



## **2013 Needs Assessment Results**

Prepared by:

Donna L. Pastore, Ph.D.

Leeann M. Lower, M.S.

Kristy L. McCray, M. Ed.



**THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Page</b>
Overview.....	3
Question #1 Results.....	4
Question #2 Results.....	5
Question #3 Results.....	7
Question #4 Results.....	8
Question #5 Results.....	10
Question #6 Results.....	13
Question #7 Results.....	13
Question #8 Results.....	14
Question #9 Results.....	15
Question #10 Results.....	16
Question #11 Results.....	17
Question #12 Results.....	17
Question #13 Results.....	18
Question #14 Results.....	18
Question #15 Results.....	20
Question #16 Results.....	20
Question #17 Results.....	21
Question #18 Results.....	21
Question #19 Results.....	22
Question #20 Results.....	22
Question #21 Results.....	23
Question #22 Results.....	23

## Overview

The Ohio State University Graduate Sport Management Program was contacted by Joe Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation (City of Reynoldsburg), in spring 2013 and asked to assist with a needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment was to assist the department “to identify our quality of life programs and platforms” (2013 Needs Assessment). Two doctoral students and one faculty member reviewed the needs assessment instrument for content, clarity, wording, format, thoroughness, ease of use, focus, and appropriateness. Feedback was provided and the final needs assessment consisted of 22 items. The department administered the instrument. Community members were asked their thoughts and perspectives because “The Reynoldsburg Parks and Recreation Department is aiming to deliver the very best quality of life programs possible for [the] community” and “ensuring that what [the] community wants is represented” (2013 Needs Assessment).

Data was collected by the Parks and Recreation Department and compiled into an Excel spreadsheet. A total of 388 Community members responded to the needs assessment. The Ohio State University Graduate Sport Management Program then analyzed the data using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Version 21 and compiled the results presented in this report. The results are shown in tables with frequencies and percentages (when appropriate). The percentages calculated ranged between 99%-100%.

**Question #1** asked Community members to check all the recreation facilities in Reynoldsburg that they or any member of their household used or visited within the past 12 months.

Table 1 (Question #1, All Recreation Facilities Used or Visited)

<b>Item (N=735)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Walking/running paths	126 (17.1%)
Walking trails at Civic, JFK, or Huber Park(s)	121 (16.5%)
Playgrounds	119 (16.2%)
Soccer fields	54 (7.3%)
Senior center	54 (7.3%)
Pine Quarry Park	47 (6.4%)
Youth baseball/softball diamonds	43 (5.9%)
Other	42 (5.7%)
Outdoor gazebo	39 (5.3%)
Skate Park	30 (4.1%)
Tennis courts at JFK	26 (3.5%)
Basketball courts at Civic	22 (2.9%)
Adult baseball/softball diamonds	12 (1.6%)

Results: The walking and running paths/trails were identified as the most used/visited facility. Playgrounds were identified as the second most used/visited facility.

**Question #2** asked Community members which three facilities (from the list in Question #1) are most important to them and members of their household.

Table 2A (Question #2, 1<sup>st</sup> Most Important)

<b>Item (N=207)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Senior Center	39 (18.8%)
Playgrounds	35 (16.9%)
Youth baseball/softball diamonds	34 (16.4%)
Walking/running paths	27 (13.0%)
Walking trails at Civic, JFK, or Huber Park(s)	21 (10.1%)
Other	19 (9.1%)
Soccer fields	14 (6.7%)
Pine Quarry Park	9 (4.3%)
Basketball courts at Civic	5 (2.4%)
Skate Park	2 (0.9%)
Tennis courts at JFK	2 (0.9%)

Results: The Community members identified the senior center, playgrounds, and youth baseball/softball diamonds as the most important recreation facilities.

