

4. NRPA and SCORP Assessments

4.1 Introduction to the NRPA Systems Approach to Park Planning

Since 1983 the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) has published a Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines publication to assist communities in developing park and recreation plans. Through this publication, the NRPA looks to ensure that communities know how to secure “the right kind of land” to meet their community needs. To ensure that this occurs, the NRPA recommends a systems approach be used in planning a community park network. Several steps of the NRPA’s multi-step planning process have been undertaken as part of this planning effort. These efforts are described in Section 4.2.

It is likely that the Town of Warwick will pursue grants and other funding opportunities available through New York State. To best facilitate this, the standards used to assess the adequacy of the Town’s parks are those established in the New York State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). These standards and classifications are described in Section 4.3, while the Town’s parks are assessed using the SCORP standards in Section 4.4. An assessment of the Town’s recreational facilities can be found in Section 4.5.

4.2 Multi-Step Park Planning Process

Under the systems planning model, the NRPA has identified a multi-step process that results in effective parks and recreation planning. The first four steps, which are directly related to developing the parks plan, are described in the following paragraphs.

4.2.1 Identifying Customers

Step #1 involves identifying customers.

According to the NRPA guidelines, this includes Participant Users (individuals that participate in a structured manner, i.e., sports leagues); Direct Users (those that use a facility in an unstructured manner, such as hiking or picnicking); and Non-Users (those that do not use the park directly and may or may not recognize the benefits the park system brings to the community.) Non-users may also represent a latent need for specific types of resources, including, for example, facilities that are compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).



As the authority that oversees the recreational needs of the Town of Warwick, the Town's Recreation Commission meets regularly to discuss customer needs and the condition of park resources. As part of this planning process, the consultants met with Recreation Commission to discuss expressed community needs. A demographic profile was developed, providing for a synopsis of the community's population. Specific characteristics analyzed included population trends, age, income, household composition, and education.



In addition, a recreation needs resident survey was developed. Town residents were invited to complete an online or a paper version of the survey. The survey was accessible online from November 28, 2005 through and including December 12, 2005. The deadline for paper copies of the survey was December 12, 2005. A total of 544 surveys were completed, resulting in a response rate of approximately 5%. This feedback was instrumental in helping the

plan consultants develop an overview of both user as well as non-user populations in the Town.

4.2.2 Obtaining Customer Involvement and Developing Relationships

Step #2 includes obtaining customer involvement and developing relationships.

In order to meet the actions required of this step, a public visioning open house open to all Warwick residents was held on November 30, 2005. With the intent of making the process as inclusive as possible, three simultaneous public forums were held in the Town Hall, in the Greenwood Lake Senior Center, and in the Florida Senior Center. The goal behind each of these public forums was to obtain feedback from users and non-users on what they would like to see at the Town's various parks and recreational facilities, including improvements to existing resources and development of new amenities, both now and in the future.

4.2.3 Assessing Need

Step #3 involves assessing need. Once the information from the public workshop, the stakeholder questionnaires, and the resident surveys had been compiled and summarized, this information was integrated into a usable form. Common themes regarding potential inadequacies in the system were identified. The plan consultants then evaluated the community's resources in the context of customers' expressed desires (as indicated through the public forums). Through interaction and communication with the Town and Recreation Commission, the plan consultants attempted to balance customer perceptions and feedback with information about ongoing recreation activities and programs. For example, the perception that the Town does not allocate sufficient resources to special outdoor events may only indicate that not all areas of the community are well informed about such events.

4.2.4 Developing the Strategic Plan

Step # 4 is developing the strategic plan. As part of this planning process, using the feedback obtained through the various public forums, a community vision for the Town’s parks and recreation system was identified. Based on the values and ideals residents have identified throughout the public participation process, as well as the critiques and shortcomings identified, the strategic plan will provide viable solutions to rectify inadequacies in Warwick’s park and recreation system. Implementation techniques, including policy development, capital improvements, development of new funding sources, and any proposed land acquisitions, are included in the final six steps of the systematic planning process. *The Park and Recreation Plan* that has been developed as part of this process will include a matrix of appropriate implementation techniques to facilitate the development of the Town’s park system.



