

**Friends of Royal Lake (FORL)**  
**Spring 2022 Community Survey Report**  
**Project Goals, Methods, Analysis and Dissemination Plans**  
June 2022

## Table of Contents

---

Introduction .....	1
Section 1: Project Goals .....	2
Section 2: Data Collection Methods .....	4
Section 3: Information Security and Transparency of Survey Data Resources.....	5
Section 4: Preliminary Analysis and Insights.....	5
Years Visiting the Parks.....	6
Community vs. Regional Park .....	6
Longer Tenured Visitors Live Closer.....	6
Communities Where Respondents Live.....	7
Bringing Children to the Parks .....	8
Attitudes about the Environment, Preservation, and Increased Activities .....	9
Respondents Use the Park for Many Activities.....	10
Responses by Activity.....	10

# Introduction

---

Friends of Royal Lake (FORL) is a volunteer group that works to help preserve, protect, and improve Royal Lake and its surrounding parkland in Fairfax, Virginia. Lakeside Park and Royal Lake Park – both administered by the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) – are the two parks around which FORL’s activities are focused.

Community use of resources in and around the two parks is varied and frequent among residents in adjacent neighborhoods, their visitors, and many who visit from other parts of Fairfax County and the broader metro area.

Park patrons regularly enjoy the natural resources and setting – including the abundance of aquatic- and forest-based flora and fauna. People jog, hike, or walk their dog on the extensive trail system. Children gather on two playgrounds while others enjoy family-friendly activities, such as organized youth sports through Kings Park West Soccer League and Fairfax Little League, and pick-up basketball and tennis on the several courts spread across the two parks. Many bring fishing gear, kayaks, and canoes.

In brief, the resources in and around Royal Lake represent a treasure to individuals who reside in its adjacent communities, e.g., Kings Park West, Lakepointe, New Lakepointe, Bonnie Brae, Briarwood, Glen Cove, Rollingwoods Estates, Village Park, and others.

In Spring 2022, FORL completed its second survey of community members to learn about how they use the park and to gather systematically their perspectives about potential park improvements. The original survey, conducted in 2017, had a similar scope; for this 2022 project, the FORL Community Survey Team members, herein after Survey Team, undertook an extensive design process to bring the survey instrument and data collection methods up to date.

FORL is excited about the opportunity to share analysis from data collected from 433 respondents who completed the survey electronically during a 30-day period in Spring 2022. To set the stage for the analysis of survey responses and the development of an updated vision to inform park improvements for the next decade or more, this document addresses the following four goals:

1. To describe FORL survey goals and how our 2022 efforts build upon findings from the earlier 2017 survey findings and resulting FORL Community Vision Plan, herein after Vision Plan;
2. To explain key portions of the methods used in survey administration and the resulting dataset;
3. To provide initial insights from an analysis of a subset of selected data elements; and
4. To share an early version of a plan for dissemination, addressing how FORL will use survey results to inform FCPA, the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), the Kings Park West Civic Association (KPWCA), community members, and others.

Through this process, FORL intends to inform key decision-makers and other interested parties as they move forward in planning park capital improvements and maintenance efforts.

## Section 1: Project Goals

---

In Spring 2017, FORL conducted a survey of patrons of the Royal Lake Parks to obtain community input about potential enhancements to the park's environment, infrastructure, and equipment. In sum, 247 individuals responded to the 2017 survey.

FORL held a series of community meetings to disseminate results and generate support for a set of goals for park improvement. The report that stemmed from that effort, FORL's Community Vision Plan<sup>1</sup>, was distributed to the Braddock District Supervisor, as well as other key officials at FCPA, DPWES and community-based organizations. The Vision Plan played an important role in informing ongoing investments in park improvement and maintenance efforts implemented by County agencies.

By 2022, many improvements had been implemented and the natural flow of community members into and out of the community had occurred. FORL considered it important to learn about how perspectives of current community members may have evolved and continue to encourage community-based input into the process through which County agencies plan and implement the management of park resources.