Table 2B (Question #2, 2<sup>nd</sup> Most Important)

<b>Item (N=207)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Walking trails at Civic, JFK, or Huber Park(s)	39 (18.8%)
Youth baseball/softball diamonds	34 (16.4%)
Walking/running paths	32 (15.4%)
Playgrounds	27 (13.0%)
Other	17 (8.2%)
Pine Quarry park	15 (7.2%)
Soccer fields	14 (6.7%)
Basketball courts at Civic	8 (3.8%)
Tennis courts at JFK	6 (2.8%)
Outdoor gazebo	5 (2.4%)
Senior Center	5 (2.4%)
Skate park	4 (1.9%)
Adult baseball/softball diamonds	1 (0.4%)

Results: The Community members identified walking and running trails/paths and youth baseball/softball diamonds as the second most important recreation facilities.

Table 2C (Question #2, 3<sup>rd</sup> Most Important)

Item (N=207)	Frequencies and Percentages
Youth baseball/softball diamonds	51 (24.6%)
Walking/running paths	36 (17.3%)
Playgrounds	34 (16.4%)
Walking trails at Civic, JFK, or Huber Park(s)	32 (15.4%)
Pine Quarry park	14 (6.7%)
Other	10 (4.8%)
Basketball courts at Civic	9 (4.3%)
Outdoor gazebo	8 (3.8%)
Soccer fields	5 (2.4%)
Skate Park	3 (1.4%)
Senior Center	2 (0.9%)
Adult baseball/softball diamonds	2 (0.9%)
Tennis courts at JFK	1 (0.4%)

Results: The Community members identified youth baseball/softball diamonds, walking and running trails/paths, and playgrounds as the third most important recreation facilities.

**Question #3** asked Community members to rate the quality of the parks that they use in the City of Reynoldsburg.

Table 3 (Question #3, Quality of the parks used in City of Reynoldsburg)

<b>Rating Scale (N=388)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Excellent	110 (28.3%)
Good	178 (45.8%)
Fair	84 (21.6%)
Poor	10 (2.5%)
Not sure	6 (1.5%)

Results: The majority (73.1%) of Community members rated the parks as being high quality. Whereas, a small percentage (2.5%) rated the parks as low quality.

**Question #4** asked Community members to check their top three choices when choosing to visit or use a recreation facility.

Table 4A (Question #4, 1<sup>st</sup> Most Important)

<b>Item (N=207)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Convenience	112 (54.1%)
Quality	37 (17.8%)
Care of facility and infrastructure	23 (11.1%)
Feel safe	15 (7.2%)
Variety of recreation users	8 (3.8%)
Family atmosphere	6 (2.8%)
Specific functions at facility	3 (1.4%)
Availability of food	2 (0.9%)
Only facility available	1 (0.4%)

Results: The Community members selected convenience as the most important choice.

Table 4B (Question #4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Most Important)

<b>Item (N=207)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Quality	62 (29.9%)
Family atmosphere	47 (22.7%)
Care of facility and infrastructure	43 (20.7%)
Feel safe	19 (9.1%)
Convenience	13 (6.2%)
Only facility available	8 (3.8%)
Variety of recreation users	7 (3.3%)
Walking/running paths	3 (1.4%)
Specific functions at facility	2 (0.9%)
Recommended by friends/family	2 (0.9%)
Other	1 (0.4%)

Results: The Community members selected quality as the second most important choice.



Table 4C (Question #4, 3<sup>rd</sup> Most Important)

Item (N=207)	Frequencies and Percentages
Feel safe	98 (47.3%)
Specific functions at facility	26 (12.5%)
Convenience	19 (9.1%)
Family atmosphere	19 (9.1%)
Care of facility and infrastructure	15 (7.2%)
Variety of recreation users	12 (5.7%)
Other	6 (2.8%)
Quality	4 (1.9%)
Recommended by friends/family	3 (1.4%)
Only facility available	3 (1.4%)
Availability of food	2 (0.9%)

Results: The Community members selected feeling safe as the third most important choice.

