



VCU

L. Douglas Wilder School of
Government and Public Affairs

Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory

Henrico County Recreation and Parks Survey Results

July 2022

Prepared for

Henrico County, Virginia

SERL Project #0136

Table of Contents

Organization of the Report..... 1

Executive Summary 3

Technical Summary of Results 5

 Summary of Methods..... 5

 Overview of Results..... 6

 Characteristics of the respondents..... 6

 Use of facilities 7

 Satisfaction with facilities 8

 Use of recreation programs 9

 Quality of programs 9

 Perceptions of value 10

 Barriers to use and participation 10

 Learning about Recreation and Parks opportunities 10

 Accessibility and accommodations 10

 Trails 11

 Bicycling 11

 Open-ended responses 12

Selected Results in Detail 13

 Use of facilities 13

 Needs for parks or recreational facilities 15

 Need for recreation programs 23

 Overall participation in and satisfaction with recreation programs 26

 Obstacles to riding a bike more often in the county 29

 About the responses to open-ended survey questions (Appendix D) 30

Appendix A: Questionnaire A-1

Appendix B: Methods B-1

 Recreation and Parks survey methods B-3

 Overview B-3

 Data collection strategy B-3

 Sampling B-4

 Recruitment and eligibility B-5

 Response and sampling error B-5

 Weighting the data B-7

 Procedures to ensure data quality..... B-10

 Known errors B-10

Appendix C: Data tables C-1

Appendix D: Open-ended responses..... D-1

List of Tables

Table 1: Magisterial districts of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted) 6

Table 2: Race/ethnicity of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted)..... 7

Table 3: Age of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted) 7

Table 4: Gender of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted) 7

Table 5: Concerns with the parks, trails, athletic complexes and recreation facilities in Henrico County you have visited..... 9

Table 6: Parks, trails, athletic complexes or recreational facilities visited during the past 24 months, by magisterial district..... 14

Table 7: Concerns with facilities visited in the past 24 months, by magisterial district..... 15

Table 8: Needs for parks or recreational facilities, by magisterial district 16

Table 9: Mean ratings of unmet needs for facilities 18

Table 10: Ownership of parks or facilities relied on most often by residents 20

Table 11: Top four most important facilities for households, by magisterial district..... 22

Table 12: Need for recreation program, by magisterial district..... 23

Table 13: Mean ratings of unmet needs for recreation programs 24

Table 14: Top four most important recreation programs for households, by magisterial district 25

Table 15: Top four currently most often participated-in recreation programs for households, by magisterial district..... 26

Table 16: Overall participation and quality ratings for recreation programs, by magisterial district 27

Table 17: Barriers to use and participation, by magisterial district 28

Table 18: Preferences for communication, by magisterial district 29

Table 19: Obstacles to riding a bike more often, by magisterial district 30

Table 20: Rec & Parks Survey mailings B-4

Table 21: Response and sampling error by magisterial district..... B-6

Table 22: Unweighted and weighted statistics for key demographic variables..... B-8

Table 23: Unweighted and weighted statistics for additional demographic variables..... B-9

Organization of the Report

This report is a summary of results from the Henrico County Recreation and Parks Survey, a component of the HenricoNext process designed to update the county's current comprehensive plan through the year 2045.

This report focuses on critical findings that offer statistically significant insights on residents' opinions. Data tables containing all survey results are found in Appendix C. Unless otherwise noted, when differences in survey responses across subgroups are discussed herein, they are statistically significant differences.

This report includes the following sections:

- **Organization of the Report** – briefly describes sections and contents
- **Executive Summary** – narrative summarizing the objectives of conducting this survey, the approaches used, and a summary of the responses received
- **Summary of Methods** – briefly describes the methods used in the survey
- **Overview of Results** – summarizes key results overall
- **Selected Results in Detail** – discusses selected key results in more detail, focusing on results by magisterial district
- **Appendix A: Questionnaire** – screenshots of the web-based survey completed by respondents, showing complete question wording and context
- **Appendix B: Methods** – describes the survey methods used to create the random sample and evaluate the results of the responses
- **Appendix C: Data Tables** – includes the results of the responses for each survey question broken out by magisterial district, race/ethnicity, respondent age and presence of children under 18 years of age in the household
- **Appendix D: Open-ended Responses** – a complete listing of verbatim comments in response to the one open-ended question in the survey

The electronic data file of survey responses, documentation allowing independent use of it, and reference data tables in Excel format with statistical significance testing were also delivered as part of this project. These resources, along with the data tables in Appendix C, are available for further exploration and should serve as resources to answer specific questions about the opinions of county residents that are not covered below.

This page intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary

Why the survey was conducted

The survey was undertaken as part of the update of the Henrico County Comprehensive Plan. As conditions in the County are assessed and goals are developed for the future (along with implementation strategies designed to achieve those goals), it is critical to gain understanding of the opinions and values of Henrico County residents. The questionnaire was designed to give residents an opportunity to express their views and offer ideas as plans are being considered for the future of Henrico County.

Note that the survey asked about activities within the last 24 months rather than 12 months to cover time before the COVID-19 pandemic as well as during. The pandemic increased use of parks and trails, and largely prevented traditional programs and activities from being offered.

How the survey was conducted

A sample of 4,000 residential mailing addresses was randomly selected by the county's Geographic Information Systems team. The survey's sampling approach was designed to represent the views of residents in the five magisterial districts of Henrico County: Brookland, Fairfield, Three Chopt, Tuckahoe, and Varina. Within each of the districts, 800 residential mailing addresses were randomly selected to participate in a survey by internet. Using a technique known as weighting, the survey data were adjusted prior to analysis to reflect the statistics known about adults residing in the county. This ensured proportional representation of residents (aged 18+) across three variables:

1. Magisterial district (Brookland, Fairfield, Three Chopt, Tuckahoe, Varina)
2. Racial/ethnic classifications (Asian, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino, White, Missing/Refused, All others)
3. Age groups (18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+)

See Appendix B for more details on the methodology for weighting the data.

What the survey findings reveal

The survey results show high levels of use of Henrico County recreation centers, parks, facilities, and athletic fields. In the past 24 months, the most frequently used or visited facilities were trails and playgrounds. Picnic areas and shelters were also popular. When asked about the physical condition of facilities, 87% gave a favorable response. When asked about satisfaction with facilities and programs provided by Henrico County Recreation & Parks, 80% gave a favorable response.

Regarding participation in the 16 recreation program categories offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks, three were most commonly mentioned: fitness, concerts, and special events.

More than 80% of respondents gave favorable ratings for the overall quality of the programs in which they or household members have participated.

The survey asked respondents to value the importance of funding improvements to the recreation and parks system compared to other priority services in Henrico County (i.e., police, streets, code enforcement, etc.). Three-quarters (75%) of responses indicated “equally important,” while 17% responded “more important” and 8% responded “less important.”

For households that had a member with a physical, sensory, or mental disability, 58.5% gave favorable ratings for the accessibility of Henrico County parks and facilities. For households that used trails, the most common reasons for trail use were exercise, experiencing nature, and recreation. Regarding which types of trails should have the highest priority in Henrico County, responses highlighted trails that link neighborhoods with parks.