Table 9: Parks, Open Space, and Pathways Classifications Table

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATIONS			
Classification	General Description	Location Criteria	Size Criteria
Mini-Parks	Used to address limited, isolated or unique residential needs	Less than ¼ mile distance in residential setting	Between 2,500 s.f. and 1 acre
Neighborhood Parks	Basic unit of the park system & serves as the recreational & social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation.	¼ to ½ mile distance and not interrupted by non-residential roads or other physical barriers.	> 5 acres and < 10 acres is optimal.
School Park	Depending on circumstances, pursuing joint opportunities can fulfill space requirements for variety of park classification needs (e.g., neighborhood, community, or sports complex.)	Determined by location of school district property.	Variable, depends on function.
Community Parks	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park. Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes & open space.	Determined by quality & suitability of site. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods at ½ to 3-mile distance.	As needed. Often 30-50 acres.
Large Urban Parks	Serve a broader purpose than community parks and are used when smaller parks are inadequate. Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as unique landscape/open space preservation.	Determined by quality & suitability of site. Usually serves entire community.	> 50 acres and < 75 acres is optimal.
Natural Resource Area	Lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, landscapes, and open space.	Resource availability and opportunity.	Variable.
Greenways	Effectively tie the park system components together to form a continuous park environment.	Resource availability and opportunity.	Variable.
Sports Complex	Consolidates heavy programmed athletic fields & associated facilities to large multipurpose sites.	Strategically located in community-wide facilities.	Min.: 25 acres Optimal: > 40 acres and < 80 acres
Special Use	Area for specialized or single purpose recreation activities such as campgrounds, golf courses etc.	Variable depending on specific use.	Variable
Private Park/ Recreation Facility	Privately owned facilities that contributes to the public park and recreation system.	Variable depending on specific use.	Variable

PATHWAY CLASSIFICATIONS		
Classification	General Description	Description of Each Type Size Criteria
Park Trail	Trails located within greenways, parks, & natural resource areas. Focus is on recreational value and harmony with nature.	Type I: Separate/single-purpose, hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians/cyclists/ skaters. Type II: Multi purpose hard surface trails. Type III: Nature trails for pedestrians. Hard or soft surfaced.
Connector Trails	Multipurpose trails emphasizing safe travel for pedestrians throughout community. Recreation & transportation focus.	Type I: Separate/single-purpose, hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians/cyclists/ skaters located in independent ROW. Type II: Separate/single-purpose hard surface trails typically in independent ROW.
On-Street Bikeways	Paved segments of roadways that serve as a means to safely separate cyclists from cars	Bike Route: Designated portions of the roadway for preferential/exclusive use of cyclists.
All-Terrain Bike Trail	Off-road trail for all-terrain (mountain) bikes.	Singe-purpose loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas.
Cross Country Ski Trail	Trails developed for traditional and skate-style cross-country skiing.	Loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas.
Equestrian Trail	Trails developed for horseback riding.	Loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas. Sometimes developed as multipurpose with hiking and all-terrain biking where conflicts can be controlled.

Source: National Parks Recreation Association, Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines. (1996)

4.3 Introduction to the SCORP Standards

The State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) establishes standards that provide guidance to communities focused on developing recreational resources. These recommended guidelines provide suggested requirements on the minimum population density required to support a specific recreation opportunity; the approximate number of acres needed to support the recreational opportunity; the recommended standard size per 1,000 population; the maximum travel time of a potential user; and the appropriate means of accessing the resource. The SCORP also provides suggestions on how such recreational resources may be further enhanced. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation developed these guidelines through researching the various recreational activities, working with the public through a public participation process, and obtaining feedback from other government agencies that have a vested interest in open space and recreation.

These standards can be used a guide by communities looking to develop additional recreational facilities. The SCORP guidelines look to maximize the social and economic benefits of recreation

while minimizing the adverse impacts to the resource. These standards provide communities with information to assist them develop specific recreational resources and ensure the success of the resources or facility. Through comparing the community's characteristics, population density, and land availability with the SCORP standards, communities can better identify the likely need for a proposed resource. If the community specifics differ greatly from the recommended standards, and fall short of the SCORP minimum standards, the potential success of that proposed resource is questionable.