### FORL Has Long Played a Supportive Role in Promoting Royal Lake Improvements

FORL's support for FCPA improvements at Royal Lake pre-dates the Vision Plan. Two key areas of FORL support include:

- **Royal Lake Dredging** – Fairfax County embarked in 2015 on a project with costs exceeding \$6 million that both dredged and restored Royal Lake. FORL played a key supportive role in this process. FORL held in-home meetings with key county officials, provided regular updates to the community throughout the project and represented the community at the “Pardon our Dust Meeting” that occurred at the project's outset. FORL was also active in the rescue of freshwater mussels as dredging occurred.<sup>2</sup>
- **Outdoor Fitness Equipment** - In 2016, FCPA and FORL installed outdoor fitness equipment in Royal Lake Park that replaced outdoor fitness equipment installed in the mid-1980s. The project was financially supported by the KPW Civic Association (KPWCA) as well as the Lakepointe, Chatham Town and Village Park communities. Private individuals within the greater Royal Lake community also contributed financially to this effort.

---

<sup>1</sup> The FORL Community Vision Plan for Royal Lake Parks, as provided to the FCPA Planning and Development Division on May 2, 2018, and related materials are available at: <https://www.friendsofroyallake.org/>

<sup>2</sup> Further information on the dredging project is available at: <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/small-lakes>

## Vision Plan-Spurred Park Improvements

The 2017 FORL survey represented a critical step toward the development of the FORL Community Vision Plan, which was instrumental in prompting many significant park improvements during the 2017–2022 timeframe implemented by FCPA, DPWES, and FORL volunteers.

The following is a list of some of the major park improvements that have occurred during this period:

- Installation of steps in several steep areas of the circuit trail adjacent to the Lakeview Swim Club.
- Enhancements in accessibility to the soccer field from the Richardson Drive entrance through removal of overhanging tree limbs and the addition of wood chips to the trail.
- Planting of many shade trees in Lakeside Park adjacent to the picnic area, the baseball field, and the basketball court to make the park more inviting on sunny days.
- Removal of overgrown juniper bushes adjacent to the main park trail from the baseball field to Craven bridge.
- Enhancements to the bridge adjacent to Rabbit Branch.
- Addition of a new circuit trail segment between the Lakeside playground to allow those using the trail to avoid cars in the Lakeside Park parking lot.
- Replacement of the bridge at the edge of the Lakeside soccer field with a culvert.
- Addition of dog waste stations at both Lakeside and Royal Lake Parks.
- Enhancements of the drainage system between Rabbit Branch bridge and the Lakeside Park parking lot.
- Paving of circuit trail segments at both parks in high traffic areas between key park facilities (e.g., playgrounds, baseball field, tennis courts).
- Upgrading the circuit trail with stone dust in several locations to include adding large culverts.
- Extensive removal of invasive plants and substantial replanting of natural species.
- Twice-yearly trash removal by volunteer teams across the FORL parks.

## Spring 2022 Survey Goals

Given these recent accomplishments, we wanted to get structured community input through a follow-up survey in Spring 2022 – five years following the initial effort. 433 individuals responded to the survey during a 30-day period in April-May 2022. Our goal was to elicit broad-based input from two key sets of community members: current park users and residents of nearby Fairfax County communities.

Broadly, FORL had two goals:

- To characterize how each resource is used by community members; and
- To identify and prioritize further potential improvements and maintenance efforts from the perspective of survey respondents at a level of specificity that would support further discussion and potential implementation by County agencies.

## Plans to Disseminate Survey Results

FORL anticipates disseminating using 2022 survey results to update the Vision Plan. We plan to hold community-wide meetings to review survey results and reach a consensus for how the Vision Plan should be updated. We anticipate interacting with key community leaders and groups in this process, including but not limited to:

- Community meeting of Friends of Royal Lake in June 2022
- Braddock District Supervisor – James Walkinshaw
- Leadership in FCPA Planning, Maintenance, and Trails Management and Construction Divisions
- DPWES Leadership in the Planning, Maintenance, and Stormwater Management Groups; and
- The Kings Park West Civic Association and other local homeowner associations and civic / community organizations.

## Section 2: Data Collection Methods

---

This section provides an overview of how the team design the 2022 questionnaire, fielded the survey and structured its analytic process.

### Questionnaire Design

From January through March 2022, a group of six FORL volunteers embarked on efforts that were foundational to this effort. Through weekly meetings conducted virtually via Zoom, the team reached agreement on survey goals, designed a draft questionnaire, conducted field testing and finalized the draft, and developed a broad-based plan for data collection.