Use of recreation facilities varied by magisterial districts. More than 90% of respondents indicated that members of their household visited Henrico parks or facilities during the past 24 months. That figure was under 80% for respondents from the Fairfield district. The most frequently cited reason for not using parks, facilities, or programs was lack of knowledge about offerings. Additionally, 90% of respondents who had used or visited a Henrico facility gave ratings of good or excellent to describe the quality of programs.

Next steps

Results of survey responses presented in this report are displayed in a manner that links responses indicating satisfaction, use, concerns, importance, and needs regarding recreation facilities and programs within magisterial districts in Henrico County. These data sets and accompanying analysis can help provide guidance in determining priorities for future Recreation and Parks initiatives.

Technical Summary of Results

Summary of Methods

Clarion Associates of Chapel Hill, North Carolina (CA) contracted with the Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory at Virginia Commonwealth University (SERL) to execute and summarize a sample survey conducted by internet of the residents of Henrico County, Virginia, regarding their opinions about recreation and parks issues. In this report, the survey will be called the “Rec & Parks Survey.” The questionnaire was constructed as a collaboration among staff at CA, SERL, Land Planning & Design Associates, Inc. of Charlottesville, Virginia (LPDA), and Henrico County government. The survey was funded by Henrico County through an agreement with CA.

Note that the survey asked about activities within the last 24 months rather than 12 months to cover time before the COVID-19 pandemic as well as during. The pandemic increased use of parks and trails, and largely prevented traditional programs and activities from being offered.

The survey’s sampling approach was designed to represent the views of residents in the five magisterial districts of Henrico County as defined by the geographic boundaries that were in place in mid-2021 before redistricting was completed in late 2021: Brookland, Fairfield, Three Chopt, Tuckahoe and Varina. The populations of these districts were roughly equal at the time of the survey (see Appendix B for details).

The county’s Geographic Information Systems (GIS) team created a list of all residential mailing addresses in the county. Each address included a code for its magisterial district. With guidance from SERL, the county GIS team randomly selected the addresses for the survey. Within each of the districts, 800 residential addresses were randomly selected to receive a survey invitation.

Up to three mailings were sent between October 7, 2021 and December 27, 2021, to the 4,000 addresses in the sample inviting them to complete the survey by internet. In addition, respondents who completed a separately-recruited Residents Survey¹ by internet were asked if they would also complete the Rec & Parks Survey.

Overall, there were 778 responses obtained by January 11, 2022, when the survey was closed. After accounting for 375 undeliverable addresses, the response rate for the survey was 18.4%.² The final response total (778) exceeded the anticipated number of responses (650). This response rate is not unusually low or high.

¹ The “Residents Survey” was conducted concurrently with the Rec & Parks Survey. It queried Henrico County residents about issues and opportunities that will influence development of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.

² This response rate was calculated as follows: 778 total Rec & Parks Survey completions / (3,625 deliverable Rec & Parks letter recruitment addresses + 595 Residents Survey respondents by web who were invited to also do the Rec & Parks Survey).

To ensure proportional representation of adult residents of the county, the survey data file was weighted by magisterial district, racial/ethnic classifications, and age groups. See Appendix B for more information.

The sampling error for questions answered by all 778 respondents is approximately +/- 4.7 percentage points at the 95% level of confidence. This includes the effect of weighting the data. This sampling error offers good precision for characterizing residents’ opinions.

It is important to note that sampling error is only one source of errors in surveys. Many errors in surveys are difficult or impossible to detect. Readers should keep in mind the limitations inherent in survey research.

SERL is grateful to the respondents who took the time to provide their opinions about recreation and parks issues in the county.

For more details about the methods used for the survey, see Appendix B.

Overview of Results

Characteristics of the respondents

The survey respondents reflected the diversity of the county, but residents who were 55 years of age or older and white were more likely to respond. The samples in the Tuckahoe and Three Chopt magisterial districts yielded more completed surveys because fewer letters were undeliverable and participation was higher among the deliverable addresses in those districts compared to the others. Using a technique known as weighting, the survey data were adjusted prior to analysis to more closely reflect the statistics known about the age, race/ethnicity, and magisterial district of adults residing in the county. See Appendix B for details about characteristics of the respondents, weighting, and tables with the percentages cited below.

Table 1: Magisterial districts of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted)

Magisterial District	% of Total Respondents	% After Weighting Data
Brookland	21.7%	20.2%
Fairfield	13.2%	19.7%
Three Chopt	25.2%	21.5%
Tuckahoe	24.9%	19.7%
Varina	14.9%	18.9%

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 2: Race/ethnicity of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted)

Race/ethnicity	% of Total Respondents	% After Weighting Data
Asian	6.1%	9.0%
Black/African-American	12.0%	27.8%
Hispanic/Latino	2.5%	4.3%
Multiple races/ethnicities	4.7%	4.2%
White	74.7%	54.7%

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 3: Age of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted)

Age Cohorts	% of Total Respondents	% After Weighting Data
18-34	9.3%	28.2%
45-54	23.7%	16.4%
65+	28.4%	19.2%
The changes in percentages among other age groups were negligible.		

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

Table 4: Gender of survey respondents (percent of total and weighted)

Gender	% of Total Respondents	% After Weighting Data
Female	55.3%	60.3%
Male	43.8%	38.0%
Other description	0.8%	1.6%

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

Use of facilities

Overall, 90.8% of residents said they or members of their household visited Henrico County parks, recreation centers, facilities or athletic fields during the past 24 months. Among those who did visit, 51.5% visited either a few times per month (25.7%) or at least once a week (25.8%). In good weather, almost all visitors accessed local parks by driving (95.0%), while fewer walked (22.9%), biked (12.3%) or used transit (0.1%). Respondents could select multiple modes of access.

The most frequently used or visited facilities in Henrico County in the past 24 months were exercise trails (62.9%), paved trails (54.4%), unpaved trails (46.0%) and playgrounds (42.0%). Picnic areas (38.2%) and covered picnic shelters (38.1%) were also popular.

Satisfaction with facilities

Respondents were asked two questions about overall satisfaction with the county's recreation and parks. Satisfaction was strong in these questions.

First, respondents³ were asked: "Overall, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the parks, trails, athletic complexes and recreation facilities in Henrico County you have visited?" On a four-point scale (poor, fair, good, excellent), 87.0% gave a favorable response, with 23.7% saying "excellent" and 63.3% saying "good."

The second question about overall satisfaction was asked of all respondents: "Overall, how satisfied are you with the parks, trails, facilities and recreational programs provided by Henrico County Recreation & Parks?" On a five-point scale (very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, neutral, somewhat satisfied, very satisfied), 79.6% gave one of the two favorable responses, with 37.1% saying "very satisfied" and 42.5% saying "somewhat satisfied."

Respondents⁴ were also asked: "What concerns, if any, do you have with the parks, trails, athletic complexes and recreation facilities in Henrico County you have visited?" A list of eight possible concerns was presented, along with a ninth choice, "No concerns." See Table 5 for responses.