**Question #5** asked Community members if they or members of their household have a need for the sport, program, or class listed below. If a Community member indicated yes, they were asked how well their need was being met. The percentages in the next three tables were compiled based on yes responses.

Table 5A (Question #5, Need for Sport)

<b>Sport (N=388)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Partly Met</b>	<b>Mostly Met</b>	<b>Fully Met</b>
Soccer	148	240	19 (12.8%)	22 (14.9%)	56 (37.8%)	51 (34.5%)
Flag Football (Youth)	54	334	25 (46.3%)	3 (5.5%)	10 (18.5%)	16 (29.6%)
Basketball (Youth)	105	283	19 (18.0%)	28 (26.7%)	28 (26.7%)	30 (28.6%)
Basketball (Adult)	26	362	13 (50.0%)	4 (15.4%)	3 (11.5%)	6 (23.1%)
Softball (Youth)	42	346	8 (19.0%)	6 (14.3%)	16 (38.1%)	12 (28.6%)
Softball (Adult)	19	369	6 (31.6%)	4 (21.0%)	6 (31.6%)	3 (15.8%)
Baseball (Youth)	92	296	9 (9.8%)	15 (16.3%)	37 (40.2%)	31 (33.7%)
Adaptive Sport	20	368	12 (60.0%)	2 (10.0%)	5 (2.5%)	1 (5.0%)
Volleyball (Youth)	53	335	12 (22.6%)	15 (28.3%)	17 (32.0%)	9 (17.0%)
Volleyball (Adult)	18	370	8 (44.4%)	3 (16.7%)	5 (27.8%)	2 (11.1%)
Lacrosse	25	363	18 (72.0%)	4 (16.0%)	2 (8.0%)	1 (4.0%)
Gymnastics/Tumbling	85	303	38 (44.7%)	20 (23.5%)	12 (14.1%)	15 (17.6%)
Golf	47	341	15 (31.9%)	14 (29.8%)	8 (17.0%)	10 (21.3%)
Tennis	60	328	12 (20.0%)	19 (31.6%)	19 (31.6%)	10 (16.6%)

Results: Soccer and basketball (youth) were identified as the greatest need for sports. The majority (72.3%) of Community members indicated the need for soccer was mostly/fully met. Whereas, a little more than half (55.3%) of the community members indicated that youth basketball was mostly/fully met.

Table 5B (Question #5, Need for Programs)

<b>Programs (N=388)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Partly Met</b>	<b>Mostly Met</b>	<b>Fully Met</b>
Art for Kids	101	287	30 (29.7%)	30 (29.7%)	23 (22.8%)	18 (17.8%)
Summer Day Camp	69	319	27 (39.1%)	18 (26.1%)	14 (20.3%)	10 (14.5%)
Water Exercise	110	278	87 (79.0%)	9 (8.2%)	6 (5.5%)	8 (7.3%)
Water Safety	83	305	57 (68.7%)	9 (10.8%)	6 (7.2%)	11 (13.2%)
Learn to Swim	135	253	86 (63.7%)	16 (11.8%)	14 (10.4%)	19 (14.1%)
Competitive Swim	53	335	37 (69.8%)	6 (11.3%)	4 (7.5%)	6 (11.3%)
Open Community Swim	136	252	79 (58.1%)	21 (15.4%)	18 (13.2%)	18 (13.2%)
Adaptive Swim Time	45	343	29 (64.4%)	8 (17.8%)	4 (8.9%)	4 (8.9%)

Results: Open community swim and learn to swim were identified as the greatest need for programs. A large majority (73.5%) of Community members indicated the need for open community swim soccer was not/partly met. This result was similar for the learn to swim program as 75.5% of the Community members indicated that this program was not/partly met.