Central to these efforts was ensuring that the survey would feature both structured questions with pre-coded answers as well as opportunities for respondents to offer extended comments. Additionally, the team considered visitor use of park resources and structured the survey to allow respondents to answer questions about activities in which they participated or had interest while skipping sections of little personal relevance. For example, if a respondent frequently brought young children to the playground, but was not involved in sports activities, that respondent could answer questions in the playground-related section while opting out of sections about soccer and baseball.

Team members tested sets of draft survey questions in February and March among park visitors at the trails, playgrounds, soccer fields, basketball, and tennis courts. The team wanted to ensure that questions about each key park activity or resource would address both how users currently experience the park and their perspectives about potential improvements.

While questions from the 2017 questionnaire served as a foundation for these efforts, we were not limited by the scope or wording of that instrument in designing the 2022 questionnaire.

The Survey Team finalized the questionnaire in early April 2022, and it is available here.<sup>3</sup>

### Encouraging Park User and Community Response

The Survey Team prioritized obtaining broad-based community engagement in this effort and began publicizing the Spring 2022 survey in January 2022. We sought responses from representative samples of users of each of the park's six types of resources. That is, we wanted a representative sample of trail users to address issues related to trail maintenance while ensuring that a representative sample of parents of Kings Park West Soccer League parents would offer perspectives about their experience.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Spring 2022 Survey Instrument is available on the FORL website at: xxx

Outreach efforts undertaken by FORL Survey Team members included:

- Announcements in community newsletters (e.g., the [Kings Park West Herald](#), the Lakepointe Community website, the FORL Spring 2022 Newsletter, the April edition of Braddock District Supervisor James Walkinshaw’s [Braddock Beacon](#)).
- Emails to Kings Park West Soccer League and Fairfax Little League leaders, who in turn encouraged member parents to take the survey.
- Posts on local neighborhood Facebook pages and on NextDoor.
- A booth at the Laurel Ridge Elementary School Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math (STEAM) Night in April 2022.
- A booth at the KPWCA Egg Hunt on April 10.
- Flyers posted throughout key park locations and at retail locations in University Mall.
- Live interaction with park users on the final two weekends of April, in which the Survey Team asked visitors to scan a QR code that linked to the survey.

## Characterizing Survey Respondents

In aggregate, 433 individuals completed the 2022 survey, a 75 percent increase from 2017 when 247 community members completed that survey. While we did not have resources to develop a sample frame and implement a random survey design that would ensure a representative sample, we were mindful of the value of these steps and are confident that the set of 433 2022 survey respondents is broadly generalizable to the two sets of community members on which we were focused: current park users and residents of nearby Fairfax County communities.

While 433 individuals answered the survey questions, a small number – from one to three percent – did not complete certain questions; this is discussed in Section 4: Preliminary Analysis and Insights). The number of respondents used in each table drawn from survey data is provided.

## Section 3: Information Security and Transparency of Survey Data Resources

---

Through this report and subsequent dissemination methods, the Survey Team intends to conduct an objective analysis across the breadth of available data elements. This said, as with any substantial survey dataset, more analysis can always be conducted to address particular questions of interest.

FORL can make the source data file available upon request. Any personally identifiable information provided during data collection will be removed to ensure confidentiality.

## Section 4: Preliminary Analysis and Insights

---

This section reviews responses from a subset of survey questions. The goal here is to:

1. Review with Survey Team members and FORL leadership the preliminary insights displayed;
2. Assess whether the conclusions drawn are reasonable; and
3. Generate further ideas for additional analyses to be included in early dissemination efforts.

## Years Visiting the Parks

Survey respondents indicated the number of years since they had first visited the Royal Lake Parks. Across all respondents, the median was ten years, and the average was 13.5 years. For analytic purposes, we classified each response into one of five age ranges, as displayed in Table 1. Over one-third (36 percent) of respondents began visiting less than five years ago, while an additional one-third (34 percent) first visited the park 15 years ago or more.

