | 8* * | | -{ aP - + + | I | I | ſ | ۲.4 * • | 1.0 | ï | 1 | | 0.1 | I | - | - |
| An and a second s | 2, B 2, B | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 7 0 | u c | c c | , c | e c | | | ₽ * | 4 * | | 1 dP • # | 1. of P |
| | • | 5 | ¥7 | 8 19 | 2% | 28 | 48 | a E | | 0.4 1.4 1.4 | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. | 1.6 2% | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | ۲.5 ۳.5 | 1.4 1 | 1.8 I | 1.1 1.4 | 4 1.4 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | , I | | | | | | dP . |

Table Q14 Fage 25 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 ~ April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Satisfaction with recreation and parks in your area

| GEOGRAPHY Total G'ville Balance | 5 | HY alance | | GENDER Men Wor | DER Women | AS(18-44 | ASCRIBED AGE | AGB | м — — | EDUCATION | N Coll | - RA | RACE | CHILDREN IN HH | REN | PARK 1 | USER | DI TENA ESD | TIC |
|---|------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | ł | | | | | | 100 | | | Grad+ | White | Other | Yes | e Ro | Yes | No | rools Yes | Ŋ |
| 113.4 56.3 | 56.3 | | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | 64.3 | 34.0 | 15.0 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46 - 6 | 9 09 | C C T | | | | | | |
| 401.0 301.0 10 | | មិ | 100.0 | 171.0 | 0.062 | 110.0 | 180.0 | 111 0 | 1 26 0 | | ' | | 0 5 1 | ה יי יי | 59.0 | 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| 56.3 27.9 21 | | ដ | 28.4 | 25.5 | 30.9 | 7 62 | 1 2 1 | | ſ | | 4 | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 | 267.0 | 245.0 | 156.0 | 151.0 | 245.0 |
| 50% | | u) | 8 08 | 488 | 518 | | 478 | 70% | 50% | 10.7 448 | 24.2 528 | 35.5 518 | 19.6 | 25.7 | 30.3 | 36.8 | 19.5 | 28.7 | 27.1 |
| 16.9 11.1 5 15% 70% 7 | | ų. | 5.B | 8.2 | 8.7 | 7.8 | υ. υ | а. 8 | | - | | | | 2 7 7 | 5 1 2 8 | 86 9 | 52% | 56% | 45& |
| יי א ר פי ר | | | _έ ρι | 1 10% | 148 | 1,2% | 16% | 25% | 10 1 | 1.04 | 218 | 184 | 1.04 1.08 | 7,5 148 | 9.4 16% | 11.6 15% | 5.3 148 | 6.4 124 | 178- |
| 35% 30% 40% | | - 6 - 7 - 7 | 0.40 | 5.7.T 8.EE | 22.2 37 8 | 21.9 348 | 10.8 32% | 6.7 458 | 26.5 10e | 7.6 | 14.6 | 22.9 | 15.5 | 18.2 | 20.9 | 25.2 | 14.2 | E 00 | |
| 46.6 25.9 20.7 | | 20.7 | | 24.7 | 21.8 | 29.1 | 141 | | • | ר א ק ק | | 8 60 70 | 86E | * * * | 358 | 866 | 88E | 448 | 288 |
| 1 4 6 8 | | 363 | | 478 | 36% | 458 | 418 | 238 | 9.01 800- | 458 | 19.4 42 8 | 27.0 39& | 17.0 43 8 | 23.1 438 | 23.1 398 | 35.0 46% | 11.6 318 | 18.8 37* | 27.6 |
| 98 48 138 | | 1.7 | | 2.4 58 | 7.4 | 5. С. Ф. | Э.б 11.78 | 0.8 58.0 | 4.1 108 | 2.7 | а. 47 | 6.4 0 | а. э | 4.6 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 6.2 | с. С. С. | 8.7 |
| 0.6 0.3 0.3 18 18 18 | | 0.3 18 | 1 | 0 | 6.4 0 | 1 [*] | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | | с г. 0 | 9 O | * I 10 | ař I Di | 96 7 | 5 2 2 | , 168 0 168 | 78 | 80 00 |
| 1.56 1.66 1.47 | | 1.47 | | 1.59 | 1.54 | 1.50 | 9 7 1 1 1 | * (V c | ж н і | | æ * | 3° | | | 17 여원 • 다니 > | 9a 1 • + 5 | , 1 1, 4 | I | 0.6 18 |
| д. 00 | | 2.00 | | 1.00 | 2.00 | н. 00 Н | | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1 00 1 | 1.66 2.00 | 1.61 2.00 | 1.51 1.00 | 1.53 1.00 | 1.59 2.00 | 1.59 | 1.50 | 1.61 2.00 | 1.55 1.00 |

Table Q15 Page 26 May 14, 2008

Site Sclutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

L__1

Recreation and park facilities should be funded through ...

Table Q15G Page 27 May 14, 2008

ţ

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Would support bond referendum to develop and improve parks

| | DELIC | LS No | | 60.1 | | 245.0 | 35.5 | 598 | 19.4 | 328 | 5.2 | 8° 65 |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
| | USE FUBLIC | I POOLS | | 51.3 | | D. TCT | 40.9 | 808 | 6.1 | 128 | 4.3 | 8- 6- |
| | USER | No | | 37.7 | 156 0 | | 2.91 | # 1 1 | 13.1 | #0 5 | 5.4 | 148 |
| | PARK | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 | | 58.5 77 | 6 | 12.4 | P D H | 4.7 | 68 |
| | OREN | ç | | 59.0 | 267.0 | | 41.5 70% | | 12.6 218 8 | | 4.0 | 8-13 1-14 |
| | CHILDREN IN HH | Yes | | 9. 19. | 127.0 | | 30.Z 688 | | 12.6 | | 4.7 | in D |
| | 8 | Other | | 5. FC | 129.0 | 50 | 748 | | 8-6T | | 3.0 88 | 5 |
| | RACE | White | 2 09 | | 258.0 | 45.3 | 65% | 0 - 1 | 26% 26% | (, | າ ເ 0 | |
| • | Coll | _ ` | 46.6 | | 178,0 | 31.6 | 68% | E.01 | 22% | - F | 105 | |
| EDITOR WT ON | Some Q | LOLL Grad+ | 24.2 | - | 80.0 | 18.1 | 75% | 5.B | 248 | 6.0 | e H | |
| EDU | | | 41.0 | с Ц | 0.621 | 27.6 | 67% | 8.8 | 218 | 4.6 | 1.1% | |
| - ы | + ان | | 15.0 | - O I E E | | 8.7 | 285 | 4.8 | 328 | 1.5 | 108 | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | | | 34.0 | 180.0 | | 20.2 | ም እ | 9.7 | 28% | 4.3 | 128 | , |
| ASCR | 18-44 45-64 | | 64.3 | 110.0 | | 48.9 | 6 | 11.0 | \$/7 | 4.4 | 81 | |
| н. | Women | | 60.4 | 230.0 | | 47.4 | | 9.6 9.7 | р 5 † | | њ 0 Ц | |
| GENDER | | | 52.9 | 171.0 | × u | 678 678 | 1 | т5.7 308 | | ч.н 4.р | , , | |
| | nce - 1 | | 57.1 52.9 | 100.0 IT | | 58% | | 1 825E | | 20F | | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Bala | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O HO | Total G'ville Balance Men | 5 23 | | 0.IOE | 44.5 | 867 | 7.1 | 138 | 4.6 | 8°0 | | |
| | btal | 113.4 | | 0 - TN# | 77.8 | £69 | 25.5. | 22% | 10.1 | 8 6 | | |
| | е ¦ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| • | | (B000) E | SMED | | | | | | efused | | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTERVIEWS | | | | | | Don't know/Refused | | | |
| | | Tota | 40 # | 4 2 2 | מ ע ד | | 0N O | | Don't | | | |

Table Q16 Page 28 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

| | | DI I | No | | 60.1 | 245 0 | | 168 168 | | 1.4 68 | a | 19.0 19.0 | 9.7 | н т т | 1 | 15.3 | 258 |
|--|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------|------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|---|----------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-----|
| | | DULLS DUCE | Yes | | 51.3 | 151.0 | | 238 | r c | х 1965 И | . ¥ | 23.8 | р 1 | u 9 | 289 | | 148 |
| | ` | 1 11350 | No I | | 37.7 | 156.0 1 | 0 | 19 19 19 | ~ | 1 89 | 7.2 | | 2 5 | | - | 13.4 | 36% |
| | | FARK US | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 1 | 9.7 | 248 | ۲. ۲. | ι, Έ | 2.6 | 178 | 10.3 14% | | 29% | 9.1 1 | |
| | | | No No | | 59.0 | 267.0 24 | 9.1 | | | æ, | | 15% | 6.3 118 1 | 17.8 22 | | 15.0 | |
| | | CRIIDREN IN HE | Yes N | | 53.5 5 | 127.0 26 | | 258 | | 7& | 11.0 E | | 7.2 6 13% 1 | 11.0 17 | | 6.7 15 | |
| | | | _ ¦ | | | | | | | 48 | | | | | | | |
| 88 .1 | | RACE | Other | | 9.6E | 129.0 | 8.8 | | 1.5 | 4 | 6.7 | 17 | 5.0 19 | 12.5 | Ē | 8.0 | Ň |
| facilit | : | 84 | | ; | 0.40 | 258.0 | 13.3 | 198 | 4.4 | 68 | 13.0 | ир с Л с Т т | 168 168 | 14.3 | * | 13.6 | |
| 1 park | - | Coll Coll | | | 0.0* | 178.0 | 10.8 | 8 C N | 0.0 1 | ም በ | 6.5 8 | 10 - F | 228 | 60 F | P D f | 6.1 138 | |
| ion and | EDUCATION | Some C | 1 | 0 7 | 1 | 85.0 | 7.5 216 | 8 T C | 1.9 9.1 | р. К | з. 8 16# | | 78 | 6.6 774 | | 2.9 128 | |
| recreat | EDEI | SH=> | | 41 0 | | 125.0 | 4,2 | 2 | 1.6 48 | 5 7 | 7.5 18% | 4 | å | 13.8 34* | | 918 318 | |
| ртоvе ј | - | | | 15.0 | | | 1.4 98: | , | 7.5 98 | | 2.4 168 | 6.0 | \$ 9 | 3.5 238 | - | 9.4 19.4 | |
| r to in | ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 (| | 34.0 | | | 5.7 178 | | ດ 😽 | c | 178 | | 20 8 | 6.7 208 | | 228 | |
| nually | ASCRIB | 18-44 45 | | 64.3 3 | | | 248 | | , 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, | | | | | 18.6 298 2 | | 158 2 | |
| pend a | | | | | 0 110 0 | 4 | | י מ ד | | | | | | | | | |
| ùg to s | gender | Women | | 60.4 | 230 0 | - | 208 | ſ | ĵ | 4.9 | 168 | 7.3 | 12 | 14.1 238 | .ET | 238 | |
| LÂLLÎN | | Мел | | 52.9 | 171.0 | 10.4 | 20% | () () | 48 | 10.4 | 20% | 6.2 | \$ 1 7 | 288 288 | 8.9 | 178 | |
| Amount household willing to spend annually to improve recreation and park facilities | Трал | Balance | | 57.1 | 100.0 | 9.2 | 16% | 1.8 | ň | 11.4 | 20% | 5.1 08 | , c | 268 268 | 14.6 | 268 | |
| Amount | GEOGRAPEY | G'ville | | ν. Ο | 301.0 | 13.5 | 24% | £.1 | 88 | 8.4 | 158 | 158 158 | 1. 0 | 1258 | 7.9 | 8.97 | |
| | | Total | 5 5 5 | 5. | 401.0 | 22.7 | 20% | 6.0 | ት ት | 19.8 172 | ч. Т. | 13.4 12% | 28,8 | 25% | 22.6 | P 2 | • . |
| | | | tts (000s) | | DHIT A | \$200 | | | | | | | 52 | į | Refused | | |
| | | | Total Adults (000s) | 40 # | TETNT TO U | More than \$200 | 62.00 | nnzė | 61 0.0 | 0074 | \$50 C | - - | \$25 or less | None of | Refused | | |