Table 5C (Question #5, Need for Classes)

<b>Classes (N=388)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Partly Met</b>	<b>Mostly Met</b>	<b>Fully Met</b>
Performing Arts (Music, Dance)	125	263	63 (50.4%)	22 (17.6%)	21 (16.8%)	19 (15.2%)
Arts & Crafts (Ceramics, Painting)	131	257	66 (50.4%)	32 (24.4%)	13 (9.9%)	20 (15.3%)
Kids in Karate/Adult Karate	70	318	26 (37.1%)	18 (25.7%)	14 (20.0%)	12 (17.1%)
Nature/Eco Adventures	112	276	57 (50.9%)	26 (23.2%)	13 (11.6%)	16 (14.3%)
Aerobics/Spinning/Zumba	102	286	60 (58.8%)	19 (18.6%)	12 (11.8%)	11 (10.8%)
Yoga	83	305	56 (67.5%)	13 (15.7%)	8 (9.6%)	6 (7.2%)
Pilates	63	325	48 (76.2%)	6 (9.5%)	5 (7.9%)	4 (6.3%)
Computer Education	73	315	42 (57.5%)	11 (15.1%)	7 (9.6%)	13 (17.8%)
Floor Exercises Classes at Senior Center	54	334	6 (11.1%)	8 (14.8%)	11 (20.4%)	29 (53.7%)
Arthritis Stretching at Senior Center	48	340	4 (8.3%)	6 (12.5%)	9 (18.8%)	29 (60.4%)

Results: Arts and Crafts (Ceramics, Painting) and Performing Arts (Music, Dance) were identified as the greatest need for classes. The majority (74.8%) of Community members indicated the need for arts and crafts was not/partly met. Whereas, more than half (68%) of the community members indicated that performing arts (music, dance) was not/partly met.

**Question #6** asked Community members which three sports, programs, or classes were most important to them and members of their household.

Table 6 (Question #6, Three most important sports, programs, or classes, 1<sup>st</sup> choice, 2<sup>nd</sup> choice, 3<sup>rd</sup> choice)

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Choice</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Choice</b>
<b>Item and Frequency</b>	<b>Item and Frequency</b>	<b>Item and Frequency</b>
Soccer 56	Soccer 66	Soccer 81
Basketball (Youth) 15	Arts & Crafts (Ceramics, Painting) 20	Learn to Swim 13
Baseball (Youth) 14	Basketball (Youth) 15	Performing Arts (Music, Dance) 11

Results: Soccer was the top selection for each choice.

**Question #7** asked Community members to check the three criteria that they would identify as being most important to their household when choosing to participate in a sport, camp, program, or class.

Table 7 (Question #7, Three Criteria most important for Sport, Camp, Program, or Class Participation)

<b>Item (N=1,109)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Affordable/Value	292 (26.3%)
Quality of instructors	242 (21.8%)
Convenient location	189 (17.0%)
Quality of facility	132 (11.9%)
Convenient time	88 (7.9%)
Need for physical exercise	87 (7.8%)
Friends participate	47 (4.2%)
Uniqueness	26 (2.3%)
Availability of food	6 (0.5%)
Variety offered	0 (0.0%)

Results: The Community members identified affordable/value, quality of instructors, and convenient location as important criteria for participation selections.

**Question #8** asked Community members to check all the ways they learn about programs, classes, and/or events.

Table 8 (Question #8, Learn about Programs, Classes, and Events)

<b>Item (N=1,464)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Printed Brochure	287 (19.6%)
Websites	202 (13.8%)
Friends	171 (11.7%)
E-mail	161 (10.9%)
Newspaper	153 (10.4%)
Mail	137 (9.4%)
Social Media	112 (7.6%)
Family	90 (6.1%)
Television	60 (4.1%)
Radio	45 (3.1%)
Other	29 (1.9%)
Not Aware of offerings	17 (1.2%)

Results: Printed brochures and websites were identified as top ways to learn about programs, classes, and events.

**Question #9** asked Community members to check all the reasons that prevent them from using parks, trails, recreation programs, and activities in Reynoldsburg more often.