The two tables that follow are the SCORP standards for the Recreational Opportunity Standards and the Facility Development Standards. These tables are generalized tables that are used by all of New York State and not all of the items listed in these tables will apply specifically to the Town of Warwick.

Table 10: Recreational Opportunity Standards *

Facility Type	Critical Min. Pop. Density	Approx. Size In Acres	Standard Per 1000 Pop.	Max. Travel Time	Means of Access	Comments
Play lot	2500/sq. mi.	1-2	2 acres	10 min.	By foot or By bicycle	Combined with residential development or school
Pocket park	2500/sq.mi.	.25-.50	.25 acres	10 min.	By foot or by bicycle	For office workers, shoppers, neighborhood
Neighborhood Park	2500/sq.mi.	4-7	1 acre	20 min.	By foot or by bicycle	Should contain passive areas with landscaping, as well as active areas such as play fields, court games, tot lots, etc.
District Park	500/sq. mi.	20-100	2 acres	30 min.	Automobile, Mass transit, bike, hiking or trail	Should include comfort station, interests for all ages; 1/3 capacity for winter activities (e.g., ice skating, sledding)
Community Park	**	50-100	5 acres	30 min.	Automobile, transit, bike, hiking or trail	Extensive day use areas
Large Regional Parks	**	40+	15 acres	1-2 hrs.	Automobile, charter bus, transit, or major trail	Camping, picnicking should include water access and selected winter activities ski touring, snowmobiling
Metro	10,000/sq.m i.	25	.124	30 min.	Limited auto access or any non-auto mode	Urban parks emphasizing special recreational cultural or historical themes and activities, day and evening operation during all seasons

Source: NYS Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2003. Appendix I: Recreation Facility Design Guidelines. Standards and Development Guidelines.

* Partially derived from National Recreation and Parks Association

** Not applicable

Table 11: Facility Development Standards

Facility Type	Instant Max. User Density	Standard Per 1000 Pop	Comments
Field Games	15 users/acre	3 acres/1000	The following may be provided through off-peak use of school facilities
Tennis Courts	4 users/court	1 court/2000	The following can be lighted and converted for ice skating
Basketball (Courts)	16 users/court	1 court/1999	
Swimming Pool	1 user/25 sq. foot	750 sq. ft./1000	The following may be enclosed to extend seasonal use
Skating Areas (natural)	500 users/acre	1 site/2500	This category includes non-refrigerated rinks
Big Game Hunting	1 hunter/5 acres	200 acres/1000	
Fishing (Stream)	5 users/mile	0.5 mi. stream/1000	
Golf Course	8 users/hole	0.5 holes/1000	

Source: NYS Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2003. Appendix I: Recreation Facility Design Guidelines. Standards and Development Guidelines.

4.4 Evaluating Warwick's Parks Using SCORP Standards

SCORP standards are designed to be evaluated at the municipal level. (See the Recreational Opportunity Standards in Table 10). The Town of Warwick is 116 square miles, one of the largest towns in New York State, and houses three distinct and incorporated Villages within its boundaries. A household residing in the Village of Greenwood Lake is highly unlikely to use the facilities and fields at the Pine Island Park, which is located approximately 15 miles away, past the lake, and on the other side of the mountain. Bearing this in mind, it was necessary to identify appropriate sub-areas by which to evaluate park and resource adequacy.

After some discussion—and receiving feedback from stakeholders and residents—the Recreation Commission determined that basing the adequacy delineations along school district boundaries made the most sense.² It should be noted, however, that school district boundaries do straddle municipal and, even on occasion, County boundaries in New York State. As the intent of this plan is to measure the adequacy of municipal parks in Greater Warwick, and *to identify what the Town of Warwick and the Villages of Warwick, Florida, and Greenwood Lake can do to improve their parks*, parks in other municipalities have not been included in the assessment although households living near a municipal boundary may choose to use other communities' parks.³

² SCORP assessments were initially conducted at the municipal level. Tables evaluating the adequacy of parkland in Greater Warwick (Town and Villages), Town-only, and Villages-only relative to the existing, estimated, and projected population base of those communities are included in Appendix B, SCORP Parks Analysis.