**Table 1. For how many years have respondents been visiting the parks?**

Year Range	Number	Percentage
< 5	151	36%
5-10	74	17%
10-15	52	12%
15-20	35	8%
> 20	112	26%
Total respondents	424	100%

## How Far Do Park Patrons Travel to Reach the Parks?

In the survey design phase, much attention was devoted to thinking through the relationship between where respondents live and the Royal Lake Parks. We did not task questions about a respondent’s address to ensure confidentiality, thus limiting the precision with which we can measure how far each respondent lives from the parks.

We provided respondents with one of three options about how far they travel to reach Royal Lake parks – (1) less than one mile, (2) from one to three miles, and (3) more than three miles. Two-thirds (64 percent) reported that they travel less than one mile. Further details are displayed in Table 2.

**Table 2. What distance do you travel to visit the park?**

Distance	Number	Percentage
Less than 1 mile	271	64%
1-3 miles	121	29%
More than 3 miles	32	8%
Total respondents	424	100%

## Longer Tenured Visitors Live Closer

Comparing the two data elements discussed above, we see those respondents who have been visiting for greater periods of time live closer to the parks in Table 3 below. 72 percent of the respondents who

have been visiting the park for 20 years or more live within a mile, compared to 56 percent among those visiting for less than five years.

**Table 3. Years Visiting by Distance Travelled**

Year Range	Distance		
	Less than 1 mile	1-3 miles	More than 3 miles
< 5	56%	32%	13%
5-10	64%	26%	11%
10-15	69%	27%	4%
15-20	66%	34%	0%
> 20	72%	25%	3%

## Communities Where Respondents Live

There are many communities that are near Royal Lake’s two parks. The survey asked individuals if they lived in any of six named communities. Nearly one-half (47 percent) live in Kings Park West, with the remaining five communities comprising between two and six percent of all respondents.

Nearly one-third (32 percent) reported that they “don’t live in a neighborhood that surrounds Royal Lake” or they responded “other.” For analytic purposes here, we have combined the individuals providing either of these two latter responses.

**Table 4. In which neighborhood do you live?**

Neighborhood	Number	Percentage
Kings Park West	204	47%
Lakepointe	27	6%
Glen Cove	23	5%
New Lakepointe	16	4%
Village Park	13	3%
Bonnie Brae	8	2%
Combined - do not live in a neighborhood that surrounds... and Other	139	32%
Total	430	100%

Consistent with Table 4, Table 5 below shows that those who have been visiting the parks for the greatest number of years are more likely to have lived in a named community. Those who do not live in one of the six communities listed in the survey comprise a greater proportion of those who first visited the parks in the past five years (39 percent) than those who have been visiting for ten or more years (23 percent to 28 percent).



**Table 5. Do you live in a community named in the survey? Years visiting for each subset**

Do you live in a community named in the survey	Number	Percentage	Years Visiting				
			< 5	5-10	10-15	15-20	> 20
Yes	288	67%	61%	65%	77%	77%	72%
No	139	33%	39%	35%	23%	23%	28%
Total respondents	427	100%					

## Bringing Children to the Parks

The survey asked respondents about the ages of any children that they “typically” bring to the park when they come and provided age ranges of 0–2, 3–5, 6–10, 10–13, and 14 or more. About one-half (51 percent) of respondents typically bring one or more children to the parks while the remaining one-half do not. (Table 6)

The number of years visiting the parks is examined for those who reported that they typically bring / do not bring children to the parks in Table 7. Two-thirds of those visiting for less than five years and five to ten years (65 percent and 66 percent, respectively), typically bring children to the park. Those who have been visiting the park for 15 years or more were significantly less likely to bring children to the park.

**Table 6. Do you bring children of any age?**

	Number	Percentage
Yes	219	51%
No	214	49%
Total respondents	433	100%

**Table 7. Years Visiting by Yes / No Bring Children of Any Age**

Year Range	Bring Children?	
	No	Yes
< 5	35%	65%
5-10	34%	66%
10-15	42%	58%
15-20	86%	14%
> 20	72%	28%

## Attitudes about the Environment, Preservation, and Increased Activities

A key survey team goal was to gain an overarching sense about respondent's long-term vision of the Royal Lake parks years into the future. Toward that goal, we asked respondents their perspectives on two questions, as follows:

*When I think about my top goals for Royal Lake, I am especially concerned about:*

- a) *Preserving peace, quiet, and the natural environment;*
- b) *Creating more activities and amenities.*

Among those providing a response<sup>4</sup>:

- 94 percent (318 / 338) expressed agreement with statement a) above; a top goal is to preserve peace, quiet, and the natural environment.
- 39 percent (132 / 338) – a far smaller proportion of respondents - reported that a top goal for the park was to create more activities and amenities. A significantly greater proportion - 61 percent (206 / 338) expressed disagreement with the goal of creating more activities and amenities at the parks around Royal Lake.

