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Section 1: Executive Summary
1. The woodland interpretive trail:

   The woodland interpretive trail meanders through the forested south end of the site, linking key park elements such as the Park Administration/Ranger Station/Interpretive Center, the Children’s Gardens, and several picnic areas.

2. The five field softball complex south of the parking area:

   During the public workshops, great emphasis was placed on the need for lighted softball fields within the City. The five field complex and the peak-use parking capacity provided as illustrated in the Master Plan will greatly alleviate this pressure.

3. Park entrance through garden area including Community and Children’s Gardens:

   The design team felt very strongly that the entrance into the park should continue to access the site in approximately the same location as the Landfill off Warwick Boulevard. With the advent of the Lucas Creek Road extension, park access would then shift from Warwick to the new Lucas Creek extension.

   In addition, the design team felt strongly about running the entrance road to the park alongside the community garden/wildflower areas in order to immediately instill a feeling of ecological/environmental education, responsibility, and sensitivity.

4. The parking zone between the softball complex and the tennis, basketball, and beach volley ball court zone:

   As previously mentioned, the parking areas have been designed to accommodate peak tournament use, while also serving the intense active recreational uses of tennis, an additional multi-use athletic field, and the beach volley ball court zone developed west of the lake.

5. Playgrounds:

   Much emphasis was placed on the abundance of playgrounds associated with the various adult activities, in order to accommodate the parents’ desire to be in close proximity to their children, while engaged in the various recreational activities, such as basketball, softball, etc.

6. The tennis, basketball, and beach volley court zone:

   Located west of the lakeshore, this area concentrates the aforementioned activities together into a very active recreational use zone adjacent to the softball complex. The area is situated close to the park entrance in order to minimize traffic and street/parking lot construction.

7. The lake with amenities as:

   a. fishing pier;
   b. paddle boat dock;
8. Basketball court zone;

The nine court basketball complex was located west of the future Lucas Creek Road extension in order to facilitate play while the balance of the park is closed, thus avoiding conflict with park security, noise, and court illumination. This location will permit the early phasing of the basketball complex prior to the Lucas Creek extension. The complex also maintains ample parking, a small facilities building, and a playground.

9. The summit kite flying zone;

A great opportunity afforded by the updraft air currents formed by Cells 1, 2 & 3.

10. The Spiral Observation Mound and Summit Picnic Area;

More great opportunities afforded by the elevated cells. The visitor gains another 15 feet in elevation on cell 3 to an observation point via a spiral trail through colorful beds of wildflowers. The views of the adjacent park and the City from this vantage point are truly outstanding. The summit picnic area, made up of shelters, gazebos, and an affiliated playground, shares the dramatic views and the source for the recirculating stream.

11. Summit access drive and parking;

The team has taken advantage of the existing haul road alignment in order to service the summit activities. Adequate parking is provided for peak-use times.

12. The mountain & BMX bike/sledding/disc golf complex;

Anchoring the north end of the park around the perimeters of cells 1, 2, and 3 is the mountain bike/sledding/disc golf complex. Taking advantage of the dynamic topographic changes, the complex provides great opportunities for excellent climbs and descents for bikers, challenging fairways for disc golfers, and a great location for winter sledding during occasional snowstorms.
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SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION

The following report chronologically tracks the Stoney Run Park Master planning/design process which included regular input from key members of the City Staff, and extensive public participation in the form of the Citizens Advisory Committee, a group of sixteen dedicated citizen representatives from the adjacent neighborhoods, planning districts, and the citizenry-at-large.

The report is divided into seven sections:

Section 1: Executive Summary
Section 2: Introduction
Section 3: Analysis and Program Development
Section 4: Concept Plans
Section 5: Master Plan
Section 6: Estimate of Probable Construction Cost
Section 7: Appendix

The three final sections address the key meetings which essentially provided the PBS&J Design Team with the information, data, input, and feedback necessary to maintain the forward evolution of the Master Plan. The graphic exhibits affiliated with the various meetings and presentations are included within their related sections.

Background: (Reprinted from "Closed Denbigh Landfill Property," Department of Public Works)

In 1996, the City entered into a 30-year contract with Sanifill of Virginia, Inc. for disposal of solid waste. As a result, the City closed the last remaining landfill in Newport News, located at 15110 Warwick Boulevard.