³ A skip instruction was inadvertently omitted in question 1. As a result, the 9.1% of respondents who did not say they had visited any Henrico County parks, recreation centers, facilities or athletic fields during the past 24 months were asked to rate physical condition of facilities they had visited in question 6, even though they had not visited any. Almost all of the respondents who were incorrectly shown question 6 left it blank. The data for this analysis were set to blank for all respondents who were mistakenly shown this question.

⁴ The same omission of the skip in question 1 affected this question as well (question 5). For this analysis, the items about concerns with facilities the respondents had visited were recoded to blank for the 9.1% of respondents who did not say in question 1 that they had visited any facilities.

Table 5: Concerns with the parks, trails, athletic complexes and recreation facilities in Henrico County you have visited

Concern	% selecting
No concerns	38.7%
Facilities not equally distributed throughout Henrico County	30.7%
Maintenance and cleanliness	27.5%
Outdated equipment/facilities	18.8%
Security or safety issues	16.1%
Lack of access for people with mobility limitations or special needs	13.5%
Lack of facilities to meet your needs	9.9%
Lack of age appropriate park amenities to meet needs	7.6%
Customer service	2.0%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Use of recreation programs

Overall, 29.9%⁵ of residents said they or members of their household participated during the past 24 months in any of 16 recreation programs offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks listed in the survey (Question 10a). The three programs in which residents most often said they currently participate were fitness (59.2%), concerts (40.1%) and special events (36.6%). The next most frequently mentioned program was nature and outdoor classes at 11.8%.

Respondents were also asked to name the top four most important recreation programs for their households. Their responses followed the same pattern. The three most frequently listed programs were fitness (mentioned by 63.5%), concerts (42.4%), and special events (35.3%). Nature and outdoor classes (28.4%) and home and garden classes (24.9%) also were mentioned frequently as a top four most important program.

Quality of programs

Respondents who said they or other members of the household participated in recreation programs offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks during the past 24 months were asked to rate the overall quality of the programs they participated in. The ratings were strong. On a four-point scale (poor, fair, good, excellent), 89.5% gave one of the two favorable ratings, with 61.7% saying “good” and 27.8% saying “excellent.” See Table 16 and the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

⁵ This percentage can be seen in Table 16. It is derived from a separate analysis that counts respondents who participated in one or more activity in the list of 16.

Perceptions of value

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the overall value their household receives from Henrico County Recreation & Parks (Question 17). On a five-point scale with a neutral mid-point, 64.0% gave a favorable response, with 46.0% saying “somewhat satisfied” and 18.0% saying “very satisfied.”

Respondents were also asked: “Compared to other priority services in Henrico County (i.e. police, streets, code enforcement, etc.) how important do you feel it is to fund improvements to the parks and recreation system.” After setting aside those who left the item blank (1.2%) and those who said “not sure” (8.1%) and re-calculating percentages based on the three substantive responses, most respondents (74.7%) said “equally important,” while 17.3% said “more important” and 8.0% said “less important.” See the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

Barriers to use and participation

All respondents were asked what reasons prevent them or other members of their household from using parks, recreation facilities, or programs of Henrico County Recreation & Parks “more often.” The top reasons often related to the themes of lack of knowledge or lack of convenience. The most frequently selected reasons were not knowing what is being offered (52.7%), living too far away (27.6%), a program or facility not being offered (25.3%), being too busy (23.4%), program times not being convenient (21.7%), and not knowing the locations of facilities (20.6%). See Table 17 and the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

Learning about Recreation and Parks opportunities

Respondents were asked how they would prefer to learn about Recreation and Parks opportunities and were presented with a list of seven options and asked to choose one. Email (38.7%) was the most popular choice, followed by website (18.4%), direct mail newsletter/postcard (17.8%) and social media (13.8%). Flyers/posters and mobile app were each selected by fewer than three percent. See Table 18 and the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

Accessibility and accommodations

Respondents were asked: “Do you or other members of your household have a physical, sensory, or mental disability?” and 11.3% said they did. Among these respondents:

- a majority (58.5%) gave favorable ratings for the accessibility of Henrico County parks and facilities, with 50.1% saying it was “good” and 8.4% saying “excellent” on a four-point scale.

- fewer than half (41.8%) gave favorable ratings for how well county Rec & Parks programs and events accommodate the needs for people with disabilities, with 39.4% saying “good” and 2.4% saying “excellent” on a four-point scale.

Ratings from respondents with a disabled household member were lower for their impressions of accessibility compared to respondents without a disabled household member⁶ – 58.5% favorable vs. 81.9%. Similarly, ratings from respondents with a disabled household member were lower for how well Henrico County Recreation & Parks programs and events accommodate the needs for people with disabilities compared to respondents without a disabled household member – 41.8% favorable vs. 66.6%. These differences were statistically significant.

Trails

The most common reasons for using trails in Henrico County were exercise (81.8%), experiencing nature (69.2%) and recreation (57.5%). Respondents could select more than one reason.

The two most-preferred types of trails were “wide, paved shared-use paths (easy for walking and biking)” (43.7%), and “a mixture of trail types (provides options and choices)” (41.1%).

The most-preferred trail difficulty was “a mixture of difficulties (provides options and choices)” (40.0%), with “moderate challenges with fewer and smaller hills” (27.0%) and “flat paths that allow for easy walking and biking” (26.0%) also mentioned frequently. Least popular was “challenging terrain with hills” (7.0%).

Respondents were also shown six types of trails or pathways and asked which two should have the highest priority in Henrico County. By far the most popular choice was trails that link neighborhoods with parks (61.9%). Trails that link neighborhoods with places of employment were least popular by far (3.6%). See the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

Bicycling

Overall, 42.7% of residents said they ride bicycles in Henrico County. Among those riders, issues related to safety and lack of infrastructure were the most frequently perceived obstacles to riding more often: safety and security (60.6%), lack of bike lanes (57.1%), bad driver behavior (55.5%), lack of bike trails (51.0%) and unsafe roads (46.3%) were the most frequently mentioned obstacles. See Table 19 and the appropriate tables in Appendix C for more details.

⁶ The two questions that asked for ratings of accessibility and accommodations were supposed to be skipped for the 88.7% of cases who did not say that they or other members of their household had a physical, sensory, or mental disability, but this skip instruction was inadvertently omitted from the web survey. However, that omission allowed for this comparison of these ratings. For other portions of this report, the dataset was recoded so that respondents who should have skipped the question were set to blank for these ratings.

Open-ended responses

The open-ended (written, verbatim) responses contributed by the respondents cover a range of concerns and suggestions. Readers can review the full responses firsthand in Appendix D.

Selected Results in Detail

Presented in more detail below are items from the questionnaire which SERL determined to be most noteworthy after reviewing statistically significant differences as well as broader patterns in the data. The data tables in Appendix C can be consulted for additional details on these items as well as other data not discussed in this report.

Use of facilities

Although 90.8% of all residents said they or members of their household visited Henrico parks, recreation centers, facilities or athletic fields during the past 24 months, only 79.9% of residents in the Fairfield magisterial district said they had done so. This was significantly fewer than the other magisterial districts, all of which had percentages greater than 90%.