When we look at these two survey questions in combination, we see that the most common response was:

- Agreement with preserving peace, quiet, and the natural environment, and
- Disagreement with the goal of creating more activities and amenities.

Over three-fifths of all respondents – 61 percent (198 / 338) respondents – shared this overarching perspective on the two questions related to goals for Royal Lake parks.

Responses to three additional questions about the park's environment and key sanitation topics support the desire to preserve the natural environment:

- **Native plants:** Nearly all (96 percent, or 267 / 277) who expressed an opinion agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: *I would like more native plants to be planted to improve the ecology of Royal Lake.*
- **Garbage cans and pollution:** Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73 percent) agreed cited pollution / litter in or near the lake as a problem that merits attention. Over two-thirds of respondents (68 percent, or 227 / 336) agreed or strongly agreed *that more garbage cans should be*

---

<sup>4</sup> 338 / 433 respondents expressed an opinion on these questions. The remainder indicated that they did not have an opinion or did not respond to these questions.

placed throughout the parks. This perspective was particularly pronounced among those respondents involved in Kings Park West soccer.

- **Fishing lines:** Over four-fifths of those expressing a perspective (83 percent, or 204 / 246) agreed that fishing lines being improperly discarded is a problem. Some respondents offered more poignant perspectives, including:
  - *“Fishing line and hook disposal stations are needed; a lot of wildlife have either died or lost limbs because of the lines!”*
  - *“I would like to see designated fishing areas. I would also like to see PVC collectors for fishing line so people who break a line can put it in something.”*

## Respondents Use the Park for Many Activities

When FORL began the 2022 survey effort, we wanted to understand whether those who came for a particular activity (e.g., a child participating in organized soccer or baseball) or to walk around the main park trail were limited in their interest to that particular activity. The evidence gathered points to the vast majority of park users being interested in many park activities.

Respondents were asked if they would like to complete each of six sections linked to a distinct park activity. The sections included trails, civic activities and Braddock Nights concerns, playgrounds, soccer, tennis or basketball, and baseball.

On average, respondents completed 2.7 sections of the survey, with two sections being most common. Table 8 below provides details.

**Table 8. Activity Sections Completed / Interested in / Participate in**

Number of Activities	Number	Percentage
1	84	20%
2	144	34%
3	95	22%
4	47	11%
5	35	8%
6	20	5%
Total respondents	425	100%

## Responses by Activity

The next several subsections review perspectives across each of six individual activities.

## Trail Use is Most Common Activity

### *All Activities Feature Diverse Park Users – Many Potential Park Improvements Requested*

Trail use was the activity of greatest interest across the 433 respondents. 380, or 88 percent of respondents, completed the trail section. Nearly one-half of trail respondents (47 percent) reported bringing children when they come, while the remainder (53 percent) did not. 82 percent of trail users completed one or more additional sections of the survey, demonstrating keen interest and participation in a much broader set of park activities.

## Drainage a Problem for Trail Users, but Paving is not a Favored Solution

The most common improvements that trail users requested to the trail included efforts to reduce the muddiness / improve drainage following rainy periods. More than four-fifths (81 percent) of trail users agreed with the statement, *“I avoid the trail after a rainy day because it’s too muddy.”* The survey provided an opportunity for open-ended responses.

Three-quarters (76 percent) of trail users agreed, *“I would be concerned about bikers and a loss of natural beauty if more sections were paved.”* Meanwhile, over one-half (57 percent) of trail users disagreed with the statement, *“I would find the trail easier to use if more sections were paved.”*

Several commenters – while finding drainage problematic in areas such as near Shane’s Creek and near the soccer fields – cited recent paving activities as contributing to current flooding and the drainage challenges. On potential solutions, open-ended responses such as, *“The natural surface as is currently in place is ideal. The last thing we need is more asphalt.”* and *“Adding gravel to the muddy sections of the trail would be better than paving.”* were common.