Table QA Page 29 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenvilie and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Number of adults in household

| | DELIC | S No. | | 60.1 | 245.0 | | 6.9 1 | ₽/.T | 35.1 | 8BS | 0 61 | 208 | u c | 1. 4 1. 4 | | 0.6 | 18 18 |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------|---|--------------|--|---|---------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | USE FUBLIC | Yes | | 51.3 | 151.0 | | 6.9 | 4 9 | 33. 3 | 65% | е, 6 | 10% | - | , m | | 0.0 | ¥8 |
| | USER | oN N | | 37.7 | 156.0 | | 0.7 | 2 1 1 | 21.8 | 8 2 C | 6.5 | 178 | 1.8 | 58 | | 0.6 | ¥9 |
| | PARK | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 | | 138 | | 47.0 | B.70 | 16.1 | 218 | 2.4 | ар С | • | 시 비 - 1 - 1 | P |
| | REN | °¥ | | 59.0 | 267.0 | 0 01 | 218 | с Ц | 7 - 1 7 - 1 | 5 | 10.6 | 18 8 | 0.9 | 28 | i | ſ | |
| | CHILDREN IN HH | Yes | | 53.5 | 127.0 | . 9 . 9 | - 61 - 61 | 5 7 7 | 19 19 19 | | 11.8 | # N | ы. 1. | 68 | ſ | | |
| | | Other | ; | 8.65 8 | 129.0 | 4.7 | 128 | 21.8 | 258 | | 11.0 | ¢ 0 1 | ы. 19 | 9 | 0.0 | ыр * | |
| | ž | White . | | 0.40 | 258.0 | 11.6 | 178 | 45.9 | 66 8 | 4 | 47.F | | 1.8 5 | 'n | 0.4 | - 1 -6 | |
| | | | 46 6 | | 0.871 | 7.0 | 158 | 0.EE | 718 | ų Li | 12% | | 1.1 28 | 2 | , | | |
| RULLOW | | | 24.2 | | GP.0] | 9. J | 15% | 13.6 | 568 | ה ת | 228 | . 1 | 1.6 78 | | ı | | |
| LICH. | =BS | 1 | 41.0 | 0 101 | 0.02 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 8CT | 21.7 | *D0 | 11.6 | 288 | 4 7 | ۲ 46 46 | | 1,0 | 10 11 | |
| Fr1 | | . ! | 15.0 | 11 0 F F | | 4.3 908 | P 0 1 | е.е | \$ 70 , | 1.0 | 78 | с С | - - - | , | 0 1 1 1 1 | P H | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | 180.0 1 | | 218 218 | r F | 1.8.7 55.8 | ,) | 5.4 | 16& | с С | 78 | 1 | ດ.ວ ສຸ | , I | |
| ASCR | 18-44 4 | ļ | 64.3 | 110.0 1 | | ი აი ი ი | : | 40.8 63* | , | 16.2 | 258 | 1.7 | ក ព | | r | | |
| - | | | 60.4 | 230.0 1 | L | 198 | | 53% 53% | , | 12.4 | | з.7 | 68 | с С | | | |
| GENDER | n Women | [| | | | | | | | •• | | 5 | æ | 4 | à | | |
| | | | г 52.9 | 0 171.0 | | 8 10 8 | | 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 | | 10.2 | | 0.5 | | 0 | 3.8 | | |
| VERY | Balance | ſ | T.10 | 100.0 | 7.0 | 125 | 35.1 | 638 | · (| 17. H | ĺ | т т т | a₽ N | 0.5 | 18 | | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville | 5 12 12 | | 301.0 | 10.1 | 184 | 33.1 | 59% | đ | 178 | | г. а г. | 5 | 0.2 | * * | | |
| | Total 6 | 113.4 | I | 401.0 | 17.0 | *04 | 68.8 | 618 | 22.6 | 20% | | 1 de 1 | ł | 0.7 | ¥ -7 | | |
| | i | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (202 | | | | | | | | | | | TC. | 1 | | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | RVTERC | | | | | | | | | | Don't know/Refused | | | | |
| | | tal Adı | # OF INTERVIEWS | • | | | | | | | 4 or more | | ı't kno | | | | |
| | | Ĩ | # | ٣ | 4 | ç | v | • | 17 | | 4 | | DOD | | | | |

Table QB Page 30 May 14, 2008 Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Number of children in household

| | _ | | I | ۲, | 0 | | D. 68 | г | | | 4 9 | c | °. n_a₽ | œ | 1 68 |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|
| | USE PUBLIC FOOLS | No | | 3 60.1 | 0 245.0 | | 0.05 885 885 | | 8 18 ⁸ | | 5 178 5 178 | | 0.40 0.40 | - | - 8- |
| | I USE | Yes. | | 51.3 | 151.0 | | 468 | 5 | 158 | ŗ | 0.47 0.47 0.47 | с С | , n | 0.0 | н * |
| | USER | No | | 37.7 | 156.0 | 25 A | 678 | 3.7 | 104 | r U | 14. | 2.7 | 3 8 7 | 0.6 | 38 |
| | PARK | res | | 75.7 | 245.0 | 33.6 | 448 | 14.9 | 208 | F 66 | 298 | 4.6 | 68 | 0.3 | d₽ + |
| | HEN HE | | | 0.92 | 267.0 | 59.0 | 100% | ı | | I | | ı | | 1 | |
| | CHILDREN IN HH VOC V | | | 0 7 0 | 127.0 | 1 | | 18.6 | 35% | 27.6 | 52% | 7.3 | 148 | ı | |
| - | k Other | | 0 | 0 | 129.0 | 21.0 | 538 | 5.2 | 13% | 10.8 | 278 | 2.8 | 78 | 0.0 | * |
| č P P | White O | 1 | 69 6 | | 258.0 | 36.8 | 8 60 | 12.8 | 18% | 15.0 | 22% | 4.4 | 6% | 0.6 1 | £7 |
| _ | Coll Grad+ W | | 46.6 | | 178.0 | 20.0 | 867 | 10.3 | \$77 | 15.4 | 8 6 7 | 0.9 | 8. N | t | |
| EDUCATION | Some C Coll G | | 24.2 | | 86.0 | 10.6 | 4 4 4 | 0.E | FCT | 4.7 | 3 6Т | 8.8 9,6 | 14 14 19 | I | |
| RDU | SH=> | | 41.0 | | 0.021 | 27.9 500 | P 00 | 5.3 136 | 2 7 1 | 7.3 | 404 | 0.5 1 | Р 7 | н, # D | |
| — M | 65+ | | 15.0 | 0 | | 0.41 978 | ĥ | 0.7 4 | , } | ц. 14, | P H | I | | 0 7 7 | |
| ASCRIERD AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | 180 0 1 | | 21.5 63 8 | | 188 198 | • | ۲ م ۲ م | | 0.6 28 | | 0 7 28 | |
| ASCRI | | | 64.3 | 110.0 1 | | 23.5 378 | | 11.7 18% | | 22.4 358 | | 6.7 108 | | ı | |
| | | l i | 60.4 | 1 0.052 | | 30.4 50% | | 198 J | | יי קייק קייק | | 4.4 78 | L | 9 | |
| GENDER | Мотел | | | | | | | | ' | | | | | | |
| 5 | Men | | 52.9 | 171.0 | | ла. 5.4.6 9.4.8 | - 1 | 148 | | 268 | C | 5.5 | Ċ | , L , B | |
| ХĦđ | Balance | ; | 57.1 | 100.0 | 0.00 | 9.4.6 9.4.6 | ۰ ۱ | 128 | 3 A 6 | 268 | - 74 | 7% | C U | 18 | |
| GEOGRAPHY | G'ville Balance | , , , | n. 00 | 301.0 | 28.2 | 50% | 11.5 | 20% | 13.0 | 238 | 3.2 | 6% | 0.4 | 1 1 8 | |
| | Total G'ville Balance | 112 4 | | 401.0 | 59.0 | 52% | 18.6 | 16% | 27.6 | 248 | 7.3 | 68 | 0.9 | 4 ° | |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (6000 | | رم ا | | | | | | | | | used | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | | SMATANT AN # | | | | | | | 9 | | Don't know/Refused | | |
| | | otal A | | N N | None | | | | | | 3 or more | | on't kr | | |
| | | ι,H | 4 | f | N | | н | | 2 | | m | | A | | |

Table QC Page 31 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Ascribed age

| | UBLIC | No | | 60.1 | 245.0 | | 7.4 128 | | 6.8 118 | | 10.8 | 8 D T | 13.4 22% | ç | 178 178 | 11.3 100 |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | USE PUBLIC POOLS | хөд Хөд | | 51.3 | 151.0 | 0 7 7 | 278 | 1 | л.ст 298 | | 80,9 17,9 | P 1 | 6,0 128 | 0 | . #0 | ե Ե Ե |
| | USER | 8 8 | | 37.7 | 156.0 | ¢ | 19 19 | c | 7.8 | ł | 184 184 | | 2.48 2.48 | 2.7 | 3-67 - | 10.0 268 |
| | PARK | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 | 20.4 | 278 | 10.0 | 258 | 0 0 7 | 9.97 1987 | 1 C | 148 | 7.4 | 10% | 5.1 78 |
| | REN - | NO NO | ; | 59.0 | 267.0 | 11.5 | 208 | 6.2 | 104 | d U | 10% | α | 15% | 12.7 | 228 | 14.0 248 |
| | CHILDREN IN EH | Yes | 1 () | υ. Γ | 127.0 | 11.0 | 218 | 15.6 | 29& | 14.1 | 268 | 10.3 | 198 | 1.5 | æ | 0.8 28 |
| | | | 0 0 7 | 0.67 | 129.0 | 10.6 | 268 | 7.6 | 198 | 7.5 | 867 | 5.9 | 15% | с. | 148 | 2.8 78 |
| | RACE White of | | 69 F | | 258.0 | 20.2 | * 01 | 13.7 | 20% | 12.3 | 18% | 12.8 | 18% | 8.8 8.5 | 1 1 | 11.8 178 |
| | Coll Gradt W | - ! | 46.6 | c t | 1.8.4 | 4,0 | ю Л | 13.0 | \$B7 | 9.7 | 21.8 | 11.2 | 548 | 4.7 108 | 9 3 1 | 4.0 98 |
| Three march | Some Co Coll Gr | | 24.2 | , 0 18 | | 6.0 258.0 | , , | 4.6 | P.C.T | 4.0 | т 6¥ | 6. N | | 2.8 12# | | 3.9 16% |
| and a | | | 41.0 | 125 0 | | 978 976 | | 4,2 | | 6.J | e n f | 6.4 | р — Ч — | 6.5 168 | | 6.7 16% |
| ~ ല | 5 | | 15.0 | 111.0 | | | | I | | ı | | 1 | | ł | с 11 | 1008 |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34-0 | 180.0 | ı | | I | I | 1 | ! | 1 | 19.5 578 | 9 4 7 | 0 19 19 19 | I | |
| ASCI | 18-44 | | 64.3 | 110.0 | 22,6 | 35% | 21.8 | 348 | 0 02 | 8 TE | | I | 1 | | ı | |
| e | Women | | 60.4 | 230.0 | 12.2 | 20% | 10.9 | 18% | E.01 | 178 | с с | 178 178 | 7.7 | 867 | 9.1 | 15& |
| GENDER | Men | 0 0 1 | ñ. 20 | 171.0 | 10.3 | 20% | 10.9 | 218 | 9.7 | 381 | 0 | 178 178 | 6.9 | 138 | 6.0 | 11 8 |
| х | Balance [| 57 1 | 4 | 100.0 | 7.2 | ₽n1 | 9.6 | 178 | 0.II | 19% | 11.9 | 218 | 8.B | 15% | 8.7 | 15% |
| GEOGRAPHY | G'ville Ba | 56.3 | | 301.0 | 15.4 | P / 7 | 12.2 | ¥72 | 0,6 | н 0 # | 7.6 | 348 | 5.8 | 10 8 | 6.4 | ₽ |
| | Total | 113.4 | 0 101 | 401.0 | 22.6 20% | 5 1 1 | 21.8 189 | р Г | 20.0 | 4 2 1 | 19.5 | 178 | 14.6 125 | P 11 | 15.0 134 | - |
| | ~ | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTERVIEWS | 18-24 | | 25-34 | | 35-40 | | L | 10-10-1-1-1 | | * | 65 or older | | |