³ According to the feedback obtained through the park and recreation survey, many Greater Warwick residents do use other communities' parks. In fact, 28.3% of respondent households use New Milford Township parks, 25.3% use Vernon Township parks, 16.9% use Monroe parks, 11.2% use Chester parks, 8.2% use Goshen parks, 4.4% use Tuxedo parks, and 2.1% use Minisink parks. Section 5 includes more detailed information on the survey results and a full survey response summary is included in Appendix F, Public Outreach.

Additionally, although the school district boundary is being used as the delineation for evaluating needs assessment, *school district-owned fields, recreational facilities, playgrounds, or other resources were not included in calculating the SCORP assessments.* While a resource inventory was developed for each of the three school districts located in Greater Warwick (see Appendix D, School District Resources), the availability of each school resource differs.⁴ For example, one elementary school playground may be unlocked and accessible to area residents on weekends, while another may be open only during school hours. Other resources may be fully available to organized athletic groups—provided they submit Facility Use Forms and proof of insurance. As there is no standard measure for including “somewhat” available resources, school facilities were omitted from the SCORP calculations.

In addition, although undeveloped parks have been inventoried as part of the park and recreation planning process, they are not included in the SCORP park acreage assessments. While they do provide value as open space, and allow for a variety of passive activities —hiking, fishing, nature observation, etc. —the options they present for developing active recreational facilities is limited.

4.4.1 Study Area 1: Florida Union Free School District

The area within the Town of Warwick that corresponds to the Florida Union Free School District (see the Study Area Delineation Map that follows) presently has adequate acres of parkland. Using Census 2000 population figures, Study Area 1 had a substantial surplus in the amount of parkland (39.3% beyond what was necessary to meet then-existing need). Using 2005 Census Bureau estimates, Study Area 1 continues to have sufficient parkland (18% above what it needs), but its



surplus has significantly diminished from the Year 2000 assessment. Using 2010 population projections available from ESRI Business Information Solutions, the adequacy of Study Area 1 continues to decrease substantially. Despite this decrease, parkland acreage in Study Area 1 will continue to meet need through to 2010— measuring 99.6% adequacy.

Undeveloped parklands encompassed within Study Area 1 include the 97-acre Village of Florida Park at Glenmere Lake.

⁴ As part of this study, the plan consultants contacted representatives of each school district to discuss the extent to which each school district’s facilities and resources were available to local residents. A summary of these conversations is included in Appendix D, School District Resources.

STUDY AREA - 1 (Florida Union Free School District)
DEVELOPED PARKS

STUDY AREA - 1				2000 Needs Analysis		2005 Needs Analysis		2010 * Needs Analysis	
	SCORP Standard Per 1000 Pop	Approx. Size Acres	Existing Capacity	4,832 Residents	Estimated Surplus or Shortage	5,304 Residents	Existing Surplus or Shortage	5,792 Residents	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Park</i>									
(1) Play Lot (1 - 2 acres)	2 acres	-	0	9.7	-9.7	10.6	-10.6	11.6	-11.6
(2) Pocket Park/ Mini Park (.25 - .50 acres)	.25 acres	-	0	1.2	-1.2	1.3	-1.3	1.4	-1.4
(3) Neighborhood Park (4 - 7 acres)	1 acre	-	6.3	4.8	1.5	5.3	1.0	5.8	0.5
Walter R Sturt Memorial Park		3.6 acres							
# Louis H. Sherwin Park		2.7 acres							
(4) District Park (20 - 100 acres)	2 acres	-	0	9.7	-9.7	10.6	-10.6	11.6	-11.6
(5) Community Park (50 - 100 acres)	5 acres	-	112.2	24.2	88.0	26.5	85.7	29.0	83.2
Union Corners Park		47.9 acres							
Union Corners Sports Complex		64.3 acres							
Total Developed Parks	10.25	-	118.5	49.5	69.0	54.4	64.1	59.4	59.1
Needs Analysis (%)					139.3%		118.0%		99.6%