Table 9 provides summary information on respondent usage and perspectives on park trails.

## Civic Events, Social Activities and Concerts

The survey included a section about a range of events that occur on a seasonable basis at the park. This included free Braddock Nights concerts sponsored by the Office of Supervisor Walkinshaw that occur during the summer months at Royal Lake Park, as well as other less formal events (e.g., the KPWCA Spring Egg Hunt and Halloween events, and picnics and parties hosted by private individuals).

This section had the second greatest response rate – 231 or 53 percent of the 433 respondents to the survey addressed this section.

Nearly four-fifths (79 percent) of this set of respondents said that they were likely to attend a Braddock Nights performance in Summer 2022. Nearly one-half (44 percent) said it was likely that they would participate, or had participated, in another civic event in 2022 – including the KPWCA Halloween parade and the Spring Egg Hunt.

Several commenters also provided important feedback, including:

- *“Start Braddock nights a little later so that the sun is behind the trees. Have portable lights that can be set up to mark the paths when the park is dark so folks can exit safely.”*

- *“Moving here only two years ago, I was not aware of events like Braddock Nights. I recommend posting a welcome board with general information to allow new folks to have knowledge of events.”*
- *“I am away most of the summer so do not attend Braddock Nights but I believe it is a really valuable community event and whole heartedly support its continuation!”*

Table 9 provides summary information on responses to this section.

## Playground Improvements

The survey included a section on playgrounds, with separate sections for the two distinct playgrounds – the one at Lakeside Park and the one at Royal Lake Park called Katie’s Playground. Nearly one-half (48 percent, or 208 / 433) of all respondents addressed this set of questions.

The top desire for both playgrounds is a shade structure, followed by permanent toilet facilities. Respondents also expressed a desire for a zipline, as well as for equipment suited to older kids at both playgrounds. Below, we provide responses separately by the two playgrounds in terms of i) physical structures; and ii) play equipment:

- a) Lakeside Playground
  - i) Physical Structures
    - (1) 66% of respondents would like a shade structure added
    - (2) 46% would like permanent toilet facilities
    - (3) 21% would like benches
    - (4) 21% would like water fountains
    - (5) 20% would like year-round porta-potties
  - ii) Play Equipment
    - (1) 47% of respondents would like a zipline added
    - (2) 39% would like play equipment for older kids
    - (3) 36% would like a climbing wall
- b) Katie’s Playground
  - i) Physical Structures
    - (1) 37% of respondents would like a shade structure added
    - (2) 37% would like permanent toilet facilities
    - (3) 22% would like water fountains
    - (4) 20% would like benches
    - (5) 20% would like year-round porta-potties
  - ii) Play Equipment
    - (1) 35% of respondents would like a zipline added
    - (2) 33% would like play equipment for older kids
    - (3) 32% like the playground as it is
- c) Notable responses supporting requested improvements among those who offered additional, open-ended responses include:
  - *“A mesh canopy cover/tent like structure would be so helpful if you do have to cut down trees. Similar to what South Run Rec Ctr has on their playgrounds.”*

- *“Shade is the biggest need, particularly at the Lakeside Park playground where the sun shines on the structures starting early in the morning. Much of the equipment is too hot to play on by 10 am on a hot day.”*
- *“The playground equipment gets very hot and there is no shady place for caregivers to sit and watch the kids play.”*
- *“A real bathroom with toilets and sinks would be a very welcome addition. We’re at the park regularly for soccer and would use the playground more often if there were a bathroom.”*
- *“Actual bathroom facilities (not porta potties) would greatly improve my & my family's ability to enjoy the playground and sports field areas.”*

Table 9 provides summary<sup>5</sup> information on respondent usage and perspectives on the two playgrounds.

## Soccer Field Perspectives

Approximately one-third (146 / 433) of survey respondents answered questions about the soccer field. Of those who responded, over three-quarters (77 percent) either have, or care for, a child on a Kings Park West Soccer team or come to the field to watch soccer practices or games. Desired improvements, ranked by the proportion holding each view, include:

- 56% would like goose droppings to be cleaned up regularly
- 51% would like improved drainage
- 38% would like more grass to be planted
- 31% would like benches added to spectator area
- Although the question was not asked, there is support for trash cans (19 comments about trash or garbage) and benches (5 comments) near the field.