Table OD Page 32 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

_____,

Race

| | | GEOGR | GEOGRAPHY | GENDE | DER | ASC | ASCRIBED AGE | н И | 1412 | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Total | G'ville Balance | Balance | Men | Women | 18-44 | 45-64 | | | z, | Coll | ε. Έ | RACE | CHILDREN IN HH | L NEN | PARK USER | JSER | USE PUBLIC | LIC |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Grad+ | White | Other | Yea | | Yes | - CON | POOLS Yee | C M |
| (SOOD) SITURE (BOOD) | 113.4 | 56.3 | 57.1 | 52.9 | 60.4 | 6 7 J | 5 | L T | | | | | | | | - | | | |
| # OF INTERVIEWS | 401.0 | 301.0 | 100.0 | 0 171 | 0000 | | - * | 0.64 | 41.0 | 24.2 | 46.6 | 69.6 | 39.8 | 53.5 | 59.0 | 75.7 | 37.7 | 51.3 | 60.1 |
| White | 69.6 | 32.8 | 36.8 | 20 0 | 0.052 | 0.011 | 1.80.0 | 111.0 | 125.0 | 86.0 | 178.0 | 258.0 | 129.0 | 127.0 | 267.0 | 245.0 | 156.0 | 151.0 | 245.0 |
| | 61% | 58% | 648 | 56% | 669 | 10.1 568 | 51.5 548 | 11.8 78% | 17.7 43% | 12.3 51 | 38.86 8.8 | 69.6 1920 | t | 32.2 | 36.8 | 47.9 | 21.6 | 28 1 | ц 1 1 1 1 |
| Black/African American | 34.1 | 16.8 | 17.4 | 18.7 | 15.4 | 20.4 | | C | | | 6 1) | 800T | | 60% | 624 | 63& | 578 | 55% | 569 1668 |
| | 80r | 308 | 308 | 35% | 26% | 32.5 | 128 128 | 94 1-13 1-13 | 19.1 | ດ. ສ | 0.0 .0 | ו | 34.1 | 14.7 | 19.5 | 22.1 | 12.0 | 15 1 | |
| | 2.2 | 0.9 | н. Ч | 2.1 | 1.0 | 7 | • | | | | 0 1 1 | | 868 | 278 | 338 | 298 | 32£ | 308 | 328 328 |
| | 8-7-7- | 28 | 2% | 48 | (d° ; * | -1 #P - (77) | -1 dP - * - | 1 | е.н Ж | I | 0.9 | I | 2.2 | 2.2 | ſ | 8.0 | 1.4 | | ŗ |
| some proof face | 2.5 2.5 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1,B | с С | с С | | 1 | | р 1 | | 99 99 9 | 48 | | 89 11 | 49 77 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 ap 1 |
| | 49 V | en α | 18 | 8 T | 38 | 44 | 1.4 | ı | н 5-6 6-6 | I | 0. 1.0 | T | 2.5 7 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 2.4 | ÷ |
| THE ROLD IN THE PACES | 1.0 18 | 1.0 | t | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.0 | e c | . . | s. 1 | | ¥.0 | 48 | 18 | 28 | 28 | ср С | 1 449 - * |
| Don't know/Refused | 4.0 | р ч т | 6 | de i Ci | 8° * | er ⊢í | ар * | d₽ ★ , | 24 | -1 dP - * - * | I | ſ | 1.0 35 | I | 1.0 2% | 0.5 * | 1.0 38 | 6 0 0 | 1.0 |
| | đ | 68 | 96 97 - 1-1 | 9.9 178 0 | с. 6 6 | 2.4 | н 1.5 | 0.5 3.5 | 1.0 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1 | 1 | 2.5 | ~ | ' c r | | р 1 Ч 1 | ip ⊧ |
| | | | | | | | , , | 5 | ę , | 8 0 | aP M | | | е С | 28 | - 49 19 1 | 2. H 2. | 9 9 2 8 7 | 1.4 28 |

Table QE Page 33 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Education

| PUBL, IC | on Sic | | | | | 0 | | | | н | | ਜ # ਨਾ | 1 | 5.9 | 108 | 15.2 | 258 | , 0, m | 63 | 6.7 | 8TT | г.2 28 |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| USE | Q səy | | 51. | ļ | D.101 | с. С. | 4 | 5.0 | | 10.4 | | 1.0 5% | | 13.8 | 872 | 13.6 | 268 | Э.4 | 78 | 3.4 7 | 6 | 6. 4 0 |
| USER | N N | | 37.7 | | | 1 2 | ŝ | 2.2 | 1 | 418 418 | 1 | 1. 285 | | 0.7 | 19 7 | ، 10 ۱۳ | #0.T | ष : - स | 8 .9 | 2.4 | 5 | 0.8 28 |
| PARK | Yes | | 75.7 | 245 0 | | ч.* о | | 9 128 | t c * | 178 | r + | 2 P 2 V | | 1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1- | | 23.3 378 | 0 4 1 | ດ. ທີ່ | ¢ 0 | 8.0 118 | | - * |
| REN | 8 | | 59.0 | 267.0 | | н 28-11 Н | | רי ע 1.50 1.42 | 1 1 1 | о но 10 10 10 | v 0 | 48 | с 0 | 144 | , , , | 5.11. 198 | | 5.1 6.1 | n N | а.е 6% | 9 0 | 1% |
| CHILD | Kes | | 53.5 | 127.0 | c | 2 e . * C | ц . с | າສະ ເທິ 1 | 10.5 | 20% | 0.7 | e T | 12 0 | 248 | | 17.6 33% | | N 12 | 6 | 138 138 | 6.0 | l dP ≢ |
| | other | | 39.8 | 129.0 | | 59 G | 4 7 | 198 | 15.0 | 38% | . T. 6 | 48 | 6 6 | 218 | | 4 - 9 128 | | 28 | | 5 8 D | 1.0 | ар + |
| RAC | White - | ; | 69.6 | 258.0 | 0.6 | ар г-і | 4.2 | 6% | 12.9 | 198 | 1.4 | 28 | 10.8 | 164 | | 195 | c v | 4.6 7 86 | 5 | กละ .ชา กศ | 6.0 | 18 |
| | [| | 4 a . b | .78.0 | , | | ŀ | | ı | | ı | | , | | 0 80 | 628 | 7.3 | 1.6% | <i>v</i> 0 | 228 | I | |
| Some C | | C 76 | | | ı | | r | | ł | | а.1 200 | ም ጉ | 1.1 | 878 | ī | E . | I | | , 1 | f | t | |
| | i T | 41.0 | | | 1.4 | de ch | 1.6 | 8-11-7. | 8.1 60° | 100 | ſ | | 1 | | ī | | 1 | | ı | | ı | |
| _`- <u>-</u> _ | ~ ¦ | | 1 | | 1.0 | ¥. | | | | R | n a | | 1.0 | e o | | 4.8 | 8. | 58 | ť. | 78 | 4.4 | , 1 |
| -64 | ſ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 45 | | m. | | | | , | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - 18- | - | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | c | | |
| Women | | 60. | 230. | | | | - 60 - | <u>и</u> Т | Ŭ (1 | - | Ň | 13.6 | 239 | | 1.61 1.61 | | 4. 9.9 | 5 | 5 5 | 6 C | 0 * - H - | |
| Men | | 52.9 | 171.0 | ر د | 5 5 6 8 7 8 | n Ve | 13. 9.E1 | 12.6 | 248 | 2.1 | 48 | 7.4 | 8 P T | , 1. | 4.0 1 298 | | 10 10 10 | 1 | 0.8 0.8 | 2 0 | e T | |
| Balance | | 1.74 | 100.0 | o c | 2.5 | 0.2 | 80 | 20.0 | 35% | 1.4 | 28 | 8.8 | 16% | и К | 258 | с С | 0 80 0 80 | U U | 0 H | 0,6 | 9°T | |
| | ן ע נו | 1 | 301.0 | 0.5 | 18 18 | 6.6 | 128 | 8.1 | 148 | 1.7 | 85 | 12.3 | 228 | 14.4 | 26% | 7.0 | 12% | 4 | 86 | 6.0 | 28 | |
| ! | 113.4 | | 401.0 | 1.4 | 18 | 11.6 | 108 | 28.1 | % 07 | г г п | ۴ Դ | 21.1 | 19 1 | 28,9 | 25% | 7.3 | 68 | 10.4 | 8 6 | н, ц | a≱ ak | |
| | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTEGRATE | | tth grade or less | | Some high school | | ugn school graduate | | Special technical training | Come and a | normal contrade | | college graduate | | <code>Post-graduate</code> study | | Advanced degree | - |)on't know∕Refused | | ~ |
| | G'VILLE Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 671 Some Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER | Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=ES Coll RACE CHILDREN FARK USER USER UGE | Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=ES Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.0 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 10 24.0 <td>Total G'ville Balance Man Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=KS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE PUBL </td> <td>Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER /td> <td>Total [g'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Some Coll RACE I CHILDREN RARK USER [USE FURE 05) 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 12.7 37.7 51.3 401.0 301.0 100.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 86.0 178.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 3 1.4 0.5 0.9 0.6 0.8 0.1 125.0 86.0 178.0 257.0 245.0 156.0 151.0 2</td> <td>Total G'ville Balance Man Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <=ESS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USEN USEN UCS PURE \$</td> <td>Total G'ville Balance Man Momen 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE Catture Cature <t< td=""><td>Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL</td><td>Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I B-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll FACE CHILDREN EARK USEN USEN EARK <</td><td>Total Evilation Man Man Momen 19-44 45-64 65+ $<=$BS BOUGANTON RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE FUE 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 401.0 301.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 66.0 139.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 1.4 0.5 0.9 0.6 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 86.0 129.0 129.0 150.0 151.0 121.0 211.0 245.0 156.0 151.0 129.0 129.0 129.1 214.7 215.0 125.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.</td><td>Total Grinnel Name Incr EAL CHILDREN EARK USER CUSE FURNE EARK USER EARK USER EARK USER EARK EARK 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 11.0 127.0 239.0 157.0 151.0 21.3 127.0 24.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 12.7 51.0 121.0 21.0 121.0 21.3 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.2 0.1 11.2 0.1 11.2<</td><td>Total G'VIILe Balance Name IB-44 45-64 65+ Call RACE CHILDREN PAAK USER <</td><td>$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>Total Given Sance Rance Call and the Rance Rance</td><td>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td><td>Total G'ville Bailance Man IB-4 45-64 651 Accord RACE CHILDERN PARK USR I PARK USR I<!--</td--><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td></td></t<></td> | Total G'ville Balance Man Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=KS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE PUBL | Total G'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USER | Total [g'ville Balance Men Women 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Some Coll RACE I CHILDREN RARK USER [USE FURE 05) 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 12.7 37.7 51.3 401.0 301.0 100.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 86.0 178.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 3 1.4 0.5 0.9 0.6 0.8 0.1 125.0 86.0 178.0 257.0 245.0 156.0 151.0 2 | Total G'ville Balance Man Women 18-44 45-64 65+1 <=ESS Coll RACE CHILDREN PARK USEN USEN UCS PURE \$ | Total G'ville Balance Man Momen 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE Catture Cature <t< td=""><td>Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL</td><td>Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I B-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll FACE CHILDREN EARK USEN USEN EARK <</td><td>Total Evilation Man Man Momen 19-44 45-64 65+ $<=$BS BOUGANTON RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE FUE 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 401.0 301.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 66.0 139.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 1.4 0.5 0.9 0.6 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 86.0 129.0 129.0 150.0 151.0 121.0 211.0 245.0 156.0 151.0 129.0 129.0 129.1 214.7 215.0 125.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.</td><td>Total Grinnel Name Incr EAL CHILDREN EARK USER CUSE FURNE EARK USER EARK USER EARK USER EARK EARK 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 11.0 127.0 239.0 157.0 151.0 21.3 127.0 24.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 12.7 51.0 121.0 21.0 121.0 21.3 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.2 0.1 11.2 0.1 11.2<</td><td>Total G'VIILe Balance Name IB-44 45-64 65+ Call RACE CHILDREN PAAK USER <</td><td>$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>Total Given Sance Rance Call and the Rance Rance</td><td>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td><td>Total G'ville Bailance Man IB-4 45-64 651 Accord RACE CHILDERN PARK USR I PARK USR I<!--</td--><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td></td></t<> | Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I 18-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll RACE I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN RARK USEN USEN USEN I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL I CHLDREN I CAL I CAL | Total G'ville Balance Men Momen I B-44 45-64 65+ <=HS Coll FACE CHILDREN EARK USEN USEN EARK < | Total Evilation Man Man Momen 19-44 45-64 65+ $<=$ BS BOUGANTON RACE CHILDREN PARK USER USE FUE 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 15.0 41.0 24.2 46.6 69.6 39.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 401.0 301.0 171.0 230.0 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 66.0 139.8 53.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 1.4 0.5 0.9 0.6 110.0 180.0 111.0 125.0 86.0 129.0 129.0 150.0 151.0 121.0 211.0 245.0 156.0 151.0 129.0 129.0 129.1 214.7 215.0 125.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129.0 129. | Total Grinnel Name Incr EAL CHILDREN EARK USER CUSE FURNE EARK USER EARK USER EARK USER EARK EARK 113.4 56.3 57.1 52.9 60.4 64.3 34.0 11.0 127.0 239.0 157.0 151.0 21.3 127.0 24.5 59.0 75.7 37.7 51.3 12.7 51.0 121.0 21.0 121.0 21.3 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.7 21.2 0.1 11.2 0.1 11.2< | Total G'VIILe Balance Name IB-44 45-64 65+ Call RACE CHILDREN PAAK USER < | $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Total Given Sance Rance Call and the Rance Rance | $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Total G'ville Bailance Man IB-4 45-64 651 Accord RACE CHILDERN PARK USR I PARK USR I </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td> | | | | | $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |

Table QF Page 34 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

ZIP Code

| | | - | ł | E0.1 | 0 | Ľ | 98 (1 1 1 | 2.2 | 28 | | 1.5 78. | | त्न व | ρ | 4 | de | ы | đe | _ | (-10 | ~ | | | _ | |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|-----------|----------|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | USE FUBLIC | FOOLS Les No | | | 0 245.0 | - | | | | | | | | | Ģ | 4 1.8 | | 398 | F H | 2 | | 128 | 2.4 | 43 | 10.0 178 |
| | | хөл Д | 1 | 7 51.3 | 0 151.0 | | طب | 5.0 | | | | | 14.6 28% | | ~ | ар ГО | 15.9 | 318 | 1 I | | 4.0 | 88 | 1.1 | 24 | 12.6 25% |
| | PARK USER | 0N N | | 37.7 | 156.0 | 1.5 | 4 8 | 1.1 | ъ. В | o C | | | 178 | | е. О | ж Т | 7.0 | 188 | 777. | å | 3.4 | B 6 | 4.2 | 87T | 11.7 328 |
| | PARI | Yes | | 75.7 | 245.0 | 1 | | 0.6 | e₽ −f | 0.6 | 18 | 0 1 1 | 258 | | 2.9 9.9 | 4 | 32.9 | * * | 1 | | 7.9 | 108 | 0.6 | # 1 | 11.1 158 |
| | ILDREN JN HH | Ŋ | | 59.0 | 267.0 | 0.4 | 18 | 1.7 | ж Т | 0.9 | 28 | 11.6 | 208 | 0 6 | N # 7 17 11 | ì | 20.1 | 19 17 17 | 0.2 | d₽ ¥ | 7.9 | 138 | 5. S | ° | 9.8 178 |
| | CHILDREN JN HH | Yes | | η. η | 127.0 | 1.1 | 38 | I | | 0.6 | 18 | 13.8 | 268 | ł | I | | 19. W | 2 2 1 | 6.0 20 | ę. V | ი. ო | æ | 1.6 38 | • | 12.9 248 |
| | N | Other { | 0 | D | 129.0 | 1.5 | * | 1.2 4.5 | • 1 | 0.6 | 18 | 16.6 | 428 | 0.9 | 8 | | 4.0 118 | | 0.9 96 | P 1 | 6:2 16:2 | P 0 1 | 0,6 18 | | 188 |
| | М. | White . | 9 69 9 | 2 | 258.0 | 1 | , | 0.5 18 | | 6 0 | æ H | 8.7 | 128 | 2.9 | 48 | 1 12 | 464 | | 2'# | • . 1 | 5.0 78 | 5 | 4.1 68 | e P | 1-06 1-08 |
| | | | 46.6 | | т./я. п | ı | ((| N 68 • * ⊐ | | 1 | | 7.4 | * 0 | 2.7 | 6% | 24.5 | 52% | c c | 1 aP | I | -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 - | | 년 1월 1941 1941 | | 50 50 50 |
| | Some Co Some Co | | 24.2 | | | 1 | 0 C | n de F≓ | | ı | | 8.1 27e | 6 | | 18 | | 208 | | | | - | | | | 298 |
| - Churd | S C S S SH≅> | r r | 41.0 | 125.0 | | - 40 - 49 - 49 | ب د | 38 | 6 - | | | 9.7 248 | | 0.2 | ж к | | 248 | 0.2 | 8° * | | | | | 6.4 7 | |
| _ | 29 | | 15.0 4 | 111.0 15 | | - m | 0.5 | 8° 60 | I | | | 246 246 | | 4.0 | | 5.5 1(| | 1 | | 1.5 | | | 128 | 1.3 6 | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 6 | | 34.0 1 | 180.0 11 | F. | | | 48 | ſ | | | 17% | | יי יי ס | 9 | 12.3 5 | | 1.1 | 36 | | 8% 1 | | 59 79 | | |
| ASCRIB | 18-44 45 | | 64.3 34 | | | | ۳ ۱ | | 1.5 | 28 | | | | | | | | | ••• | | | | | 7 7.8 | |
| | | | 60.4 64 | 0 TIO.0 | 1.5 | 8e | 0.8 .0 | 8° | 1.5 1. | | 8 16 4 | | | | | 5 22.0 | | ı | | 2 7.0 | | 1.3.3 | | 7.61 | |
| NDER | Women | | 60 | 230.0 | гł | ., | 0 | | -ਜ | | 11.8 | 20% | c | 1 0 ⁶ | | 24.5 41ª | ; | | | 4.2 | F- | Э.4 | 68 | 12.5 | |
| GEND | Men | | 52.9 | 171.0 | I | | 6.0 | 8 7 7 | ſ | | 13.9 | 26% | 3.0 | 68 | 1 | E.01 298 | | 1.1 | р 1 | 1.1 | P T | 1.4 | ף ה | 208 208 | |
| , YEQ | Balance | | 1.10 | 100.0 | 1,5 1,5 | ቶ ካ | 1.6 3.6 | ° | н. С. 1 | ም ካ | а.а | 6% | 3.2 | 89 | 2 61 | 228 | | 1.1 24 | i | 11.2 | 9 9 1 | 4.8 | | 10.4 298 | |
| GEOGRAPHY | G'ville | 56 3 | 2 | 301.0 | ı | | 0 1,8 * | | I | | 22.4 | 408 | I | | 27.2 | | | I | , , | * - | i | , | τ U | 118 | |
| | Total | 113.4 | - | 0.104 | н . ч . ч | | 1. 1 28 | u +- | אפינ ייין י | | 25.7 | ie N | دي . س | e D | 39.8 | 35% | 1.1 | 1 ae 1 | 6 6 | 10% | 0 | 0 de 7 | 22.8 | 20% | |
| | . 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 8) . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ts (000 | VIEWS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | # OF INTERVIEWS | | ł | φ | | ō | | 4 | | | | , | D | | ×* | | | | _ | | | | |
| | | Tota | 99 # | 27812 | i | 27828 | | 27629 | | 27834 | | 27837 | | 01020 | 109/7 | | 27684 | | 28513 | | 28530 | | 28590 | | |

Table GENDER Page 35 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Pitt County Recreation and Parks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2008 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Gender

| | | | | | | | | | | - | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|-----------------|
| | BLIC | | No | | 60.1 | | 245.0 | 2 | | 2 | 28.4 | 478 |
| | | | Yes | | 51.3 | | 151.0 | č | 21.2 418 | | 30.0 | 59% |
| | | | | | 37.7 | | 156.0 | 5 9 1 | 494 | | 21.4 | 91 8 |
| | PARK USER | Voo | | | 75.7 | | 10.017 | 36 6 | 498 | | 39.1 | * 70 |
| | | | | | 0.85 | 0 63 | 2.20 | 28.6 | 48% | | 4.0F | 277 |
| | CHILDREN IN HH | Yes | | | | 127 0 2 | | 24.0 | 458 | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 222 |
| | | Other | ۰. | 0 05 | | 129.0 | | 22.4 | 56% | 7 17 | 448 | |
| | RACE | White C | | 69 <i>6</i> | | 258.0 | | 29.9 | 496 | 30 7 | 578 | |
| | Coll | Grad+ | | 46.6 | | 178.0 | | 22.8 | 498 | 23.8 | 51% | |
| RDUCATION | Some | Coll | | 24.2 46.6 | | 86.0 | | 4 .0 | א ה ר | 14.8 | 618 | |
| ND3 | | | | 41.0 | | 125.0 | • | 5.64 | P 7 | 21.1 | 518 | |
| | . — . | | | 15.0 | | TIT.0 | (| 0.0 404 | | 9.1 | 60% | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 15-61 | | | 34.0 | | 0,081 | 16.1 | 474 | | 17.9 | e e e | |
| ASCE | 18-44 AB-64 | | | 64.3 | 0 0 1 1 | 0.011 | 30.05 | 488 | | 33.4 | 57. 4 | |
| JER | Women | | • | 60.4 | 0.052 | 2.024 | ł | | | 60.4 | \$OOT | |
| GEND | Men | | . (| £.20 T.10 | 171.0 | | 52.9 | 100% | | I | | |
| , YHAL | Balance | | | 1.12 | 100.0 1 | | 27.2 | 484 | a 00 | 50.0 50% | | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville Balance Men | 人名英格兰斯 人名英尔布尔人名格 医人名英尔格尔人名 化分析法医疗 | 56 J | | 301.0 | | 25.7 | 46% | 30.6 | 548 | | |
| ····· | Total | | 113.4 | | 401.0 | | 52.9 | 4/4 | 60.4 | 538 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Total Adults (000s) | The transfer of the | | Men | | | Women | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table AREA Page 36 May 14, 2008

Site Solutions 2008 Greenville and Fitt County Recreation and Farks Survey Conducted April 17 - April 29, 2000 Weighted and Projected Data Tables

Geography

| | | 1 | | н | 0 | | o de C | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|
| | BLIC | | | 60.1 | 245.0 | | 428 | 35 | 58% |
| | USE PUBLIC FOOLS | Yes No | 1 | 51.3 | 151.0 | 8 05 | 608 | 20.4 | 408 |
| | USER N | | 5 | 1.10 | 156.0 | 10 01 | 278 | 27.7 | 73% |
| | м | Yes No | t U C | | 245.0 | 46.3 | 61.8 | 29.4 | 398 |
| | | | 5 |) ; ; | 267.0 | 28.2 | 48¢ | 30.8 | 528 |
| | CHILDREN IN HE | | 53.5 KG N | | 127.0 | | 52% | 25.B | 8 A 7 |
| - | | -, | 39.8 | | 129.0 | 20.4 | 51% | 19.4 | 19 17 |
| | White | 1 | 69.6 | | 258.0 | 32.8 | 478 | 36.8 526 | 5 |
| - | oll rad+ | | 46.E | | 0'R/T | 26.3 | # 0 | 20.3 44% | |
| JCALLON | Some C Coll G | | 24.2 | c v ç | 0.00 | 14.0 | 0 | 10.2 428 | |
| DI | SH≈> | - | 41.0 | 195.0 | 5 | 15.4 278 | | 25.8 63% | |
| - 8 | 65+ | | 15.0 | 0 111 |) ; ; | 6.4 438 | | 8.7 578 | |
| ASCRIBED AGE | 45-64 | | 34.0 | 180.0 | | 13.4 39% | | 20.7 618 | |
| ASCR | 18-44 45-64 | | 64.3 | 110.0 | | 36.6 57% | 1 | 43% | |
| ER I | Women / | | 60.4 | 230.0 | 1 | 30.6 518 | 0 00 | 867 | |
| GENDER | | | 5.20 | 171.0 | | 7.07 865 | 0 20 | 518 | |
| Н | alance | r 1 | 6.7C 7.1C | 100.0 171.0 | | ı | 57.1 | 100% | |
| GEOGRAPHY | Total G'ville Balance Men | с Т. | 7 | 301.0 | 5 5 5 | 300T | ł | | |
| | Total { | 113.4 | | 401.0 | 56.3 | 508 | 57.1 | 50% | |
| | | s) | | | | | | | |
| | | Total Adults (000s) | CF INTERVITED | | Greenville | | 906 | | |
| | | Tota | 40 # | | Gree | | Balance | | |

City of Greenville Recreation & Parks

Dream Park Renovation Survey Results

Survey Summary:

The Survey was conducted to support the Comprehensive Master Plan (as permitted per Page 30 of the PARF Grant Application, *stating "The (survey) may be a part of the system-wide comprehensive plan"*).

As noted in the provided survey summary, this survey shows a broad level of support for Recreation & Parks generally, and it shows specific support for the development of more neighborhood/mini parks. The survey results that are directly related to the Dream Park Renovation are related below:

Enclosure: Survey results from the Comprehensive Park Master Plan

- Page 2-4: Confidence level of survey
- Page 2-5: Survey results show that the public is most interested in using public parks for walking, jogging, and bicycling. The proposed ADA accessible trail surrounding the park would allow for such activities.
- Page 2-5: Swimming also ranked as a high interest. The addition of a sprayground to the park is a major component in the project.
- Page 2-6: 75% support additional water based activities. The sprayground would provide an alternative to swimming pools.
- Page 2-6: 72% support athletic fields. The project will construct a multi-purpose field.
- Page 2-7: Greenville residents... "agree that there is a need for park improvements (nearly 90% of those responding said there was at least some need for additional public parks)". This project provides a major park improvement.
- Page 2-9: There is a great need for facilities in West Greenville to be improved in order to make facilities equitable and bring more recreational activities in poorer neighborhoods.
- Page 2-17: As part of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, "a summary of proposed improvements/recommendations to be included in the Master Plan... Major Development of the Following Parks: Mini Parks and Splash Pads".

Population Projections

There has been significant growth in Greenville's population since 1990. In the past eighteen years, the City's population has gone from 46,000 to 72,000; a 56% increase. This growth has been spurred by the expansion of the University and the Medical Center. This rapid rate of growth is expected to continue over the next twelve years (2020). The City's Community Development Department has projected that the City will have a population of 106,000 by 2020. This projection is based on a departmental study of the community's growth with particular emphasis on new utility connections. This increase in population is significantly greater than the proposed population projections used in the development of the 2000 Comprehensive Plan. The 2000 Plan projected a \pm 2% annual growth rate that ultimately resulted in a projected 2020 population of 86,398; roughly 20,000 less than the current population projection.

Public Input

Perhaps the most important step in the planning process is obtaining an understanding of the public's needs and desires for park and recreation programs and facilities. As part of this planning process, the Recreation and Parks Department staff and the planning consultant (Site Solutions) developed a methodology for gathering input from the public. Several methods were used to ensure the public was offered an opportunity to speak. The public input process included:

Public Survey

As a means of determining the public's preferences for park and recreation facilities and programs, a telephone survey was conducted using a standard questionnaire. The survey was developed and administered by Clark and Chase Research, Inc., a Charlotte based market research firm. Household selection was accomplished through a random sample of published telephone numbers throughout Pitt County.

During the spring of 2008, a total of 401 telephone interviews were conducted. The adult in the household was randomly selected to ensure that men and women of all ages were represented in the sample. Data was broken down into two geographic areas: Greenville city limits and the remainder of Pitt County. Because the primary focus of this planning study is the City of Greenville, the majority of responses (301) came from city residents.