4.4.2 Study Area 2: Greenwood Lake Union Free School District

Using the SCORP-based assessment, the amount of parkland within Study Area 2 (the area within the Town of Warwick that corresponds to the Greenwood Lake Union Free School District) is woefully inadequate. Using Census 2000 population figures, Study Area 2 had a substantial deficit in the amount of parkland required to meet then needs (-84.3%). This indicates that Study Area 2, in 2000, needed to nearly *double* its parkland to meet its then-existing needs.

As much of this area is covered by Sterling Forest State Park, Study Area 2 has limited land available for new residential growth. While the 2005-estimated population shows an increase from 2000, this growth has been limited. The resultant needs estimate for 2005 is -84.8%. The population increase for 2010 is forecasted to be similarly slight. The resultant needs forecast for 2010 is -85.9%.

Despite the fact that population growth in Study Area 2 is forecasted to be relatively minimal, the area’s existing shortage of parkland area is quite substantial and will only worsen unless additional active parklands are developed. To meet current and immediate future (2010) shortages, this Study Area needs an additional 65 acres of active parkland. The amount of parkland needed to meet current and future need would nearly double the area’s existing parkland.⁵

⁵ It should be noted that the American Legion owns Legions Field, which is presently used for girls’ softball. Although the field was included in the SCORP calculation, the future of this field’s availability is not certain.

Undeveloped parklands encompassed in Study Area 2 include the _____-acre East Shore Beach and the 2.9-acre Greenwood Lake Public Beach.

STUDY AREA - 2 (Greenwood Lake Union Free School District)
DEVELOPED PARKS

STUDY AREA - 2				2000 Needs Analysis		2005 Needs Analysis		2010 * Needs Analysis	
	SCORP Standard Per 1000 Pop	Approx. Size Acres	Existing Capacity	6,648 Residents	Estimated Surplus or Shortage	6,883 Residents	Existing Surplus or Shortage	7,384 Residents	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Park</i>									
(1) Play Lot (1 - 2 acres)	2 acres	-	0	13.3	-13.3	13.8	-13.8	14.8	-14.8
(2) Pocket Park/ Mini Park (.25 - .50 acres)	.25 acres	-	1	1.7	-0.7	1.7	-0.7	1.8	-0.8
# Legion Field		1 acres							
(3) Neighborhood Park (4 - 7 acres)	1 acre	-	9.7	6.6	3.1	6.9	2.8	7.4	2.3
Helen Kelly Park		2.4 acres							
Lions Park		7.3 acres							
(4) District Park (20 - 100 acres)	2 acres	-	0	13.3	-13.3	13.8	-13.8	14.8	-14.8
(5) Community Park (50 - 100 acres)	5 acres	-	0	33.2	-33.2	34.4	-34.4	36.9	-36.9
Total Developed Parks	10.25	-	10.7	68.1	-57.4	70.6	-59.9	75.7	-65.0
Needs Analysis (%)					-84.3%		-84.8%		-85.9%

4.4.3 Study Area 3: Warwick Valley School District

Study Area 3 includes the central portion of the Town of Warwick that corresponds to the Warwick Valley School District. According to the SCORP analysis, Study Area 3 experienced a deficit of parkland in 2000 of -59.3%. This inadequacy is estimated to have increased to -63.0% as of 2005. As Study Area 3's population base continues to grow, by 2010 it is projected that this deficit will worsen, resulting in a demonstrated needs analysis of -66.0%. To meet current and immediate future (2010) shortages, this Study Area needs an additional 157 acres of active parkland.

Undeveloped parklands included within Study Area 3 are the 504-acre Cascade Park, the 13-acre Wickham Lake Park, and the 4.8-acre Lewis Woodlands.