The visitation percentage for white residents of the county (94.1%) was significantly greater than the percentage for Black/African-American residents (81.3%). The percentage for males (88.7%) was very similar to the percentage for females (92.0%). The percentage for residents with children under 18 living at home was significantly greater than those without children under 18 living at home – 97.5% compared to 87.4%. Visitation for those aged 55-64 (82.1%) and 65 or older (81.9%) was significantly lower compared to those aged 18-24 (98.5%) and 35-44 (97.3%). The visitation percentage for those aged 45-54 was at 91.2%, near the countywide figure. See the data tables in Appendix C for these details.

Respondents who answered in Question 1 that they or members of their household had visited Henrico parks, recreation centers, facilities or athletic fields during the past 24 months were asked in Question 4 to indicate which types of places they had visited, using a list of 28 choices. Exercise trails (65.6%), paved trails (57.2%), unpaved trails (48.9%), playgrounds (43.3%), covered picnic shelters (40.0%) and picnic areas (39.8%) were most frequently chosen.

The use of these facilities in the past 24 months was fairly consistent across magisterial districts. Exceptions included:

- Cricket fields were more popular in Three Chopt
- Boat ramps and indoor fitness centers were more heavily used in Varina
- Paved trails were least used in Fairfield
- Recreation centers were more popular in Varina and Fairfield
- Tennis courts were more heavily used in Three Chopt
- Unpaved trails were more popular in Three Chopt and Tuckahoe.

See Table 6, which is sorted by the total percentage saying they visited the facility in the past 24 months.

Table 6: Parks, trails, athletic complexes or recreational facilities visited during the past 24 months, by magisterial district

Parks, trails, athletic complexes or recreational facilities visited during the past 24 months	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Exercise Trails	65.6	62.8	62.5	71.4	69.3	60.6
Paved Trails	57.2	53.1	37.7	60.7	73.3	58.4
Unpaved Trails	48.9	45.2	41.9	59.1	57.8	37.7
Playgrounds	43.3	49.9	32.0	48.3	44.3	39.5
Covered Picnic Shelters	40.0	44.2	39.1	42.2	33.0	40.9
Picnic Areas	39.8	43.5	40.8	42.5	35.0	36.8
Multi-Purpose Fields (Football, soccer, lacrosse, etc.)	30.7	26.0	29.6	26.5	40.0	32.1
Historic Sites/Museums	29.5	34.5	27.7	27.9	29.5	27.6
Nature Centers	29.5	37.7	34.1	25.5	31.2	19.4
Dog Parks	27.2	24.2	23.1	27.5	28.8	32.3
Recreation Centers	21.5	18.2	29.7	11.6	12.0	39.2
Boardwalk	16.4	13.2	17.4	13.7	24.6	13.4
Baseball/Softball Fields	14.3	16.9	14.3	8.7	13.9	18.5
Basketball Courts	11.1	13.4	16.7	8.7	9.3	8.1
Canoe/Kayak Launch	10.1	9.7	8.4	6.6	12.0	14.4
Tennis Courts	10.1	9.9	2.9	17.5	6.9	11.4
Indoor Fitness Facility	9.8	10.6	12.9	6.4	4.0	16.4
Boat Ramps	9.7	7.4	5.0	5.2	11.6	20.0
Indoor Gyms	8.7	12.3	8.8	6.6	6.4	9.7
Spray Park	8.7	12.4	5.7	10.4	6.9	7.1
Performing Arts Centers	7.6	9.3	4.7	10.1	7.5	5.8
Disk Golf	7.3	11.9	3.1	9.0	7.8	3.6
Pickleball Courts	4.8	3.0	0.0	11.0	3.9	4.9
Pump Track	4.8	6.0	0.0	6.9	6.4	3.7
Sand Volleyball Courts	2.5	1.1	0.4	7.1	1.0	2.3
Skate Park	2.4	2.0	3.8	2.5	1.7	2.2
Cricket Fields	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.7	0.0
Horse Trail & Ring	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.5	1.2

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

In Question 5, respondents who said they or members of their household visited Henrico parks, recreation centers, facilities or athletic fields during the past 24 months were asked what concerns they had with the facilities they visited and presented with a list of eight possible concerns including a choice for “No concerns.” After “No concerns” (38.7%), the most frequently mentioned concern was an unequitable distribution of facilities throughout the county (30.7% overall). Varina residents mentioned this concern more frequently than residents of

Tuckahoe and Three Chopt. These differences were statistically significant. Otherwise, difference in concerns by magisterial district did not reach statistical significance. Customer service (mentioned by only 2.0%) is clearly not a source of concern. See Table 7, which is sorted by the total percentage mentioning the concern.

Table 7: Concerns with facilities visited in the past 24 months, by magisterial district

Concerns	<i>Total</i>	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
No concerns	38.7	36.3	42.8	42.2	42.3	30.0
Facilities not equally distributed throughout Henrico County	30.7	33.8	29.3	21.7	23.3	46.3
Maintenance and cleanliness	27.5	33.4	29.3	24.6	23.0	27.7
Outdated equipment/facilities	18.8	24.9	13.8	17.8	14.3	22.5
Security or safety issues	16.1	18.2	8.2	18.8	13.4	20.8
Lack of access for people with mobility limitations or special needs	13.5	15.8	16.6	6.8	13.3	16.1
Lack of facilities to meet your needs	9.9	10.7	10.9	11.4	6.0	10.8
Lack of age appropriate park amenities to meet needs	7.6	4.3	10.1	8.6	6.4	8.9
Customer service	2.0	3.4	0.3	3.1	0.8	2.1

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Needs for parks or recreational facilities

In Question 8a, all respondents were asked “Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the parks and recreational facilities listed below.” A list of 35 choices was presented. Trails of various types, playgrounds, picnicking and small neighborhood parks were the top needs overall, with frequencies of mention ranging from 68.0% to 38.1%.

Respondents in Varina were significantly more likely than residents in some of the other magisterial districts to mention covered picnic shelters, exercise trails, indoor fitness facility, indoor gym, indoor swimming pool, indoor walking and running track, outdoor amphitheater and recreation center. Fairfield residents were more likely than some other districts to mention indoor fitness facility and indoor walking and running track and less likely to mention boardwalk, disc golf, large community park, paved trails, playground, small neighborhood parks and unpaved trails. Three Chopt residents identified cricket fields, exercise trails, pickleball courts and small neighborhood parks. Tuckahoe residents were more likely than those in other districts to mention canoe/kayak launch and dog park. Brookland residents were more likely than some others to mention historic site/museum and small neighborhood parks. See Table 8, which is sorted by the overall total percentage selecting each type of facility.