Based on the methodology used, the study resulted in a maximum sampling error of \pm 4.9 percentage points at a 95% confidence level for the study. The following findings were from the survey:



Importance of Parks

Almost everyone interviewed (97%) felt that recreation areas and parks enhance the physical and mental well being of the community. Nine out of ten interviewed (89%) felt parks enhance the economic health of the community and 80% of those interviewed felt parks and recreation programs help reduce crime.

89% of the survey sample felt there is at least some need for additional public parks and recreation facilities; 45% of those interviewed felt the need is great. The responses to this series of questions was consistent between both City and County residents. Non-whites (69%), households with children (56%), individuals aged 18-44 (56%), and park users (52%) were more likely to indicate there is a "great need" for additional parks.

Utilization of Public Parks

Two-thirds of all County residents have used a park or recreation area in the past year. Greenville residents visit parks more than County residents (82% vs. 51%). Families with children (78%), individuals 18-44 years of age (82%) and college graduates (80%) were the heaviest users of parks.

Among those who have visited a park in the last year, the majority have visited parks more than five times. The most popular park in the area is Elm Street Park. Almost onefourth of all park users have visited Elm Street Park this year. River Park North was the second most popular park.

Adults who do not currently use public parks said their primary reasons for not doing so was lack of desire (20%) or lack of time (18%).

Park Activities and Recreational Facilities

Respondents indicated that they are most interested in using public parks for walking, jogging, and bicycling (90%). There was also a high demand for fitness activities and for festivals and concerts, and swimming received significant support (70%). While there is still considerable demand for organized athletics, these recreational activities did not rank as high as other park uses. Of all organized sports, basketball (63%) and baseball (55%) ranked the highest. Overall, there was very little difference in responses between Greenville and County residents on this question.



When asked about what other recreational facility they would like to see, 91% of those surveyed indicated they would like to see more greenway development and 82% felt open space should be increased. Community recreation centers received 82% support, while 75% said they would like additional water based activities. Responses from both City and County residents were very similar on this question.

Public Swimming Pools and Aquatics Activities

Over half of those responding (53%) said that they did not use public swimming pools. Greenville residents (55% vs. 36%) were more likely to use a public swimming pool. It is assumed this greater use is because the public pool is located in the city. Usage of City Pool is greatest among non-whites (38%), households with children (33%), and park users (33%).

More than six in ten adults (63%) have used the Tar River for recreation. Park users (76% vs. 36%) are the most likely to use the river for recreation.

Satisfaction with Recreation and Parks

When asked about the level of satisfaction with the public parks in the area, fifty percent of the respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the public parks in their area. Satisfaction was highest among respondents 65 and older. Approximately 10% of those responding said they were not satisfied at all with existing public recreation. Those living outside Greenville were most likely to express dissatisfaction with public recreation services.

Funding Recreation and Park Facilities

The majority of those interviewed (60%) felt that current taxes should be utilized to fund parks. Only one in four (25%) expressed support for funding parks with new taxes. County residents were less likely to express support for new taxes to fund parks and recreation than Greenville residents.

When asked directly whether they would support a bond referendum to develop new and existing parks, seven in ten (69%) said they would support a park bond. Support was significantly higher (79%) among Greenville residents than County residents (58%).

A graded scale was used to ask respondents how much they would be willing to pay on an annual basis to improve recreation and park facilities. Twenty-five percent of those interviewed said they would be willing to spend \$200 or more annually for better parks. At the other end of the spectrum, forty-five percent said they would only pay \$25 or less per year. Those with children, park users, and individuals 18-44 expressed the greatest willingness to pay for park improvements.

Summary

The people of Greenville believe that parks and recreation programs and facilities benefit the community. They also agree that there is a need for park improvements (nearly 90% of those responding said there was at least some need for additional public parks).

Respondents spoke strongly for the desire to walk, jog, and bicycle. Likewise, there was strong support for using parks for passive recreation, special events, and preservation of green space. On the active side of recreation, there was strong demand for fitness and aerobic activities, but less support for team sports (football and soccer). With regard to water based recreation, there was demand shown for swimming in the question regarding desired activities. However, use of the City's existing swimming pool (City Pool at Guy Smith Park) is not popular.

Finally, with regard to willingness to pay for new park facilities, the majority of citizens are not supportive of new taxes for parks, but would overwhelmingly (79% of City residents) support funding park improvements with bonds. Almost a quarter of those interviewed said they would be willing to pay \$200 annually to support new parks. Conversely, almost half of those said they were



willing to pay only \$25 or less annually, or were not sure what they were willing to pay.

Stakeholder Interviews

As part of this planning effort on March 25th and May 7th, one-on-one interviews were conducted with fourteen stakeholders. The purpose of these interviews was to gain important insight into the specific needs of various park user groups and community advocates for park and recreation. The interview findings are very insightful and represent a wide-spectrum of public and private interests. Views expressed during these interviews provided an important backdrop for the development of this Comprehensive Recreation and Parks Master Plan.

The following citizens/stakeholders were asked to share their views:

| S | nare their views: | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------|
| | Mark Gillespie | Parks Superintendent |
| | Shana Kriewall | Recreation Superintendent |
| | Larry Spell | City Councilman/Parks and |
| | | Recreation Liaison |
| | Thomas Moton | Assistant City Manager |
| | Wayne Bowers | City Manager |
| | Merrill Flood | Community Development |
| | | Director |
| | Sandy Steele | Recreation and Parks |
| | | Commissioner |
| | Dr. Patricia C. Dunn | Mayor |
| | Max Joyner, Jr. | City Council Member |
| | Rose Glover | City Council Member |
| | Bryant Kittrell | City Council Member |
| | Ray Craft | Former City Council Member |
| | Dr. Nelson Cooper | East Carolina University |
| | Dr. Jimmie Grimsley | Retired East Carolina |
| | | University Professor |
| | Denise Walsh | Uptown Greenville |
| | Debbie Vargas | Director, Greenville |
| | | Convention and Visitors |
| | | Bureau |
| | David McRae | Chief Executive Officer, |
| | | University Health Systems of |
| | | Eastern Carolina |
| | William Brian Floyd | Vice President, |
| | | Cardiovascular Services, |
| | | University Health Systems of |
| | | Eastern Carolina |
| | | |

Each interviewee was asked a list of questions regarding the community, current parks and recreation services, and their vision of the department for the future. There was an overall agreement and similarity in many of the responses. The following is a summary of these one-on-one conversations:

1. What do you like most about living in Greenville?

Almost everyone interviewed spoke of the value of living in a community with an outstanding university. The university attracts a diverse population of educated, sophisticated, and worldly people. These people help create a city with lots of cultural activities and a metropolitan feel. This gives Greenville a large town feel, without "big city" problems.

Many also mentioned wonderful natural resources of open space, the Tar River, and rural character of the surrounding landscape. Likewise, many mentioned the parks and facilities offered by the Recreation and Parks Department as a valuable community asset.

2. What do you like least?

Several people mentioned that while the city is rich in diversity, this diversity sometimes leads to segregation between groups of people. Likewise, there is sometimes a differentiation between Greenville natives and those moving into the community.

Several people pointed out the City's lack of sidewalks and trails. Greenville is not a walkable community.

The importance of "smart growth" was mentioned several times during the interviews. It was also mentioned that recent growth has resulted in traffic congestion.

A number of intervewees noted that while "metropolitan" in many ways (see answers in question number 1), as a relatively small city, Greenville lacks some of the retail and entertainment opportunities found in larger cities.



Youth sports, and associated tournaments, can be a source or economic development.

3. What role do local parks and recreation offerings (facilities and programs) play in the quality of life for the community?

Everyone interviewed felt the Recreation and Parks Department provides both programs and services that are meeting many of the community's needs, and as a result, are critical to the excellent quality of life found in the community. Several people mentioned the quality of youth athletics, particularly youth baseball.

The value of the department goes beyond "play" value. Greenville's quality programs and parks make the city attractive to businesses and adds to the economic vitality of the community. Likewise, youth sports, and associated tournaments, bring people to Greenville, also adding economic development.

4. What role should they be playing?

Most people interviewed felt the City's Recreation and Parks Department is doing a good job providing both facilities and programs. It was generally felt that the Department should continue to be responsive to citizen needs, constantly try to improve upon the delivery of recreation services, and improve existing facilities (where needed) and expand facilities and services as the city grows.

Several people expressed the importance parks and recreation programs can, and should, play in bringing diverse groups together.

5. What things are the Greenville Parks and Recreation Department doing right (facilities and programs)?

The following accomplishments were listed as "done right":

- Extremely strong sports program; particularly youth programs
- A variety of excellent, well maintained facilities
- Strong senior programs
- Some internal procedures very strong (risk management and safety programs)
- Development of soccer complex was a big step
- Strong arts and crafts program
- Department is visible within the community; good public relations and marketing

6. What things could be improved?

- Need good and equitable distribution of facilities throughout the city
- Many suggested expanding greenways, trails, sidewalks; implement recommendations from the Greenway Master Plan
- Expanding facilities in perimeter areas of the city will help meet future needs
- Greenville is growing; need to plan for growth with land acquisition and facility development
- New neighborhood parks are needed; several stakeholders suggested requiring developers to dedicate land or make payment in lieu of dedication would facilitate these parks; others were against this approach
- Identify those who are not currently using parks and determine why they do not use the system
- Vandalism in some parks is a problem that needs to be addressed
- The Department's marketing efforts should be expanded
- More interaction between the City's recreation centers; this may be an avenue for bringing diverse groups together
- Facilities in west side need to be improved. Parks throughout the city should be equitable.

7. In the next ten years, Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department should:

- Determine existing and future needs for parkland and facilities, prioritize those needs, and begin now to purchase land for future parks
- Strive for greater equity of facilities among all sections of the city
- Improve some internal operations of the department; establish more standardized procedures
- Develop a city wide greenway system
- Develop a major park in each quadrant of the city
- Expand the city's aquatic program/facilities (mentioned several times)
- Construct several spraygrounds
- Provide an inclusive method of meeting special population needs
- Encourage community to take more ownership of parks
- Improve facilities in poorer neighborhoods
- Improve existing recreation centers
- Possible need for new recreation centers
- Parks can play an important role in downtown revitalization. Civic parks downtown provide a sense of place. Town Common is an excellent green space, but could be even better.
- Expand links to Tar River
- Review 100% Cost Recovery Policy
- Expand special events oriented around active recreation. This should go beyond softball and soccer tournaments but should include 10ks, walk-a-thons, etc.



Spraygrounds provide an alternative to swimming pools.

8. As the largest parks and recreation department in Pitt County, Greenville currently provides park facilities and programs for citizens who live both within and outside city limits. What role should Greenville play in providing services to non-city residents and how should the City work with Pitt County in coordinating county-wide services?

Everyone interviewed felt there should be communication and cooperation between the City and County departments to ensure that duplication of services and facilities is minimized. It is important to recognize that county needs (more rural) are different than city needs (more urban); therefore, focus of departments will be different.

It was noted by several stakeholders that many County residents are using City facilities.

There are many opportunities where the City and County could work together on programs; for example, Senior Olympics and Special Olympics. Greenways and trails are another area that should have a strong link.

There are no written agreements to outline roles and responsibilities since 1993. Written agreements between the two departments should be developed and executed.

While it was mentioned in several interviews, no one suggested a merging of the two departments.

9. What role should Pitt County Schools be playing in providing opportunities for park and recreation activities?

Everyone interviewed agreed that the Recreation and Parks Department and the school system should be working together on joint use of facilities whenever possible. This will lead to the best use of public funding for facilities.

Many stakeholders pointed out that school recreational facilities are not adequate for school or recreational use.

Written joint use agreements should be established between the schools and the Recreation and Parks

Department. There are some good joint use programs going on (City uses school buses for summer programs). These should be built upon.

Staff Meeting

Members of the Greenville Recreation and Parks Department met with the planning consultant on Wednesday, May 7th to review the master plan process and discuss ways to make the master plan relevant and useful. The meeting began with an overview of the planning process and schedule. Staff members seemed very supportive of the master plan process and were actively engaged in discussions about the Department; how to build on its success, and how to improve in areas of need.

Following the discussion of the planning process, the group went through a series of open-ended questions about current programs and facilities and goals for the future. The following questions were asked and comments made:

What things are the Greenville Recreation and Parks Department doing right (facilities and programs)?

- Baseball programs are some of the best anywhere.
- The Department offers a wide variety of programs.
- Outstanding special use facilities. A municipal golf course and tennis center in a city the size of Greenville is an accomplishment.
- Outstanding playgrounds. They are up to date and well maintained.
- Lawns and grounds are well maintained.
- Programs for special populations have grown.
- Senior citizen programs with County.
- The Department is working with other agencies to provide programs and services but could expand/build relationships with the County parks department and ECU.
- Greenville has one of the best departments in the region. People from outside the area recognize Greenville as a leader in the parks and recreation field.

What things could be improved?