A sample of open-ended responses about the soccer field include:

- *“Kids often leave trash from post-game snacks. A trash can would help provide a designated place for kids to learn to use.”*
- *“I would like a trash can by the benches so our league can throw out trash more easily.”*
- *“Currently the closest trash can is near the baseball field and you have to walk away from your child's game in order to properly dispose of garbage.”*
- *“Plant shrubs and shade trees closer to the lake. The area shows signs of erosion.”*
- *“It seriously might need some native weeds, like clover, wild violets, mixed with whatever grass will grow. The grass doesn't seem to stay too well on its own and some of the slopes are pretty bare and worn.”*

Table 9 provides summary information on soccer field user perspectives.

---

<sup>5</sup> Where the proportion offering a particular response differs between Table 9 and the information written in the Playground Section, the difference is attributable to whether the results were aggregated across the two playgrounds (as in Table 9) or compiled separately.

## Basketball and Tennis Court Perspectives

Just over one-quarter of survey respondents completed the section on the two basketball courts – at Lakeside Park and at Royal Lake Park and the tennis courts at Royal Lake Park. Desired improvements include, by court:

- Katie’s Playground Basketball Court:
  - 38% like the court the way it is
  - 33% would like the court resurfaced
  - 26% would like lines repainted
- Lakeside Playground Basketball Court:
  - 45% like the court the way it is
  - 26% would like benches added
  - 21% would like the court resurfaced
- Tennis Courts at Royal Lake Park:
  - 46% would like the courts resurfaced
  - 28% would like nets replaced
  - 28% like the court the way it is

Table 9 provides summary information on basketball and tennis court user perspectives.

## Baseball Field Perspectives

Use of the baseball field was less common among survey participants than any other specific activity. One-eighth (13 percent, 58 / 433) of all respondents addressed questions about the baseball field. Three-fifths of baseball users reported that they either have or bring a child to the park to practice or play baseball, including those who say they watch baseball from the benches adjacent to the field.

Forty percent of respondents to the baseball section would like better drainage of the baseball field. Other potential improvements cited by respondents include higher fencing (26 percent) and a storage shed (21 percent).

Selected open-ended responses from baseball section respondents include:

- *“The field should be open for use unless there is some definite reason to the contrary. The sign will often inexplicably say the field is CLOSED and NO TRESPASSING. Again, we pay taxes for this field and should be able to use it even if not on a regular team.”*
- *“Remove signs discouraging use.”*
- *“Control of geese needs to be improved.”*
- *“Maybe signs that notify people when practice or game is in progress that they should avoid walking in outfield for their and player’s safety.”*
- *“A net could be added to the top of the dugout fence at a small expense.”*

## Summarizing Participation across Activities

The table below displays, for each of the six park activities discussed above, a summary of potential improvements sought by participants...

**Table 9. Characteristics of Respondents, by Activity Participation**

Activity	Respondents	Brings Children 0-13 to Park		Sections Completed average	Only That Section percent	Most Cited Potential Improvements				
		#	percent							
Trail	380	178	47%	2.8	18%	Muddy when raining - drainage (71 %)	Segmen from lower dam to top of dam (35 %)	Lower dam pathway (33 %)		
Civic / Braddock Nights	231	108	47%	3.4	1%	Plant more grass (33 %)	Picnic (30 %)	Seating (26 %)	Stage (15 %)	
Playground	208	181	87%	3.5	3%	Shade structure (68 %)	Toilet / portapotty (63 %)	Picnic (26 %)	Benches (25 %)	
Soccer	146	118	81%	3.8	3%	Goose dropping cleanup (56 %)	Improve drainage (51 %)	Plant more grass (38 %)	Add water fountain (20 %)	
Tennis / Bball	117	66	56%	4.1	2%	Resurfacing (33 %)	Repaint (26 %)	Benches (24 %)	Maintenance equipment (19 %)	
Baseball	58	41	71%	4.7	3%	Improve drainage (40 %)	Fencing (26 %)	Storage shed (21 %)	Maintenance equipment (19 %)	