Table 9 (Question #9, All reasons for using Parks, Trails, and Recreation Programs)

<b>Item (N=1,239)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Program or facility not offered	133 (10.7%)
Fees are too high	122 (9.8%)
Lack of quality programs	116 (9.4%)
Program times are not convenient	104 (8.4%)
Not enough time	89 (7.2%)
Security is insufficient	81 (6.5%)
Facilities are not well maintained	77 (6.2%)
Use facilities in other cities	75 (6.1%)
Facilities operating hours not convenient	75 (6.1%)
Facilities lack the right equipment	73 (5.9%)
I do not know what programs are offered	65 (5.2%)
Too far from our residence	42 (3.4%)
Lack of on-line registration	39 (3.1%)
Too hot outdoors	37 (2.9%)
Class full	31 (2.5%)
Lack of parking by facilities and parks	23 (1.9%)
Poor customer service by staff	22 (1.8%)
I do not know locations of parks and trails	19 (1.5%)
Not accessible for people with disabilities	10 (0.8%)
Lack of public transportation	6 (0.5%)

Results: The most cited reasons for preventing Community members from using parks, trails, recreation programs, and activities were program or facility not offered, fees too high, and lack of quality programs as the cited reasons for preventing them from usage.

**Question #10** asked Community members to identify which three of the reasons listed in question #9 are the major reasons preventing them and members of the household from using parks, trails, and recreation programs.

Table 10 (Question #10, Three major reasons for prevention of using Parks, Trails, and Recreation Programs)

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Choice</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Choice</b>
<b>Item and Frequency</b>	<b>Item and Frequency</b>	<b>Item and Frequency</b>
Facilities are not well maintained 62	Facilities are not well maintained 77	Facilities are not well maintained 96
Fees are too high 24	Program times are not convenient 17	Fees are too high 16
I do not know what programs are offered 20	Lack of quality programs 15	Lack of quality programs 14

Results: Facilities are not well maintained was the top selection for each choice.



**Question #11** asked Community members to indicate their level of agreement with the benefits provided by parks, trails, and facilities. The percentages in the table correspond to the scale values for each benefit.

Table 11 (Question #11, Frequencies of level of agreement with benefits provided by Parks, Trails, and Recreation Facilities)

<b>Benefits (N=388)</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Improve physical health & fitness	259 (66.8%)	94 (24.2%)	22 (5.6%)	3 (.8%)	5 (1.3%)	5 (1.3%)
Help reduce crime	150 (38.7%)	69 (17.8%)	85 (21.9%)	34 (8.8%)	28 (7.2%)	22 (5.6%)
Preserve open space and the environment	253 (65.2%)	93 (23.9%)	28 (7.2%)	2 (.5%)	2 (.5%)	10 (2.6%)
Increase property values in surrounding areas	193 (49.7%)	88 (22.7%)	68 (17.5%)	16 (4.1%)	11 (2.8%)	12 (3.1%)
Help attract new residents and businesses	181 (46.6%)	85 (21.9%)	75 (19.3%)	18 (4.6%)	15 (3.9%)	14 (3.6%)
Promote our community	225 (57.9%)	79 (20.4%)	47 (12.1%)	14 (3.6%)	14 (3.6%)	9 (2.3%)

Results: The Community members indicated strong agreement (91%) for improving physical health and fitness and preserve open space and the environment (88.1%) as benefits.

**Question #12** asked Community members if they would support park and recreation related non-profit or private businesses being developed within a public park that results in additional funding that helps to operate and maintain the park.

Table 12 (Question #12, Partnership with non-profit or private businesses)

<b>Item (N=388)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Very Supportive	198 (51.0%)
Somewhat Supportive	96 (24.7%)
Not Supportive	56 (14.4%)
Not Sure	38 (9.8%)

Results: A little over half (51%) of the community members were very supportive of this opportunity.