- Marketing of the Department's facilities, programs, and accomplishments should be improved. A marketing position should be added to the Department. It was noted that public information sent through the City's Public Information Department has improved.
- Information on programs should be sent out (particularly to schools and businesses) in a timely manner.
- Park maintenance facilities need to be improved. The Department's central maintenance facility is old and outdated. Maintenance operations should be reviewed to see if a district maintenance system should be considered.
- Bike and walking trails should be expanded.
- More inclusion programs should be developed. Accessibility of all facilities should constantly be reviewed and improved.
- Ballfield lighting is needed on many fields.
- Bradford Creek Golf Course needs major improvements.
- Maintenance entrances/access in many parks (Boyd Lee & Bradford Soccer Complex) need to be improved.
- Radio communication for maintenance and operational staff needs to be improved.

In the next ten years, Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department should:

- Demand for parks will grow in the next ten years. Retirement of the Baby Boomers, greater transportation costs, etc. will result in more people using parks. The Department must plan for this increased demand.
- Security in parks and on greenways must always be a concern.
- Water conservation will become a critical issue in facility development and maintenance.
- Volunteer programs are a great way to expand the Department while not expanding operational cost. Ways to encourage volunteers should be explored and encouraged.
- Maintaining facilities in good, safe condition is important.

- Better signage is needed in parks. Getting people to parks, and then guiding them through the parks is important. Currently many parks do not have adequate signage.
- Expansion of walks/boardwalks in River Park North will increase use and environmental education opportunities.
- A water park facility would provide a unique special use facility and could be used for revenue generation.
- Develop a system for rotating programs throughout recreation centers.

The Master Plan should include:

- An assessment of operational and maintenance cost of any proposed capital improvement. The Master Plan should not include more new facilities than can adequately be programmed and maintained.
- Recommendations on improvements to maintenance facilities.
- Acknowledgement that staff are the key to success. The Department should invest in attracting, training, and keeping quality people.
- The Department needs to clearly identify their client. City residents vs. County residents.
- A review of other institutions in the service area providing recreational services and facilities and determine if services are complimentary or competitive.



It was mentioned in the staff interviews that more ballfields should be lighted.

Public Meetings

As part of the planning process, three public workshops were held to obtain citizen input and allow a public review of the plan as it was developed. These workshops were held over a period of several months in different areas of the city. The following is a summary of these meetings:

First Public Meeting

The first public meeting to discuss the Greenville Comprehensive Plan for Recreation and Parks was held on Tuesday, May 6th at Jaycee Park. Over 40 people attended the meeting.

Gary Fenton, the City's Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those in attendance, introducing staff and local officials in attendance, and giving a brief overview of the role of the comprehensive plan and the importance of public input in developing the plan. He then introduced Derek Williams of Site Solutions, the park planner for the planning process.

Mr. Williams began the presentation by explaining the purpose of the meeting (to obtain public input) and noted that the meeting was about asking questions and listening. No plans or recommendations have been formulated to date. With that understanding, the six steps of the planning process were presented and findings from the county-wide recreation survey were shared.

Following the discussion on planning process and survey, attendees were asked a series of questions regarding current park facilities and services, and desires for future facilities and services. Attendees were asked to express their preferences on the following questions/issues:

When asked if they had used a public recreation area, park, or trail in Greenville within the past year, everyone attending except one person said yes. Half of those present said they used a park monthly; almost half said they used a park weekly. Parks used included:



Walking, jogging, or bicycling ranked highest in public meetings as an activity participants would most like to participate in.

Paramore Park Greensprings Park Open Space on 33 East H. Boyd Lee Park River Park North Town Common Bradford Creek Golf Course River Birch Tennis Center Elm Street Park Bradford Soccer Complex Jaycee/Extreme Park

Participants were asked to identify activities they currently participated in or would like to participate in. The following results were recorded:

| Walking, jogging, or bicycling | 22 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Golfing | 6 |
| Swimming | 10 |
| Baseball | 1 |
| Arts and crafts | 2 |
| Basketball | 2 |
| Performing arts | 11 |
| Soccer | 2 |
| Nature activity | 23 |
| Lacrosse | 2 |
| Festivals, concerts | 18 |
| Fitness activity | 16 |
| Fishing | 3 |
| Activity for teenagers | 3 |

Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with Greenville parks. Following some discussion on the difference between evaluating the condition and value of existing facilities, and evaluating the overall departmental offerings (whether or not existing facilities are adequate to meet current/future needs), the group decided that the question should differentiate between the evaluation of existing park facilities and an evaluation of whether the current facilities were adequately meeting recreational needs.

| (| Condition | Availability |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| of | ^f existing | of existing |
| | facilities | facilities |
| Very Satisfied | 7 | - |
| Satisfied | 8 | - |
| Somewhat Satisfied | 5 | 15 |
| Not Satisfied at all | - | 8 |

Overall it was felt that there was general satisfaction with many of the department's existing facilities, but the majority of people felt additional facilities were needed. It was noted on several occasions that the department is excellent; staff is "top notch". Lack of facilities is the problem.

When asked what improvements and/or expansions to facilities and/or programs the department should consider, the following ideas were presented:

- Provide large open spaces
- Expand greenways and trails
- Build pocket/urban parks
- Design and build all facilities with safety in mind
- Improve existing facilities
- Need additional swimming pools/water based recreation
- Connect people with parks through greenways
- Provide mixed use/multiple use parks
- Developers should be responsible for providing some park facilities
- Look for 501(C)(3), public/private ventures to build parks
- Light ballfields and courts to extend use
- Provide parks for solitude and nature classes
- Provide a place for astronomy

- Provide equitable distribution of parks in all areas of the city including Afro-American areas
- Develop safe bikeways
- Develop walking trails (mentioned repeatedly)
- Use old City landfill as a park

Participants were asked if they felt the current offerings of the following facilities were meeting community needs, or should these types of facilities be expanded. The following responses were made:

| | Needs | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------|--|--|
| | Expansion/ | Meeting | | |
| | Improvements | Needs | | |
| Greenways, | | | | |
| walk/bike trails | 25 | | | |
| Open space | 25 | - | | |
| Athletic fields | 10 | 9 | | |
| Water based recreatio | n 12 | - | | |
| Community Centers | 13 | - | | |

Overall there was strong support for greenways and open space, with mixed support of athletic fields, water based recreation, and community centers.

Finally, participants were asked how public recreation and park facilities should be funded.

| Current taxes | 25 |
|--------------------|----|
| New taxes | 20 |
| Usage fees/charges | - |
| Government bonds | 21 |

Several people also suggested raising money through donations and corporate sponsorships, and several people said developers should be required to dedicate land and/or donate funding for park development.

When asked how much their household would be willing to spend on an annual basis to improve recreation and park facilities, the following responses were received:

| \$0 | - |
|-----------------|----|
| \$0-25 | - |
| \$25-50 | 1 |
| \$50-\$100 | 3 |
| \$100-\$200 | 6 |
| More than \$200 | 12 |

Following the discussion on the planning process and the response to questions, the meeting was opened up for public comments and questions. Six citizens signed up to speak, but several others also made comments. The following is a summary of their remarks:

Marion Blackburn provided a wonderful description of the city-owned property (120 acres) on NC 33 East/10th Street Extension and the desire to see this property developed as a park with active and passive recreation. Possible uses included:

- Trails
- Tent Camping
- Ballfields (on open fields)
- Picnicking
- Star Gazing
- Environmental Education
- Dog Park

It was noted that this park has received support from many Greenville residents and there are many opportunities for funding this park (Clean Water Trust Fund, Friends of the Park, etc.). Marion appeared to be the designated speaker on this issue, but most everyone in attendance showed support for the development of this park.

Bill All, President of Carolinas Skies Astronomy Club and recent appointee to Greenville's Recreation Advisory Commission, spoke of the need of a "Greenville Family Astronomy Park" to provide a place for astronomy, star gazing and education. He noted the land on Route 33 would be ideal for such a use.

Terri Edwards spoke of the growing popularity of lacrosse and the values of youth sports to the community. There is a growing need for lacrosse fields.

Don Williams talked about the value of parks for open space/green space and the need for places for walking, outdoor classrooms, community gardens, and for unstructured play like hide and seek. Herb Carlton spoke on the value and importance of greenways (open space, exercise, alternative transportation, etc.) He was on the Planning Committee of the 2004 Greenway Master Plan and supports the implementation of the plan. Herb stressed the importance of maintaining existing and proposed park facilities, and the importance of considering the cost of maintenance and operation when planning for these future facilities. He recommended park construction and operation should be based on "green" principles, and include recycling in planning.

Bob Edwards discussed the importance of biking and development of bike trails.

Following the six speakers who signed up to share their comments, a general discussion was held, and many people expressed their views on park needs. Overall everyone was very supportive of the planning effort and felt parks play an important role in the community. As noted above, many of those in attendance expressed strong support for the development of a park on the City's property on Highway 33.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. by Gary Fenton, who thanked everyone for attending and asked them to attend the second public meeting on June 3^{rd} at Eppes Recreation Center.

Second Public Meeting

The second public meeting to discuss the City's Comprehensive Plan for Recreation and Parks was held on Tuesday, June 3 at Eppes Recreation Center. Over twenty-five citizens attended the meeting. Many of those in attendance had also attended the first public meeting on Tuesday, May 6th. In addition to the citizens, the Mayor and several Council members (Council, Glover and Mercer), and representatives from the City's Recreation and Parks Department were present.

Gary Fenton, the City's Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those in attendance and provided a very good description of the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan. He then introduced Derek Williams, Park Planner.

Mr. Williams explained the purpose of the meeting was to gather public input and that it was a continuation of the first public meeting. Further, he explained that much work has been done on the plan since the May meeting, and while a general framework has evolved, all work is in the formative stages. Input from this meeting will guide the plan as it is solidified.

The presentation was a combination of information from the first public meeting (to inform those who had not attended the first meeting) and recommendations for recreation standards to be used in developing the master plan. A general overview of the planning process was given, as well as a summary of the findings from the telephone survey. In addition to the background information, new standards for park development and recreation facility development were provided. Overall, many of the standards and assumptions made in the 2000 Master Plan are still valid. Based on this understanding, there appears to be a need for the following additional parks:

> 1 District Park 2-3 Community Parks 4-5 Neighborhood Parks 12-15 Mini Parks

Next, a list of general observations/recommendations was made. These recommendations included:

- Greenville is rapidly growing. Open space is disappearing. Preserving open space is important. The significance is becoming more apparent as the city grows.
- Many of the facilities in the inner city are in need of improvements/expansion. Park resources must be balanced between improving existing facilities and building new facilities.
- Greenville is not pedestrian friendly. Greenways and trails should be developed to provide pedestrian links between different sections of the city.
- There is a need for an additional indoor aquatic facility.



Expansion of the City's aquatic program and facilities received public support

- There is a desire to develop more neighborhood/ mini parks. Walk-to type parks.
- A marketing position in the department is needed.
- As the department grows, maintenance operations will grow. Currently there is a need for significant improvements to the existing maintenance facility. Future development may lead the department to consider district maintenance.
- The ten-year capital needs for parks will be significant. Partnerships will need to be developed to share these costs.

Following Mr. Williams' presentation, the meeting was opened to the public for comment. Three people originally signed up to speak, but several others voiced their opinions of future park/departmental development. Comments included:

Dr. Melanie Hames spoke in support of developing a public park on the land on Highway 33 and suggested that this future park be connected to other parks and the river by greenways. She discussed the importance of trails and bikeways as they relate to healthy and active lifestyles and that the Tar River is a valuable asset that should be utilized for waterbased recreation.

Ann Weingartz spoke on the importance of youth athletics in developing well-rounded youth. There are many participants in all youth sports and the City has a need for practice facilities and fields. Donna Whitley spoke about the Elmhurst Neighborhood and how it should be used as a development model for future neighborhoods. It has endured as a successful neighborhood for generations. Its success is related to having schools, parks, and greenspace all within walking distance. She feels that neighborhood parks are important and should be included in the plan.

Other Comments made by citizens included:

- The County has many miles of easements along drainage easements throughout the county. These easements, if properly utilized, could provide a county-wide greenway access to the river.
- While the river is relatively shallow and offers only limited use of power boats, it is an excellent water source for canoes and kayaks.
- The Tar River should be utilized more. The quality of the water will support swimming and other aquatic use. Trash, rocks and other hazards are the real obstacle for using the river.
- The importance of developing bikeways (off and on-road) throughout the city was mentioned several times. It was noted that this is not simply a recreation and parks issue, but must also involve public works and transportation.
- A bikeway task force has been established. The Recreation and Parks Department should stay actively engaged in their discussions and promote their efforts to improve the City's bike routes.
- Interconnectivity of parks is important; another reason to build greenways.
- Disc golf is a popular and inexpensive sport. Currently the City has one disc golf course. Others should be developed.
- The buyout property adjacent to the City's new dog park could be developed as a new city park with open space, water access, canoe launch, and fishing dock. River Park South.
- Sidewalks should be built throughout the city. These sidewalks can become part of a citywide greenway that would provide a walkable community and connect parks and other points of interest.