Table 8: Needs for parks or recreational facilities, by magisterial district

Do you have a need for this park or facility?	<i>Total</i>	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Exercise Trails	68.0	68.0	63.0	74.5	55.8	77.3
Paved Trails	46.6	46.3	31.5	56.7	52.7	45.9
Picnic Areas	45.0	46.3	42.3	47.4	34.2	53.7
Unpaved Trails	38.8	41.5	28.4	45.3	46.3	32.8
Playground	38.7	49.0	27.5	40.8	36.1	40.1
Small Neighborhood Parks	38.6	54.7	23.2	47.0	40.3	28.0
Covered Picnic Shelter	38.1	42.3	38.1	31.5	29.3	49.2
Large Community Park	34.4	43.5	19.7	31.6	38.3	40.7
Indoor Swimming Pool	34.2	27.5	32.9	36.3	26.8	46.9
Dog Park	33.2	38.8	28.1	26.7	41.0	33.0
Indoor Walking & Running Track	30.5	26.4	40.9	24.7	18.1	41.3
Nature Center	30.3	35.7	26.0	27.4	30.7	32.1
Indoor Fitness Facility	27.2	23.5	33.5	22.9	12.8	42.6
Recreation Center	27.1	29.9	30.8	18.9	18.6	37.6
Historic Site/Museum	26.7	33.9	22.7	20.3	27.7	30.0
Indoor Gym	23.1	20.9	21.6	22.2	13.2	37.1
Mountain Bike Trails	23.0	31.8	16.4	19.0	26.1	23.1
Multi-Purpose Field (Football, Soccer, Lacrosse, etc.)	22.5	30.8	14.3	18.4	24.1	26.1
Outdoor Amphitheater	20.5	20.5	16.7	15.8	21.8	28.5
Tennis Courts	18.3	16.8	12.9	28.3	18.4	14.2
Basketball Courts	17.8	18.6	17.9	17.8	18.4	16.3
Performing Arts Center	17.0	12.8	18.3	15.5	13.2	24.8
Canoe/Kayak Launch	15.5	16.3	10.4	11.8	23.7	16.6
Baseball/Softball Field	13.8	17.6	9.2	8.6	14.6	20.0
Spray Park	12.3	17.3	7.6	14.9	8.9	12.7
Boardwalk	12.0	15.8	2.6	13.9	12.8	15.1
Disc Golf	9.2	12.0	2.7	13.0	10.0	8.1
Pickleball Courts	8.8	7.9	2.8	14.8	10.0	8.2
Boat Ramp	8.1	6.4	5.2	4.3	12.7	12.8
Skate Park	8.0	13.7	5.4	6.1	6.2	8.7
Sand Volleyball Courts	7.1	4.5	8.2	7.3	5.0	10.1
Other	4.9	3.7	7.1	4.8	3.6	4.9
Pump Track	4.5	3.9	0.7	4.6	7.6	6.1
Cricket Field	2.5	3.8	0.0	7.7	0.5	0.0
Horse Trail & Ring	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.0	2.8	0.8

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

There were two follow-up questions asked of respondents who indicated at least one need. First, Question 8b asked: “How well are your needs being met for the following?” The web survey displayed only the facilities for which they had said they had a need in Question 8a.

For this assessment of unmet needs, respondents could use a four-point scale with 4 being “Fully met,” 3 being “Mostly met,” 2 being “Partly met” and 1 being “Not met.” When these responses are averaged, the lowest means indicate the types of facilities with the most unmet need, according to residents who said that they or any member of their household had a need for that facility.

The facilities with the greatest unmet needs were outdoor amphitheater (mean of 1.67), indoor walking and running track (1.68), and indoor swimming pool (1.70). Because Question 8b was asked only for those who expressed a need, the number of respondents was small in some cases, so breaking the data down by magisterial district resulted in too few cases to support inferences. (Those complete breakdowns are available in Appendix C but should be used with caution.) Therefore, Table 9 shows the mean ratings of unmet need for each type of facility for the county overall. The table includes the unweighted number of respondents (“uN”) who providing ratings of unmet need for each type of facility. Lower means indicate greater unmet needs.

Table 9: Mean ratings of unmet needs for facilities

Parks, trails, athletic complexes or recreational facilities	Total	
	Mean	uN
Outdoor Amphitheater	1.67	132
Indoor Walking & Running Track	1.68	176
Indoor Swimming Pool	1.70	204
Skate Park	1.97	55
Indoor Gym	2.08	131
Mountain Bike Trails	2.10	149
Pickleball Courts	2.11	72
Cricket Field	2.15	14
Indoor Fitness Facility	2.15	152
Small Neighborhood Parks	2.20	264
Other	2.23	41
Sand Volleyball Courts	2.23	34
Tennis Courts	2.27	111
Performing Arts Center	2.36	124
Spray Park	2.39	70
Boardwalk	2.43	84
Canoe/Kayak Launch	2.49	114
Nature Center	2.50	207
Basketball Courts	2.62	100
Disc Golf	2.68	50
Dog Park	2.68	223
Recreation Center	2.70	145
Horse Trail & Ring	2.78	7
Unpaved Trails	2.82	268
Large Community Park	2.88	227
Paved Trails	2.89	333
Pump Track	2.90	32
Boat Ramp	2.94	58
Exercise Trails	2.95	439
Historic Site/Museum	3.06	184
Picnic Areas	3.08	263
Baseball/Softball Field	3.10	103
Playground	3.13	237
Multi-Purpose Field (Football, Soccer, Lacrosse, etc.)	3.19	125
Covered Picnic Shelter	3.22	241

Note: Lower means indicate greater unmet needs. Means calculated using a scale of 4 = “Fully met,” 3 = “Mostly met,” 2 = “Partly met” and 1 = “Not met.”

The second follow-up question asked of respondents who indicated at least one need in Question 8a was Question 8c: “If you have a need, who runs the place that you or members of your household rely on MOST for this facility?” The web survey displayed only the parks or facilities for which they had said they had a need in Question 8a. The answer choices used in this analysis were “Henrico Co. public park or school,” “Private” and “Other.”⁷

Most of the total ownership responses across all the parks or facilities were “Henrico Co. public park or school” (64.4%), followed by “private” (27.5%) and “other” (8.1%).⁸

Parks or facilities most frequently mentioned as being run by “Henrico Co. public park or school” were large community park (96.5%), covered picnic shelter (96.3%), pump track (96.0%), playground (96.0%), picnic areas (95.2%), different types of exercise and walking trails (94.2% to 93.2%), boat ramp (93.0%), spray park (92.9%), dog park (92.4%), multipurpose fields (91.4%) and Boardwalk (90.8%).

Facilities most frequently mentioned as being privately run were indoor swimming pool (65.2% privately run), indoor fitness facility (62.6%), indoor gym (60.5%), and indoor walking and running track (58.9%). See Table 10.

⁷ In preparing the draft questionnaire for question 8c (“If you have a need, who runs the place that you or members of your household rely on MOST for this facility?”), a category labeled “Public” was re-labeled “Henrico Co. public park or school,” but the category labeled “Public” was not removed from the answer choices when the survey went into data collection. Therefore, the answer choices included both categories. Answers in these two categories were combined and labeled “Henrico Co. public park or school” in this report.

⁸ This was a separate analysis and is not found in the data tables in this report.