STUDY AREA - 3 (Warwick Valley School District)

DEVELOPED PARKS

STUDY AREA - 3 (Warwick Valley School District)				2000 Needs Analysis		2005 Needs Analysis		2010 * Needs Analysis	
	SCORP Standard Per 1000 Pop	Approx. Size Acres	Existing Capacity	19,284 Residents	Estimated Surplus or Shortage	21,176 Residents	Existing Surplus or Shortage	23,101 Residents	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Park</i>									
(1) Play Lot (1 - 2 acres)	2 acres	-	0	38.6	-38.6	42.4	-42.4	46.2	-46.2
(2) Pocket Park/ Mini Park (.25 - .50 acres)	.25 acres	-	0	4.8	-4.8	5.3	-5.3	5.8	-5.8
(3) Neighborhood Park (4 - 7 acres)	1 acre	-	9.2	19.3	-10.1	21.2	-12.0	23.1	-13.9
Pine Island Park		4.8 acres							
Airport Park		4.4 acres							
(4) District Park (20 - 100 acres)	2 acres	-	0	38.6	-38.6	42.4	-42.4	46.2	-46.2
(5) Community Park (50 - 100 acres)	5 acres	-	71.2	96.4	-25.2	105.9	-34.7	115.5	-44.3
Veteran's Memorial Park		60.7 acres							
Stanley-Deming Park		10.5 acres							
Total Developed Parks	10.25	-	80.4	197.7	-117.3	217.1	-136.7	236.8	-156.4
Needs Analysis (%)					-59.3%		-63.0%		-66.0%

4.5 Evaluating Warwick’s Recreational Facilities Using SCORP Standards

New York State’s Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, through its SCORP standards, in addition to recommended parkland acreage estimates, also provides recommended Facility Development Standards (See Table 11). Based on average usage and availability, the SCORP recommendations identify a standard number of resources that should be available per 1,000 residents. This standard seeks to establish a baseline measure to ensure the amount of local resources available is adequate to meet resident need.

The same qualifications identified in Section 4.4 continue to be true. Although approximate school district boundaries delineate the three study areas, actual school facilities have not been incorporated into the SCORP analysis. This plan was developed primarily to assess municipal need and, as such, to direct municipal actions related to park investment/upgrades and partnership-building. Also, as the public accessibility of each school district’s resources varied greatly among school districts and among facility types, identifying a uniform measure of availability was not feasible. However, assuming concerns regarding public availability and public access could be resolved, the extent to which each school district’s existing facilities could be used to meet existing need has been discussed.

It was deemed more appropriate to evaluate two specific recreational facility types, golf courses and swimming pools, at the Town-wide level. This is due to the cost associated with constructing and maintaining such facilities.

4.5.1 Study Area 1: Florida Union Free School District

While Study Area 1 historically has had sufficient field space to meet its needs, this is changing. An estimated 2005 shortfall is projected to continue growing. The area’s one (1) existing basketball court (at Walter R. Sturr Memorial Park) and complete lack of tennis courts presently do not meet existing need. This situation will worsen in the future as the population base increases.

The Florida Union Free School District has an estimated eight (8) field areas of varying sizes located at the S.S. Seward Institute and at Golden Hill Elementary. This includes two (2) soccer fields at the “Field of Dreams,” two (2) soccer fields and two (2) baseball fields at the Elementary School, and two (2) multi-use fields at the High School. The school district also has two (2) indoor basketball courts.

Study Area 1			2000		2005		2010	
	Standard Per 1000 Pop	Existing Park Capacity	Estimated Need (2000 Pop = 4,832)	Estimated Surplus or Shortage	Existing Need (2005 Pop = 5,304)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Projected Need (2010 Pop = 5,792)	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Facility</i>								
Field Games (Baseball, Softball, Football, Soccer)	3 acres/1000	14.38	14	0	16	-2	17	-3
Tennis Courts	1 court/2000	0	2	-2	3	-3	3	-3
Basketball Courts	1 court/1999	1	2	-1	3	-2	3	-2

4.5.2 Study Area 2: Greenwood Lake Union Free School District

Unless new fields are developed, designated field space in Study Area 2 has, is, and will continue to be insufficient to meet the needs of area residents. While the area presently has a little more than 4 acres of field space, they need 20 acres to meet local need. While the area’s three (3) basketball courts –two (2) at Lions Park and one (1) at Helen Kelly Park—do presently meet resident need, the area completely lacks tennis courts. By 2010, it is projected that Study Area 2 will need additional field space, tennis courts, and one (1) additional basketball court to meet resident need.