- Preservation of greenspace is important for the quality of the community. Currently developers are building residential communities with no open space or parks. The City should require developers to dedicate land for parks and open space. (This was mentioned by several people)
- The youth tackle football program needs practice fields.
- Councilwoman Glover spoke of her involvement with the League of Municipalities and her trip to California where she saw an outstanding sprayground/playground made of recycled tires. She also discussed the Kaboom Playground in Creedmore and her interest in working with this organization to build parks. She noted there are many things the City (working with volunteers and corporate sponsors) can do to provide parks and playgrounds.

The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m. after more than an hour of comments/discussion by those in attendance. Overall there was very strong support for developing better parks and preserving open space throughout the city. Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton closed the meeting by thanking all of those in attendance for their participation and inviting them to participate in the third, final meeting on June 24th at Boyd Lee Park.

Third Public Meeting

The third public meeting to discuss the City's Comprehensive Recreation and Park Master Plan was held in H. Boyd Lee Park's gymnasium. The meeting was very well attended; over 75 people were present. Many of those present had attended one or both of the previous public meetings.

Gary Fenton, Recreation and Parks Director, opened the meeting by welcoming those present and introducing the city staff, Advisory Board Members, and elected officials in attendance. He then provided the audience with a description of the purpose of the master planning process, stressing the importance of public participation in developing and implementing the plan.

Following Mr. Fenton's remarks, Derek Williams, Park Planner, led those present through a brief review of the planning process and presented a summary of proposed improvements/recommendations to be included in the Master Plan. These recommendations included:

The Acquisition and Development of the Following Parks:

- 15 Mini Parks
- 6 Neighborhood Parks
- 2 Community Parks

Development of the Following Facilities:

Fields

- 2 Adult Baseball Fields
- 9 Youth Baseball Fields (game/practice)
- 6 Softball Fields
- 4 Football Fields
- 8 Soccer Fields

Courts

- 5 Basketball Courts (outdoor)
- 10 Tennis Courts
- 5 Volleyball Courts
- 8 Shuffleboard Courts
- 5 Horseshoe Pits

Outdoor Areas

- 20 Picnic Shelters
- 15 Playgrounds

Trails

- 17.7 Miles of Hiking/Greenway Trails
- 11 Miles of Fitness Trails

Aquatic Facilities

- 1 Swimming Pool
- 3 Splash Pads
- Consider participation in community competition
 pool

Specialized

- 1 Recreation Center w/Gymnasium
- 14 Miles of Blueways
- 1 Disc Golf Course
- 3 Neighborhood Performing Areas
- 3 Off-leash Dog Areas

Major Renovations to the Following Existing Facilities:

- Eppes Center
- Drew Steele Center
- South Greenville Recreation Center
- City Pool
- Highway 33 Community Park
- H. Boyd Lee Park

Consideration of the Following Operational and Relationship Recommendations:

- Increase marketing efforts/add staff position
- Improve/expand maintenance facility
- Add a park planning position
- Research/implement operational and construction measures to make department "greener"
- Investigate "outside" sources to assist in development of parks
 - Public/private partnerships
 - Development community
 - Friends of the parks
 - Corporate sponsorship/donations
- Explore ways to continue and expand joint use opportunities with Pitt County Schools in the use/development of facilities.
- Where applicable, coordinate programs and facility development with Pitt County Community Schools and Recreation.
- Work with University Health System of Eastern Carolina in developing programs that promote healthy lifestyles.
- Work with the task force on development of bikeways throughout the community

Following the presentation of these recommendations, the meeting was opened to the public for comment and discussion. Nine people signed up to speak and the following comments were made:

Bill All spoke in support of the development of a site for stargazing and astronomy would provide a valuable program/educational element to the City's park offerings. The City's property on Highway 33/10th Street Extension would be ideal for this park use.

Tony Parker spoke in support of developing a park on the City property on Highway 33.

Ginny Cooper spoke on behalf of Greenville's population with special needs. Speaking as a mother of a child with special needs, she asked that the Department seek advice and work with parents and caregivers as they plan and develop programs and facilities. It was noted that the Department once had excellent service/support for citizens with special needs, but currently is not as actively engaged with this segment of the population. In summary, the Department should be open to listening to those with special needs.

Ryan Nyquist spoke about the unique opportunity Greenville has to become a major center for extreme sports because of all of the world class competitors that currently live in the area. He praised the City for its support and development of Extreme Park and asked for additional facilities to be constructed as new parks are built.

Matthew Farris gave an excellent presentation describing the sports/activities he enjoys and asked that the City provide opportunities for those activities for all citizens; including those with special needs.

Tammy Perdue spoke of the need for an indoor/ outdoor complex for competitive swimming. The value it would bring as a sport, and the value it would bring as a catalyst for economic activity. She presented a petition of support for an aquatic facility signed by 149 citizens.

Chris Mansfield, from the Tar River University Neighborhood, spoke in favor of developing a park in the City's "buy-out" property adjacent to the Offleash Dog Area (River Park South). He stressed the importance of "connectivity" between parks; through greenways or sidewalks. In addition, he talked about the importance of partnerships for developing the many park needs which have been identified as part of this master planning process. Marion Blackburn spoke in support of developing a park on City property on NC33 and provided a list of potential park uses (see minutes from first public meeting).

Greg Lewis, a member of Pitt-Greenville Soccer Association (PGSA), stressed the growth and popularity of soccer and the need for additional fields. He thanked the Department for the development of the Bradford Park Soccer Complex, but requested improvements to the complex; particularly the need for restrooms. Suggested tournament level soccer facilities would result in more tournaments which would generate economic activity.

The last two speakers did not identify themselves. One spoke of the values of greenways; stressing the importance of safe crossings at streets. The second spoke of the value of the Tar River, and how the City was not using the river to its full potential; recommending the development of river access and of blueways.

Overall, everyone seemed in general agreement with the recommendations that were made. Several people spoke in support of some of these recommendations, and no one spoke against any of these recommendations.

Following almost an hour of open discussion, Gary Fenton closed the meeting by thanking everyone for attending and providing input.

Presentations to Local Groups

()

City of Greenville Dream Park Renovation



Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. Omicron Gamma Sigma Chapter

Full Body Fraternity Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: December 4th, 2011

Time: 3 p.m. Sharp

Location: Fraternity House

- I. Call to Order (10 Minutes)
 - a. Announcements
 - b. Amendments to Agenda
- II. Meeting minutes (Bro. Richard Patterson) 10 minutes
 - a. Discussions, amendments and questioning
 - b. Approval of meeting minutes
- III. Officer Reports 20 minutes
 - a. Financial Report (Bro. ReOtis Anderson)
 - b. President Report

i

iii.

V.

- Dream Park Presentation (summary and Sign-In Sheet)
- ii. Sleep Out for the Homeless
- Social Action (Bro. Kevin Faison) PIA Form?
- iv. Education (Bro. Bryan Goings)
 - i. Clifton Langley Scholarship
 - ii. Carver Day Update
 - iii. Aids Awareness Month (December) Programs?
 - Bigger and Better Business (Richard Patterson)
- vi. Collegiate Report from Xi Nu
- IV. Unfinished Business 20 minutes
 - a. Founder's Day Ceremony
 - i. Proposed Locations of Ceremony
 - ii. Planned Festivities
 - b. 2011 Elections
 - c. NPHC Membership Approval
- V. Old Business (Group Discussion) 10 Minutes
- VI. New Business 10 Minutes
- VII. Prayer and Adjournment



MEETING MINTUES

P.O Box 7207 | Greenville, NC 27835-7207 | tel 252-329- 4567 | fax 252-329-5062 | www.greenvillenc.gov

PROJECT: Dream Park Master Plan

LOCATION: Phi Beta Sigma Inc. Fraternity House PROJECT NUMBER: TBD

MEETING #: Dream Park Presentation - Social Action Committee Presentation MEETING DATE: December 4, 2011 ATTENDEES: See attached sign in log

The Greenville Recreation and Parks Department the Dream Park Master Plan before the Phi Beta Fraternity, Inc. The purpose of the meeting was to get financial and moral support for the project as part of its Social Action and Bigger and Better Business initiatives in the Greenville/Pitt County Community. The following topics were discussed:

Opening Comments (Recreation and Parks Planner Lamarco Morrison)

- 1). The brothers of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. gave introductions and discussed their goals towards improving the quality of life and health in the African-American community. Mr. Ion Outterbridge stated that this project is in line with the fraternity's Social Action initiative under Health & Wellness.
- 2). Mr. Morrison greeted the Social Action Committee of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. and gave an executive summary of the proposed project.

Conceptual Phase (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 3). Mr. Morrison gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the project scope and concepts. The following topics were discussed during the presentation:
 - Existing Conditions Site is 2.64 acres and bordered by residential, commercial, and institutional uses.
 - Initial Project Goals: 1). Bring Dream Park up to the NRPA Standard; 2). Maximize the use of Dream Park; 3). Provide a family friendly park that serves the neighborhood and the surround southwest Greenville community.
 - Stakeholder Project Goals: a). maximize programming space by exploring shared land use with Greenville Community Shelters; b). partner with grass roots organizations to run community programs; c). seek community involvement with the design process; d). explore grant opportunities from local, State and Federal agencies, and e). get input from middle school aged children.

Program Elements were discussed; they include new playground, spray ground / splash pad, multi-purpose field, extreme Park, community garden, picnic shelter, outdoor restrooms, memorial plaza / walk, sand volleyball, outdoor performance space, shared program space w/ GCS & American Legion, improvements to City Pool and miniature gold

12/06/2011

1



MEETING MINTUES

P.O Box 7207 | Greenville, NC 27835-7207 | tel 252-329-4567 | fax 252-329-5062 | www.greenvillenc.gov

Master Plan Process (Lamarco Morrison, Parks Planner)

- 4). Mr. Morrison discussed the master plan process and project schedule
- 5). Mr. Morrison discussed partnerships with other potential donors including Jack and Jill Corporation of America and NAACO, Inc.

Questions and Comments

- 6). Mr. Faison made a motion that Phi Beta Sigma should endorse the project and help raise funding for construction; the motion passed unanimously.
- 7). Mr. Richard Patterson asked about the timeline of the project and when the City was going to submit an application for the PARTF grant. Mr. Morrison responded that staff would submit the application January 30, 2011 and construction could start in August if the City is awarded the grant.

The content of the above referenced meeting minutes are considered accurate, and a permanent record unless a written request for revisions are submitted within ten (10) days of issuance.

End of Meeting
| H:\Dream-Park\Concepts\Phi Beta Sigma Sign in sheet.doc | ` | | Hevin Faison | | China Goines | 2 | 1300 Evenette | | Incise Gorffin | | TheOto Anderson | ð . | I.J. N. OUTTERACID GE | | HUNGER S. Katte | K A A A A | Name & Company | Meeting: Civic Preser | Project: Dream Park | Location: Phi Beta Sigma, Inc. I 804 West 5 th Street Greenville, NC 27834 | Date: December 4th, 2011 | • | Recreation & Parks | |
|---|-------|---------------|---------------------------|-----|----------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| ma Sign in sheet.doc rev 09/19/2006 | | 1110 N1 27878 | 2203 Old Constrause Drive | 134 | X 12 | | I | Creenville NC 27834 | 101 Drive B-9. | Pinetopa No 27864 | P. C. Bar 851 | GREENVILLE NC 21958 | TET Vicky Lane | OVILLINC LISSY | 2000 ST 40,2, Wallhaver Kel | City, State Zip | Address | Civic Presentation Meeting – Concepts Presentation | Dream Park Master Plan | Phi Beta Sigma, Inc. Fraternity House 804 West 5 th Street Greenville, NC 27834 | h, 2011 | www.greenvillenc.gov | 2000 CEDAR LANE GREENVILLE, NC 27835 252.329.4242 F 252.329.4062 | (ITY OF GREENVILLE Recreation and Parks Department Parks Division |
| | | | | | 252-758-5031 | | 252-312-9073 | | 852695-5153 | | | 352 245-0759 Hours | 252-53)-7 206 (all | | | Fax | Phone | | | | | | | |
| Page c´ | | | | | him h - a pueboo can | | iverentechotmail.com | | torice, arthra Bonnellicon | je se | ReOther Anderson a malling | L | | FSPAtterson S1330 Me. co | | | Email | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | Sign-In |

۱

۱ ۴

-

-

.

.