Table 10: Ownership of parks or facilities relied on most often by residents

Park or facility	Henrico Co. public park or school	Private	Other	Total*
	%	%	%	%
Large Community Park	96.5	1.3	2.2	100.0
Covered Picnic Shelter	96.3	1.4	2.4	100.0
Pump Track	96.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Playground	96.0	2.4	1.6	100.0
Picnic Areas	95.2	4.4	0.4	100.0
Unpaved Trails	94.2	1.9	3.9	100.0
Paved Trails	93.8	3.9	2.3	100.0
Exercise Trails	93.2	4.1	2.7	100.0
Boat Ramp	93.0	5.5	1.5	100.0
Spray Park	92.9	6.6	0.5	100.0
Dog Park	92.4	4.1	3.5	100.0
Multi-Purpose Field (Football, Soccer, Lacrosse, etc.)	91.4	8.3	0.3	100.0
Boardwalk	90.8	8.7	0.5	100.0
Nature Center	89.2	5.3	5.5	100.0
Baseball//Softball Field	88.3	11.2	0.5	100.0
Recreation Center	84.9	10.8	4.3	100.0
Skate Park	84.1	1.1	14.7	100.0
Mountain Bike Trails	82.3	3.3	14.4	100.0
Disc Golf	82.2	0.6	17.2	100.0
Sand Volleyball Courts	81.2	18.8	0.0	100.0
Small Neighborhood Parks	80.6	13.8	5.7	100.0
Historic Site/Museum	80.5	12.8	6.7	100.0
Pickleball Courts	76.0	19.0	5.0	100.0
Canoe/Kayak Launch	74.7	12.3	13.0	100.0
Basketball Courts	72.2	27.4	0.4	100.0
Cricket Field	67.6	32.4	0.0	100.0
Horse Trail & Ring	66.9	33.1	0.0	100.0
Tennis Courts	60.6	39.1	0.2	100.0
Outdoor Amphitheater	57.2	27.0	15.8	100.0
Performing Arts Center	54.6	45.0	0.4	100.0
Other	51.8	42.6	5.6	100.0
Indoor Gym	39.0	60.5	0.6	100.0
Indoor Fitness Facility	35.8	62.6	1.6	100.0
Indoor Walking & Running Track	34.3	58.9	6.8	100.0
Indoor Swimming Pool	29.0	65.2	5.7	100.0

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

Question 9 asked respondents to choose up to four facilities that were most important to their household. Once again, trails (exercise, paved, and unpaved) and playgrounds topped the list, mentioned by 23.9% to 44.3% of residents overall. Dog park (20.4%) and small neighborhood parks (19.2%) were also near the top of the list. Indoor swimming pool (15.2%) and indoor fitness facility (13.1%) appeared in the top half of the list and were also among the facilities most likely to be privately owned and operated, according to residents.

Residents in Varina were more interested in boat ramps, indoor swimming pools, picnic areas and recreation centers. Residents in Tuckahoe were more interested in canoe/kayak launch and disc golf, but least interested in an indoor swimming pool. Residents in Varina and Fairfield were less interested in small neighborhood parks and unpaved trails, but more interested in indoor fitness facilities and recreation centers. Table 11 shows the results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating that the park or facility was one of the top four most important to their household.

Table 11: Top four most important facilities for households, by magisterial district

Park or facility	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Exercise Trails	44.3	48.0	45.5	47.5	35.0	44.9
Paved Trails	34.6	30.2	38.1	39.4	35.8	28.9
Playground	27.1	28.0	21.3	32.8	27.2	25.5
Unpaved Trails	23.9	20.4	17.0	32.9	32.9	15.2
Dog Park	20.4	22.9	18.8	17.7	27.2	15.5
Small Neighborhood Parks	19.2	22.8	11.9	26.9	25.6	7.4
Covered Picnic Shelter	17.8	15.2	25.2	12.1	15.5	21.8
Large Community Park	15.9	16.3	12.6	16.2	19.3	15.0
Indoor Swimming Pool	15.2	15.9	17.4	15.7	5.9	21.4
Picnic Areas	14.6	17.9	17.2	9.3	8.7	20.6
Indoor Fitness Facility	13.1	12.6	16.9	9.3	6.6	21.0
Historic Site/Museum	11.6	17.1	9.0	10.9	10.1	10.8
Nature Center	10.4	13.7	8.9	10.3	12.3	6.7
Multi-Purpose Field (Football, Soccer, Lacrosse, etc.)	10.3	9.6	8.5	7.6	15.7	10.6
Recreation Center	9.6	6.3	13.8	5.2	7.3	16.3
Basketball Courts	9.3	10.1	15.0	5.3	8.4	8.2
Indoor Walking & Running Track	9.1	10.2	12.3	7.7	2.5	13.1
Mountain Bike Trails	8.9	8.4	7.8	8.5	13.1	6.9
Canoe/Kayak Launch	8.6	6.9	6.2	6.4	15.6	8.1
Indoor Gym	8.3	6.2	10.3	10.3	5.6	9.0
Baseball/Softball Field	7.1	6.7	9.8	4.2	4.5	10.8
Tennis Courts	7.1	7.0	6.3	9.8	9.0	2.8
Outdoor Amphitheater	5.5	4.0	1.7	3.9	9.3	9.1
Spray Park	5.0	6.3	4.4	6.0	3.1	4.9
Performing Arts Center	4.2	5.5	2.8	5.1	5.0	2.5
Boat Ramp	3.3	2.6	3.3	1.6	1.1	8.5
Pickleball Courts	3.2	1.9	2.1	4.0	4.1	3.8
Disc Golf	3.0	2.2	0.2	6.8	3.4	2.2
Other	2.6	2.3	3.0	2.0	2.6	3.4
Sand Volleyball Courts	2.6	3.5	3.9	1.4	1.8	2.2
Cricket Field	1.5	2.7	0.0	3.9	0.3	0.0
Skate Park	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.2	3.1
Pump Track	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.6	1.4	1.0
Horse Trail & Ring	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Need for recreation programs

Question 10a in the survey asked respondents: “Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs listed below.” A list of 16 programs was presented plus a seventeenth choice for “Other” with a write-in option. The most frequently mentioned program was fitness (63.2%), followed by concerts (49.3%). Special events (36.9%), home and garden classes (34.4%) and nature and outdoor classes (33.0%) were also popular. Least frequently mentioned were “other” (3.0%), special needs programs (4.7%) and pickleball (10.1%).

Residents in Brookland and Fairfield were least interested in pickleball. Brookland residents were more interested in music instruction. Those in Brookland and Varina were more interested in history programs. Varina residents were more interested in concerts and special needs programs. See Table 12, which is sorted by the total percent selecting the program.

Table 12: Need for recreation program, by magisterial district

Recreation program	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fitness	63.2	62.9	68.3	59.7	52.8	71.5
Concerts	49.3	45.9	39.9	45.3	52.4	63.5
Special Events	36.9	33.2	38.2	33.8	31.9	46.9
Home & Garden Classes	34.4	34.4	27.7	32.2	38.6	39.9
Nature & Outdoor Classes	33.0	30.7	21.6	39.0	31.2	41.6
Cooking Classes	28.3	29.4	27.8	24.3	22.7	37.4
Creative Art Classes	27.1	25.4	22.3	34.9	21.6	29.7
Active Adult Classes	26.9	26.0	28.0	26.4	20.2	33.1
History Programs	23.1	30.9	11.4	22.4	21.0	29.8
Dance Classes	22.6	25.1	22.6	18.2	21.9	25.8
Senior Adult Classes	22.0	19.4	20.9	20.0	21.3	28.7
Summer Day Camp	21.0	22.0	19.5	21.9	22.3	19.4
Music Instructional Classes	18.0	27.9	14.2	18.0	17.3	13.1
Tours	14.3	11.2	9.8	13.3	15.9	21.5
Pickleball	10.1	5.4	3.3	16.0	13.8	11.4
Special Needs Programs	4.7	4.6	2.8	2.2	4.2	9.9
Other	3.0	3.2	3.9	1.0	4.5	3.0

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

As with parks and facilities, a follow-up question was asked for each recreation program that was needed. Question 10b asked: “If you have a need, how well are your needs currently being met?” Respondents could use a four-point scale with 4 being “Fully met,” 3 being “Mostly met,” 2 being “Partly met” and 1 being “Not met.” When these responses are averaged, the lowest means

indicate the recreation programs with the most unmet need, according to residents who said that they or any member of their household had a need for that program.