**Question #13** asked Community members if they were satisfied with the number of pavilions within the park system of Reynoldsburg.

Table 13 (Question #13, Satisfied with amount of Pavilions)

Item (N=388)	Frequencies and Percentages
Yes	176 (45.4%)
No	110 (28.3%)
Not sure	102 (26.3%)

Results: Less than half (45.4%) of the community members were satisfied with the amount of pavilions.

**Question #14** asked Community members if they would be in favor of a City operated pool.

Table 14 (Question #14, In favor of City operated pool)

Item (N=388)	Frequencies and Percentages
Yes	260 (67.0%)
No	69 (17.8%)
Not sure	59 (15.2%)

Results: A good majority (67%) of the community members were supportive of a city operated pool.

**Question #14B** asked Community members if they were willing to have a tax increase to fund the pool.

Table 14B (Question #14B, Willingness to have a tax increase to fund pool)

Item (N=388)	Frequencies and Percentages
Yes	132 (34.0%)
No	137 (35.3%)
Not sure	119 (30.7%)

Results: The community members were fairly split in their decisions about the pool.

### Question #14 (Continued)

Three additional analyses were carried out to further examine the level of support for the pool and tax increase.

The first analysis examined the Community members' responses by favor of a pool and willingness to have a tax increase.

<b>Funding</b>	<b>Yes (in favor of pool)</b>	<b>No (in favor of pool)</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
Yes	122	0	10
No	45	67	25
Not sure	93	2	24

Results: A modest number (N=122) of Community respondents indicated an interest in a pool and a willingness to a tax increase to support the pool.

The second analysis examined interest in a pool by household income.

<b>Household Income</b>	<b>Yes (in favor of pool)</b>	<b>No (in favor of pool)</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
Under \$14,999	33	11	13
\$15,000-\$29,999	20	8	3
\$30,000-\$49,999	50	25	17
\$50,000-\$99,999	107	18	19
\$100,000 or more	50	7	7

Results: The largest number of community respondents in favor of a pool was from the \$50,000-\$99,999 income bracket.

The third analysis was conducted to examine willingness to a tax increase by household income.

<b>Household Income</b>	<b>Yes (in favor of tax)</b>	<b>No (in favor of tax)</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
Under \$14,999	15	22	20
\$15,000-\$29,999	9	15	7
\$30,000-\$49,999	13	46	33
\$50,000-\$99,999	64	37	43
\$100,000 or more	31	17	16

Results: The largest number of community respondents in support of a tax increase for funding of a pool was from the \$50,000-\$99,999 income bracket.

**Question #15** asked Community members to rate the walking trails within the parks in regards to safety, walkability, cleanliness, and access.

Table 15 (Question #15, Walking trail ratings)

Item (N=207)	Most Important	2 <sup>nd</sup> Most Important	3 <sup>rd</sup> Most Important
Safety	183 (88.4%)	49 (23.7%)	44 (21.2%)
Walkability	13 (6.3%)	112 (54.1%)	32 (15.4%)
Cleanliness	4 (1.9%)	31 (14.9%)	55 (26.6%)
Access	7 (3.4%)	15 (7.2%)	76 (36.7%)

Results: The community members identified safety as most important.

**Question #16** asked Community members to indicate their 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> priorities that they would most support with tax dollars.

Table 16 (Question #16, Priorities most support with Tax Dollars)