ť

| Iteo2 Stantalli Hit Citx Stantalli Hit Citx Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: Stantalli Hit Citx Image: St | Name & Company | Address City, State Zip | | Phone Fax | Email |
|--|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| | Shuntell Phillip | 1602 west Arlight | Apt 3 creve de se arca | | shedel phillips @ holme ! |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | · · · | | | | |
| | | | 9999-, | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | | · · | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | - | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

1

Page 2

 \bigcirc



Neighborhood Advisory Board Thursday, December 15, 2011 @ 6:30 PM 3rd floor gallery Greenville City Hall 200 West 5th Street

AGENDA

| 6:30 PM | CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL |
|--------------|---|
| 6:35 PM | Approval of minutes—November 17, 2011 |
| 6:40–6:55 PM | Elect NAB member from District 1 |
| 7:00–7:30 PM | Code enforcement moderated discussion David Holec, City Attorney, City of Greenville Corporal Chris Viverette, Code Enforcement Division, GPD Moderator: Carl Rees, Community Development Department |
| 7:35–7:50 PM | Briefing on Dream Park Renovation Proposal Gary Fenton, Director, Recreation and Parks Department |
| 7:50–7:55 PM | Neighborhood Liaison report Progress on media outreach Daily Reflector approved op-ed for March. Send agendas to Daily Reflector news staff monthly. Working with Public Information Officer to feature February district meeting on GTV-9. Recruitment—Goal members for 2012/Neighborhood Watch Proposed schedule (see back) |
| 7:55 PM | NAB comment |
| IV. | ADJOURN |



NEIGHBORHOOD ADVISORY BOARD SUMMARY NOTES THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2011 @ 6:30 PM CITY HALL, 3rd FLOOR GALLERY 200 WEST FIFTH STREET

BOARD MEMBERS/LIAISONS PRESENT:

Williams Gibbs (District 1) Ann Maxwell, Chair (District 3) Laura McKenna (District 3) Melissa Tilley (District 4) Scott Hucks (District 4) Brenda Diggs (District 5)

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

David Holec, City Attorney; Corporal Chris Viverette, Code Enforcement Division, GPD; Gary Fenton, Director, Recreation and Parks Department; Carl Rees, Senior Planner; Laura Searfoss, Neighborhood Liaison/Ombudsman; and Gwen Turnage, Administrative Assistant, all Community Development Department

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Code enforcement moderated discussion

- David Holec, City Attorney, City of Greenville
- Corporal Chris Viverette, Code Enforcement Division, GPD
- Moderator: Carl Rees, Community Development Department

According to City Attorney Dave Holec, Greenville's code enforcement process is as streamlined as possible. Corporal Viverette added that code enforcement officers work to ensure voluntary compliance—remedying the code violation to meet legal requirements—in a number of ways, including making property owners aware of violations and using various notification methods (e.g., certified mail and "knock and talk").

While these legal requirements may differ from neighbors' ideas about "good" property standards, Corporal Viverette stressed the importance of due process as way to ensure fairness when enforcing violations.

Park Trust Fund update

• Gary Fenton, Director, Recreation and Parks Department

Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton presented an energetic update on the city's Dream Park plan—the result of residents' creativity at several well-attended public meetings. Proposed features of Dream Park include a sprayground, walking trails, and space for community gardening—elements that appeal to both youth and senior citizens. Greenville's Recreation and Parks Department staff is working with the Greenville Community Shelter to accommodate its residents' needs as well.

1

Mr. Fenton hopes to raise the profile of Dream Park, as his staff prepares to raise approximately \$355,000 in state grants and private donations (with an estimated city match of \$328,000).

Mr. Fenton also described the delicate balance between creating new parks in growing areas of Greenville and improving older parks (like Dream Park) in established neighborhoods. However, whether creating a new park or improving an existing one, Mr. Fenton stressed the cost of *not* investing in recreation and park facilities, which provide numerous social and health benefits to residents of all ages.

William Gibbs of Greenfield Terrace Neighborhood Association asked where the closest park was to this site and its neighborhood now. Mr. Fenton said the nearest park is Eppes Recreation Center, which is a long walk, especially without an integrated trail system.

Lisa Wilbourne of Eastwood Neighborhood Association commented that she would love a sprayground in Greenville, as she currently drives to New Bern to access one.

Neighborhood Liaison report

- Progress on media outreach
 - 1. Daily Reflector approved op-ed for March.
 - 2. Send agendas to Daily Reflector news staff monthly.
 - 3. Working with Public Information Officer to feature February district meeting on GTV-9.
- Recruitment—Goal members for 2012/Neighborhood Watch
- Proposed schedule (see back)

NAB comment

ADJOURN Meeting adjourned at 7:59PM.

Notes prepared by

Laura Searfoss Neighborhood Liaison/Ombudsman

2

Presentations to Advisory Board

City of Greenville

Dream Park Renovation

City of Greenville **Recreation and Parks Commission** Meeting Minutes Wednesday, December 14, 2011 @ 5:30 PM City Hall – City Council Chambers 200 West Fifth Street



BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

E Freddie Outterbridge, Chair

- Brian Jacobs
- Sandy Steele
- 🗵 Debra Jo Garfi
- Donald Williams

Kandie Smith, City Council Liaison
 Darin White

Matt Smith

Section Francine Taft

- STAFF
- I Gary Fenton
- E Lamarco Morrison
- □ Todd Riddick

- 🗵 Mark Gillespie
- 🗷 Laura J. Davenport

H. Robert Jones, Jr., Chair-Elect

- Shana Kriewali
- Dennis Vestal

MEETING AGENDA, DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS:

The meeting opened at 5:30 PM and the following items were addressed. Agenda items are in bold print with the highlights of the discussion and actions below the agenda item.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Fenton introduced Council Member Kandie Smith as the City Council Liaison to the Recreation and Parks Commission. Thanked Council Member Marion Blackburn for her commitment to the Commission.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the November 9, 2011 minutes:Motion:Matt SmithSecond:Don WilliamsMotion approved.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

V. DIRECTOR'S MONTHLY REPORT

- A. The Beatrice Maye Garden Park Dedication was held on Saturday and reception followed at Sycamore Hill Missionary Baptist Church.
- B. A luncheon was held in November to announce the planned development of the "Partners for Greenville Parks" group, a coalition of "friends-of-the-park type

organizations. Need to establish a board of 9-12 members, then will apply for non-profit status with the IRS. Looking for board members with a diversity of backgrounds. There will be separate chapters and each will have their own board and budget.

- C. Hosted a meeting on Monday regarding the West Greenville Basketball Complex proposal. The basketball complex is an inter-departmental project between Community Development, Police, and Recreation and Parks, as it can represent a neighborhood revitalization project, a crime reduction initiative, and an opportunity for expanded recreational services. The complex will need an adequate operational budget. Also, attended a meeting on Tuesday night regarding the Dream Park Master Plan. Both projects will require a significant investment. PARTF funds will be applied for for the Dream Park; application deadline is January 31.
- D. The department was actively involved in the BMX Jam Fest and the Greenville Gives Holiday event at 5 Points Plaza. Was also part of the Greenville Little Leagues groundbreaking for the stadium project at Elm Street Park, made possible by a generous donation from the Stallings Family, over one million dollars.
- E. Working with Cal Ripken Foundation to make some significant improvements to the Sarah Vaughn Field of Dreams.
- F. Tammy Purdue addressed City Council regarding a development of a regional aquatics facility. Ms. Perdue realizes that the magnitude of such a project mandates that it must be a cooperative effort among City, County, medical community, etc.

VI. STAFF REPORT

A. Shana Kriewall, Recreation Superintendent

- 1. Recreation Update
 - Review of November 11/12 BMX JamFest, 11/13 Cardboard Boat Regatta at GAFC, 12/2 Special Olympics Basketball Skills, and 12/3 Greenville Gives Holiday event.
 - b. MYTE Program at Eppes and South Greenville. Basketball has started and both facilities are now doing Arts & Crafts.
 - c. Tonight is the Holiday Dance for Specialized Recreation at Eppes. Holiday Break Camp at Boyd Lee Park next week and the week after Christmas. The Special Olympics 5 on 5 Tournament in Chapel Hill will be on 1/6.
 - d. Youth basketball at Boyd Lee Park has over 450 participants.
 - e. We will be combining A Celebration of Black History event with Alpha Kappa Alpha's Community Black History Quiz Bowl on 2/18

2 of 5

at the Agriculture Extension Center. Lewis Holloman, now in Senior Programs, is the contact person for this event.

B. Mark Gillespie, Parks Superintendent

- 1. Parks/Golf Update
 - a. On 12/5 Bradford Creek Golf Course Advisory Committee met. A youth program was established last summer with Cornerstone Baptist Church. Using this model, golf staff is looking to expand this program and offer it to the P.A.L. participants. Staff is seeking a grant to secure an instructor for this program. PAL Golf Tournament at Bradford Creek raised \$5,000 for the PAL program.
 - b. Shared pictures of tire cleanup on the greenway, cleanup provided by a group from ECU.
 - c. Issues at the maintenance center continue. Shared a picture of a forklift that was stuck in deteriorated asphalt.
 - d. Lamarco Morrison reported the Drew Steele Center demolition is 95% complete and the new wing will start taking shape. Will also be meeting with an interior designer for decisions regarding furniture, colors, and flooring.
 - e. Evans Park Bridge replacement Received bids within budget, plan to start in January and hope to finish in March. Bank improvements will be made as well. The project should be complete in 90 days.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Operating Agreement with First Christian Church

A partnership has been fostered by Commissioner Sandy Steele with First Christian Church regarding a baseball field they are building on church property. The operating agreement includes Recreation and Parks providing routine maintenance and mowing, and the church is responsible for the construction. There are some unresolved agreement issues, so a motion was made to table this item until the January meeting.

- Motion: Debra Jo Garfi
- Second: Matt Smith

Sandy Steele abstained.

Motion approved.

B. Lease Agreement with Eppes Alumni Heritage Society

The City and Eppes Alumni Heritage Society have had a 3 year agreement giving Eppes Alumni permission to use part of the Eppes Center. This lease was \$1 per year. The Eppes Alumni Heritage Society is asking to extend this agreement for another 3 years at \$1 per year. This item if approved, will go to City Council in January 2012. A motion was made to extend the lease agreement for another 3 years at \$1 per year.

Motion: Don Williams Second: Matt Smith Motion approved.

C. Dream Park Master Plan, Commission Recommendation to City Council Final Master Plan presentation was given last night at the Dream Park Public Meeting. The process included reviewing possible program elements with the community and including the most popular within the plan. Two concept plans were developed. Based on the public meetings, a final concept was determined that includes parking for 25 cars, memorial walk to tell the history of the park, playground, spray ground, shelter, community garden, multipurpose field, and small additional shelter on the grounds of the Community Shelter building. Considering various opportunities for funding – reviewed probable cost statement of \$683,900. Potential funding sources: PARTF Grant, Jack and Jill Corporation of NC, private donations, and City of Greenville match. A motion was made to adopt the Dream Park Master Plan and recommend to City Council to also adopt the Plan.

Motion: Darin White Second: Robert Jones Motion approved.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Department Holiday Luncheon on 12/16 at Bradford Creek Golf Course. All Commissioners are invited.
- B. Currently in the 2nd year of the 2 year budget, and preparing the next biennial budget. Funds will be tight next year.
- C. NCRPA Conference is in November 2012. Dennis Vestal is Conference Chair. Dennis is also chairing the department's Accreditation team.

IX. COMMENTS

- A. Donald Williams asked about the property on Staton Rd. This property is a small piece of land that was donated by the Federal Government. It is not a high priority property.
- B. Debra Jo Garfi Wished everyone a Happy Holidays and looking forward to the luncheon. Would like to assist with transportation planning for the 2012 NCRPA Conference.
- C. Darin White Thanked staff for their hard work. Wished everyone Happy Holidays, thanked families for their donations to support projects (i.e. the Drew Steele Center), and thanked our troops.
- D. Sandy Steele Very proud of community for their help and donations. Willing to help with fund raising for Dream Park.
- E. Francine Taft Commended the department for their hard work.
- F. Freddie Outterbridge Welcomed Council Member Kandie Smith as liaison to the Commission. Complimented the success of the Beatrice Maye Park Dedication Ceremony.

G. Kandie Smith – Thanked staff for the monument at the Beatrice Maye Park and for their hard work.

IX. MOTION TO ADJOURN Motion: Sandy Steele Second: Debra Jo Garfi Motion approved.

 \leftarrow

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lama J. Davenport

Laura J. Davenport Administrative Secretary

22 Local Board Minutes for Adoption/Acceptance of Planning Documents

- Enclosed is a certified copy of the proposed minutes for the January 9, 2012 meeting of the Greenville City Council in which the Dream Park Master Plan was adopted.
- Official minutes will be provided after they have been approved by the City Council.



NEW BUSINESS

• Dream Park Master Plan

Recreation and Parks Director Gary Fenton gave a short presentation on the Dream Park Master Plan during which he explained the Park Master Plan process, which included three public meetings with the local community. Parks Planner Lamarco Morrison led these planning sessions, and subsequently refined the park plan to reflect comments received during the planning process.

As explained by Director Fenton, the components of the park master plan include a sprayground, a multipurpose field, a formal playground area and a discovery playground, a walking trail, and a picnic shelter.

Mr. Fenton stated that the Dream Park Master Plan was presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission at their December 14, 2011 meeting. At that meeting the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the plan.

A motion to adopt the Dream Park Master Plan was made by Council Member Joyner and seconded by Council Member Blackburn. The motion was then approved by unanimous vote.



CITY OF GREENVILLE NORTH CAROLINA

CERTIFICATION OF THE CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that I am the duly appointed and acting City Clerk of the City of Greenville, North Carolina, and as such I am the legal custodian of the Official Minutes and Records of the City of Greenville, North Carolina. I further attest and certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the proposed minutes (or an excerpt thereof) for the January 9, 2012 meeting of the Greenville City Council. Official Minutes can be provided once they have been approved by the City Council.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the City of Greenville, North Carolina on this the 20^{th} day of January , 2012.



Carol L. Barwick, CMC City Clerk

Page 1 of 1