Cooking classes (mean rating of 1.32) and music instructional classes (1.37) are the two recreation programs with the greatest perceived unmet need. Both of their mean ratings are closer to “Not met” than other programs are. Even the program with the smallest unmet need – fitness – is perceived to have needs that are only about halfway between “Mostly met” and “Partly met.”

Because Question 10b was asked only of those who expressed a need, the numbers of responses are small in some cases. In these instances, breaking the data down by magisterial district can result in too few cases to support inferences. (Those complete breakdowns are available in Appendix C but should be used with caution.) Table 13 shows the mean ratings of unmet need for each recreation program for the county overall. The table includes the unweighted number of respondents (“uN”) who provided ratings of unmet need for each program. Lower means indicate greater unmet needs.

Table 13: Mean ratings of unmet needs for recreation programs

Recreation programs	Total	
	Mean	uN
Cooking Classes	1.32	150
Music Instructional Classes	1.37	101
Home & Garden Classes	1.50	197
Creative Art Classes	1.57	161
Other	1.57	19
Dance Classes	1.60	126
Active Adult Classes	1.61	162
Nature & Outdoor Classes	1.66	204
History Programs	1.72	156
Tours	1.74	97
Senior Adult Classes	1.76	161
Special Needs Programs	1.77	20
Concerts	1.86	315
Summer Day Camp	1.88	113
Special Events	1.99	210
Pickleball	2.04	84
Fitness	2.45	384

Note: Lower means indicate greater unmet needs. Means calculated using a scale of 4 = “Fully met,” 3 = “Mostly met,” 2 = “Partly met” and 1 = “Not met.”

Question 11 asked respondents to indicate up to four of these programs that were most important to their household. Once again, fitness, concerts and special events topped the list, mentioned by 63.5% to 35.3% of residents overall. Nature and outdoor classes (28.4%) and home and garden classes (24.9%) were also near the top of the list.

History programs were more popular in Brookland compared to Fairfield and Three Chopt, and more popular in Tuckahoe compared to Fairfield. Otherwise there were no statistically significant differences in all programs across magisterial districts. Table 14 shows results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating the recreation program was one of the top four most important ones to their household.

Table 14: Top four most important recreation programs for households, by magisterial district

Recreation program	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fitness	63.5	53.6	67.1	65.4	63.4	67.7
Concerts	42.4	40.0	40.3	41.4	49.9	41.0
Special Events	35.3	29.3	42.7	31.2	34.9	39.1
Nature & Outdoor Classes	28.4	32.5	20.3	32.0	29.7	27.1
Home & Garden Classes	24.9	24.9	25.5	24.1	23.1	26.7
Summer Day Camp	19.5	22.6	20.2	19.9	17.6	17.0
History Programs	18.9	28.5	10.7	14.4	23.5	18.1
Creative Art Classes	17.9	26.4	13.4	22.0	13.0	14.1
Cooking Classes	17.5	17.6	16.4	15.1	18.1	20.9
Active Adult Classes	17.2	15.0	23.0	14.4	20.4	13.3
Senior Adult Classes	16.9	12.5	21.1	11.7	20.7	19.7
Dance Classes	15.4	16.1	14.6	19.0	13.5	13.3
Tours	10.1	9.9	4.3	12.6	11.5	11.9
Music Instructional Classes	9.4	14.2	7.0	11.2	8.9	5.8
Pickleball	7.5	4.9	2.8	11.9	9.6	7.9
Special Needs Programs	5.7	9.6	4.8	2.4	5.5	6.4
Other	2.8	2.8	3.8	1.0	4.1	2.9

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Question 12 asked respondents which four of the recreation programs on the list they currently participate in most often. The participation rankings of the programs closely align with the rankings found in the prior question about importance. Tours, creative art classes and cooking classes show the greatest differences between their rankings of importance and participation. Tours are thirteenth on the list for importance and ninth on the list for participation; creative art classes are eighth and eleventh, respectively; and cooking classes are ninth and fourteenth, respectively.

Three Chopt residents reported higher participation in pickleball and summer day camp than did residents in other magisterial districts, though most of those differences were not statistically significant. Brookland residents reported higher participation in history programs and creative art classes than did residents in Fairfield and Varina. Tuckahoe residents reported slightly higher participation in music instructional classes and in concerts. Table 15 shows results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating the recreation program was one of the top four in which their household currently participates.

Table 15: Top four currently most often participated-in recreation programs for households, by magisterial district

Recreation program	<i>Total</i>	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fitness	59.2	53.7	60.4	63.1	49.2	67.1
Concerts	40.1	39.9	30.0	37.6	50.7	42.9
Special Events	36.6	30.5	37.1	34.7	35.2	44.3
Nature & Outdoor Classes	11.8	9.5	15.1	14.5	11.6	8.2
History Programs	11.0	19.6	5.6	9.6	15.7	6.2
Home & Garden Classes	10.1	5.1	7.7	11.4	12.1	13.3
Summer Day Camp	10.0	8.1	7.0	19.8	8.3	5.8
Active Adult Classes	9.7	9.9	13.4	6.0	11.6	8.4
Tours	9.2	8.5	6.7	6.6	13.2	11.5
Senior Adult Classes	8.4	2.4	11.2	7.0	9.7	11.0
Creative Art Classes	8.2	14.9	4.2	7.5	7.2	7.9
Dance Classes	6.1	4.0	5.2	7.3	6.3	7.3
Pickleball	5.9	1.4	2.6	12.0	8.1	4.5
Cooking Classes	5.3	1.6	5.3	7.9	3.6	7.2
Special Needs Programs	3.6	3.0	3.1	2.0	2.0	7.7
Music Instructional Classes	3.2	4.0	2.9	3.9	5.8	0.0
Other	2.2	4.0	4.6	1.0	1.9	0.0

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Overall participation in and satisfaction with recreation programs

Question 13 on the survey asked: “Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks during the past 24 months?” Overall, 29.9% of residents said that they or other members of their household had done so. Participation was significantly lower in the Three Chopt and Tuckahoe magisterial districts compared to the other three districts.

Residents who said “Yes” to Question 13⁹ were then asked Question 14: “How would you rate the overall quality of the programs that you and members of your household have participated in?” Respondents used a four-point scale with 1 being “Poor,” 2 being “Fair,” 3 being “Good” and 4 being “Excellent.” The vast majority of users (89.5%) gave a favorable rating, either “good” (61.7%) or “excellent” (27.8%). When these ratings were averaged, Fairfield residents gave the highest rating, statistically significantly higher than residents in Brookland. See Table 16.