Item (N=388)	1 <sup>st</sup> Priority	2 <sup>nd</sup> Priority	3 <sup>rd</sup> Priority
Acquisition and conservation of natural areas, open space and trails	100 (25.8%)	69 (17.8%)	70 (18.0%)
Acquisition of open space for sport facilities (baseball, softball, soccer, etc.)	20 (5.2%)	22 (5.6%)	21 (5.4%)
Acquisition of a community center within the City	116 (29.9%)	43 (11.1%)	39 (10.0%)
Acquisition of sport specific lights at Civic Center	6 (1.5%)	15 (3.9%)	16 (4.1%)
Improvement of neighborhood, community and regional parks	34 (8.8%)	55 (14.1%)	74 (19.1%)
Operation, maintenance and security of neighborhood, and community parks	41 (10.5%)	60 (15.4%)	72 (18.6%)
Development of new recreation programs for children	37 (9.5%)	56 (14.4%)	46 (11.8%)
Development of new recreation programs for adults	11 (2.8%)	48 (12.4%)	35 (9.0%)
Development of new recreation programs for seniors	23 (5.9%)	20 (5.2%)	15 (3.9%)

Results: Acquisition of a community center and natural areas were identified as priorities by community members.

**Question #17** asked Community members if they would be in favor of a community center that would serve the community through sport and/or recreational activities.

Table 17 (Question #17, In favor of a Community Center)

Item (N=388)	Frequencies and Percentages
Yes	307 (79.1%)
No	30 (7.7%)
Not sure	51 (13.1%)

Results: The community members indicated strong support (79.1%) for a community center.

**Question #18** (Optional) asked Community members how many people are in their household.

Table 18 (Question #18, Age of people in household)

Age	0 Members	1 Member	2 Members	3 Members	4 Members	5 Members	6 Members
Under age 5	20	42	18	5			
5 – 9	10	118	31	5			1
10 – 14	12	100	27	10			
15 – 19	12	53	11	1			1
20 – 24	14	22	4				
25 – 34	11	63	36	1	1		
35 – 44	7	90	78	1			
45 – 54	10	66	32				
55 – 64	12	26	13				
65 – 74	14	40	10				
Ages 75+	17	18		3			

Results: The age range of individuals in households varied from under 5 to above 75 years.

**Question #19** (Optional) asked Community members their age. The ages were compiled in five year increments.

Table 19 (Question #19, Age)

<b>Age (N=357)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
10 – 14	4 (1.1%)
15 – 19	0 (0.0%)
20 – 24	4 (1.1%)
25 – 34	74 (20.7%)
35 – 44	133 (37.2%)
45 – 54	65 (18.2%)
55 – 64	27 (7.6%)
65 – 74	37 (10.4%)
75+	13 (3.6%)

Results: The majority (57.9%) of community respondents were between the ages of 35-54.

**Question #20** (Optional) asked Community members to check all of the following that describes their race/ethnicity.

Table 20 (Question #20, Race/Ethnicity)

<b>Race/Ethnicity (N=358)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Far East Asian (ex. – Chinese, Korean)	4 (1.1%)
South Asian (ex. – Indian, Pakistani)	2 (0.6%)
Black – African American	52 (14.5%)
Hispanic or Latino	3 (0.8%)
Black – Other (ex. – Haitian, Other West Indies)	2 (0.6%)
White – Non Hispanic	245 (68.4%)
White - Hispanic	24 (6.7%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	6 (1.7%)
Other	9 (2.5%)
More than one race/ethnicity checked	11 (3.1%)

Results: The majority (68.4%) of the community respondents were White – Non Hispanic followed by Black – African Americans (14.5%).

**Question #21** (Optional) asked Community members to indicate their gender.

Table 21 (Question #21, Gender)

<b>Gender (N=388)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Male	115 (29.6%)
Female	273 (70.4%)

Results: More females than males responded to the needs assessment.

**Question #22** (Optional) asked Community members to check their household income.

Table 22 (Question #22, Household Income)

<b>Household Income (N=388)</b>	<b>Frequencies and Percentages</b>
Under \$14,999	57 (14.7%)
\$15,000 - \$29,999	31 (7.9%)
\$30,000 - \$49,999	92 (23.7%)
\$50,000 - \$99,999	144 (37.1%)
\$100,000 or more	64 (16.5%)

Results: The largest (37.1%) respondents to the needs assessment earned between \$50,000 - \$99,999.