The Greenwood Lake Union Free School District has four (4) designated field areas. All located at the Middle School, these include two (2) baseball/softball fields, one (1) soccer field and one (1) multi-use field. The Middle School also houses one (1) basketball court, while the Elementary School has one (1) indoor basketball court.

Study Area 2			2000		2005		2010	
	Standard Per 1000 Pop	Existing Park Capacity	Estimated Need (2000 Pop. = 6,648)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Existing Need (2005 Pop. = 6,883)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Projected Need (2010 Pop. = 7,384)	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Facility</i>								
Field Games (Baseball, Softball, Football, Soccer)	3 acres/1000	4.35	20	-16	21	-16	22	-18
Tennis Courts	1 court/2000	0	3	-3	3	-3	4	-4
Basketball Courts	1 court/1999	3	3	0	3	0	4	-1

4.5.3 Study Area 3: Warwick Valley School District

Housing roughly two-thirds of Greater Warwick's population, this area needs the greatest number of recreational facilities to meet resident need. While Study Area 3 has approximately seven (7) acres of field space, it needs 64 acres to meet the estimated needs of its current population. This deficit will grow by 5 acres by 2010. Study Area 3's two (2) tennis courts—at Pine Island Park—and four (4) basketball courts—two (2) at Stanley Deming, one (1) at Pine Island, and one (1) at Airport Park—do not meet existing need. This shortfall will worsen as the area's population grows.

The Warwick Valley School District, with a High School/Middle School and four elementary schools, has many recreational facilities distributed throughout Study Area 3. School district fields include the following: eight (8) baseball/softball fields; four (4) soccer fields; one (1) football field; and three (3) multi-use fields. (See Appendix D for the precise breakdown of facility locations.)

In addition, the Warwick Valley School District has ten (10) basketball courts, eight (8) of which are located in indoor gymnasiums. The district also has seven (7) tennis courts.

Study Area 3			2000		2005		2010	
	Standard Per 1000 Pop	Existing Park Capacity	Estimated Need (2000 Pop. = 19,284)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Existing Need (2005 Pop. = 21,176)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Projected Need (2010 Pop.= 23,101)	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Facility</i>								
Field Games (Baseball, Softball, Football, Soccer)	3 acres/1000	6.8	58	-51	64	-57	69	-63
Tennis Courts	1 court/2000	2	10	-8	11	-9	12	-10
Basketball Courts	1 court/1999	4	10	-6	11	-7	12	-8

4.5.4 Greater Warwick Town-wide Facilities

As was indicated previously, two recreational facilities, due to their cost and the need for sufficient patrons to make them feasible, have been evaluated on a Town-wide basis. These are golf courses and swimming pools.

To meet current and near-future (Year 2010) resident needs, the Town of Warwick should have one 18-hole golf course and two Olympic sized swimming pools (50 meter X 25 meter with a surface area of approximately 13,500 sq. ft.).

Although there is no municipal golf course in Greater Warwick, residents have easy access to the Orange County Hickory Hills 18-hole golf course. The golf course is described in Section 3.9.1.

The Warwick Valley School District High School has a swimming pool that is made available to Town residents one night per week.

Greater Warwick (Town and Villages)			2000		2005		2010	
	SCORP Standard Per 1000 Pop	Existing Capacity	Estimated Need (2000 Pop. = 30,764)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Existing Need (2005 Pop. = 33,363)	Existing Surplus or Shortage	Projected Need (2010 Pop. = 36,277)	Projected Surplus or Shortage
<i>Type of Facility</i>								
Swimming Pool	750 sq.ft./1000	0	23,073	-23,073	25,022	-25,022	27,208	-27,208
Golf Course	0.5 holes/1000	0	15	-15	17	-17	18	-18