Table 16: Overall participation and quality ratings for recreation programs, by magisterial district

	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks during the past 24 months?						
% answering “Yes”	29.9%	35.7%	43.5%	20.5%	16.9%	33.9%
How would you rate the overall quality of the programs that you and members of your household have participated in?						
Poor (1)	0.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fair (2)	10.0%	15.6%	5.7%	4.1%	2.7%	17.0%
Good (3)	61.7%	60.8%	52.5%	73.6%	71.3%	62.0%
Excellent (4)	27.8%	21.8%	41.8%	22.2%	26.0%	21.0%
Total*	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Average rating**	3.17	3.03	3.36	3.18	3.23	3.04

* - Percentages in the table may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

** - Note that the overall mean cannot be calculated directly from the district means shown in the table because the district means have different numbers of cases behind them.

Barriers to use or participation

Question 15 asked: “Please check all the reasons that prevent you or other members of your household from using parks, recreation facilities, or programs of Henrico County Recreation & Parks more often.” A list of 20 possible reasons was displayed, with a 21st choice for “Other” with a write-in option. Respondents could select all responses that applied.

The most frequently cited reasons related to lack of knowledge, inconvenience, program or facility not being offered, and being too busy. “I do not know what is being offered” was the only reason mentioned by a majority of respondents (52.7%). “Poor customer service” is clearly not a barrier to use or participation because it was rarely mentioned (0.7%).

⁹ Question 14 was supposed to be skipped for the 70.1% of cases who did not say in question 13 that they or other members of their household participated in any recreation programs offered by Henrico County Recreation & Parks during the past 24 months, but this skip instruction was inadvertently omitted from the web survey. Such cases were recoded to blank in the dataset for analysis and reporting.

Brookland residents were a little more likely to say that facilities are not well-maintained and parks, facilities and/or programs are too far from their residence. Table 17 shows results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating the barrier.

Table 17: Barriers to use and participation, by magisterial district

Barriers	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
I do not know what is being offered	52.7	48.6	45.5	55.5	59.3	55.1
Too far from our residence	27.6	38.2	18.5	28.5	21.6	30.9
Program or facility is not offered	25.3	15.7	33.5	27.8	25.1	24.8
We are too busy	23.4	22.0	18.6	27.7	28.6	19.9
Program times are not convenient	21.7	22.1	21.1	17.1	22.2	26.5
I do not know locations of facilities	20.6	18.7	21.9	20.3	19.5	22.9
Lack of quality programs	11.6	12.0	12.0	13.4	8.2	12.5
Class is full	9.1	8.6	11.4	10.1	7.6	7.5
Other	8.9	8.6	10.6	7.8	8.7	9.0
Security is insufficient	8.7	9.5	5.0	7.6	7.0	14.6
Use facilities in neighboring communities	8.5	8.4	10.1	8.8	8.6	6.6
Fees are too high	8.3	12.5	3.7	8.3	8.8	8.1
Facilities are not well maintained	7.9	16.5	6.7	3.8	3.6	9.0
Facilities lack the right equipment	7.5	8.6	7.1	7.3	8.4	5.9
Facility operating hours are not convenient	5.3	7.5	2.6	2.9	5.1	8.8
Use services of other agencies	4.0	1.8	2.6	3.3	5.8	6.6
We are not interested	4.0	4.9	2.9	5.2	4.1	2.5
Registration for programs is difficult	3.9	6.5	0.6	3.7	6.2	2.6
Too hard to find parking	3.2	5.7	0.3	1.7	1.3	7.4
Insufficient mobility access	2.5	2.2	4.9	1.4	1.6	2.6
Poor customer service by staff	0.7	1.4	0.5	0.0	1.2	0.3

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

Preferences for communication

Question 16 asked: “How would you prefer to learn about Recreation and Parks opportunities?” A list of seven choices was displayed. Respondents could select one option. Email (38.7%) was the most popular choice, followed by website (18.4%), direct mail (17.8%) and social media (13.8%). Brookland residents were significantly more interested in social media compared to all other districts. Table 18 shows results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating a preferred mode of communication.

Table 18: Preferences for communication, by magisterial district

Communication modes	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Email	38.7	27.0	39.0	43.6	38.7	45.1
Website	18.4	15.5	22.3	19.8	21.1	13.0
Direct mail newsletter/postcard	17.8	18.1	13.7	15.9	21.7	20.2
Social media	13.8	30.4	10.8	9.3	7.1	11.2
Text Messaging	5.8	3.1	9.5	7.0	3.5	5.8
Mobile App	2.8	3.1	4.3	2.3	3.0	1.4
Flyers/Posters	2.7	2.7	0.5	2.1	4.9	3.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

Obstacles to riding a bike more often in the county

The 42.7% of respondents who said in Question 26 that they ride bicycles in Henrico County were asked Question 27: “How do you rate the following obstacles to riding a bike more often in the County?” They were presented with a list of 15 obstacles plus a sixteenth choice for “Other” with a write-in box. Respondents could select all that applied.

Obstacles related to safety and lack of infrastructure dominated the responses. The number of total respondents within each magisterial district ranged from 39 (Fairfield) to 89 (Three Chopt). These are not large numbers, so the results by magisterial district should be used with caution. Table 19 shows results sorted by the total percentage of respondents indicating the obstacle.

Table 19: Obstacles to riding a bike more often, by magisterial district

Obstacle	Total	Brookland	Fairfield	Three Chopt	Tuckahoe	Varina
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Safety and security	60.6	68.1	63.9	67.7	55.8	42.4
Lack of bike lanes	57.1	76.8	53.6	52.0	71.9	29.0
Bad driver behavior	55.5	56.1	60.8	49.1	62.2	50.8
Lack of bike trails	51.0	68.1	46.3	48.3	55.8	34.0
Unsafe roads	46.3	44.0	47.9	44.7	58.1	37.2
Lack of bike connections to my house	37.1	52.0	47.0	31.5	31.2	21.7
Unsure of routes or places to ride	34.0	35.7	25.4	38.4	46.4	22.1
Lack of bike connections to my destination	26.9	37.1	20.4	19.9	36.6	21.5
Lack of time	12.9	5.8	16.3	9.5	7.3	28.8
The weather	11.9	11.5	11.4	6.9	17.5	14.3
No access to a bike	8.8	15.4	13.4	8.9	3.9	0.7
Lack of confidence	7.9	7.7	10.2	2.4	17.7	3.4
Other	3.9	6.1	0.0	1.2	3.5	10.1
Health issues	1.9	0.5	5.7	0.4	1.2	2.0
Cost	1.4	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	2.9
Lack of interest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer.

About the responses to open-ended survey questions (Appendix D)

All open-ended (write-in or verbatim) responses were reviewed by SERL staff. Profanity and mentions of specific individuals were redacted for this report. Reviewing the open-ended responses is a very good way to get the full range of the opinions offered by the respondents. The verbatim responses are presented in Appendix D for the one open-ended question on the survey:

1. Question 28: Please share any additional comments that could assist Henrico County in improving parks, trails, open space, and recreational facilities and services.

A separate document that summarizes the response themes from the Rec and Park Survey's open-ended question was prepared by Clarion Associates and can be found on the project website: <https://www.henriconext.us/resources-1>.