The closed landfill is comprised of 228 acres. It is bounded on the east by the CSX Railroad, on the south by Courthouse Green Townhouses, and on the north by Patrick Village and the Arbors/Trellis Condominiums. West of and contiguous to the landfill are 103 acres that were originally purchased for landfill expansion. This land is not included in the proposed park site.

The closed landfill was designed to have six distinct disposal areas, referred to as "cells". Cells 1, 2, and 3 were developed, filled with waste, and closed in sequential order. The mound created by cells 1, 2 and 3 has an elevation of 112 feet. Cell 5 (developed out of numerical sequence) was constructed, but never used. Cell 5 is approximately 17 acres, with a depth of 40 feet at its lowest point.

At the present time, undeveloped cell 6 is being utilized as a composting site. The base of the site is "crushrun," a compacted stone aggregate that is removable. Approximately 2 acres of undeveloped cell 4 is currently used as a dewatering site for ditch cleaning operations; the remainder is unused.
Around the perimeter of the landfill property are numerous environmental facilities, such as a leachate pre-treatment lagoon, collection ponds, gas collection facilities and wells, and dewatering pumps. These will have to be isolated and protected from any activities on the site.

The landfill facility is enclosed by a perimeter road. A 200-foot wide, treed buffer surrounds the landfill, providing a visual screen.

The City is planning two road improvements that will affect the property. The Snidow Boulevard extension will cross the northern part of the landfill to provide another east/west connection between Warwick Boulevard and Jefferson Avenue. The proposed Lucas Creek Road extension will run east from Warwick Boulevard between the existing landfill and the expansion area, and will connect with Snidow Boulevard. A transit station is also recommended on the site for a future light rail system on the CSX corridor.

Purpose of the Study

The City of Newport News Comprehensive Plan “Framework for the Future” stipulates a “City Park” facility to be developed as part of the Denbigh Landfill closure process (See Map 6-3, Parks and Recreation Plan Map). The following text is reprinted from Framework for the Future, and outlines the City’s goals:

PARKS AND RECREATION GOALS, POLICIES, STRATEGIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION

The Framework for the Future sets forth the following goals, policies, strategies, and implementation for Parks and Recreation.

GOAL 1. Provide adequate park space to serve the recreational needs of the residents of Newport News.

POLICY 1.1: Using the Parks and Recreation Plan Map 6-3 as a guide, develop park lands of three functional types: Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, and District Parks, to serve the needs of current and future residents.

IMPLEMENTATION 1.1:

1.1.1: Prepare and adopt a park acquisition and development plan for new active parks in areas identified as being deficient in park land.

1.1.2: Seek state enabling legislation that allows municipalities to require park land dedication (or cash in lieu of land) as a condition of residential development approvals.
1.1.3: Seek federal and state grant funding for parks and incorporate specific proposals from the Framework for the Future in the City’s Capital Improvements Program.

POLICY 1.2: Adopt the following park standards.

Neighborhood Parks:

Provide at least one Neighborhood Park within a ½ mile walk of each residential neighborhood. Neighborhood Parks should include playgrounds, picnic tables, ball courts, and landscaped areas. Neighborhood Parks should be located adjacent to schools and on local or collector streets. There should be 3 acres of Neighborhood Park for each 1,000 residents, with the ideal size ranging from 3 to 5 acres. Develop mini-parks (less than one acre in size) only where land is not available, as infill sites in urbanized areas, as part of a trail network, or for street beautification (as passive parks).

Community Parks

Locate Community Parks to serve the residents of several neighborhoods. Community Parks should contain facilities such as indoor recreation centers, ballfields, and other facilities which cannot functionally be provided in neighborhood parks. Community Park sites should be located on collector or arterial streets and be accessible by public transit. There should be 3 acres of Community Park land per 1,000 residents. The parks should range in size from 15 to 25 acres and have a service radius of 1 to 1-1/2 miles.

District Parks

Develop District Parks to serve the residents of a large section of the City. District Parks should provide for indoor recreation centers, a concentration of active recreation facilities, substantial landscaping and preservation of natural features. District Parks should be located on major arterials and be accessible by public transit. A District Park should have a minimum size of 50 acres and a service radius of 5 to 7 miles. There should be at least 4 acres of District Park land per 1,000 residents.

The park will help meet the active and passive recreational needs for the immediate community, as well as for other City residents, particularly once the proposed “Light Rail” system is built and operating.

The purpose or end of this study is to formulate a logical overall Master Plan for the development of the City of Newport News Denbigh Landfill to Park Conversion Project, A.K.A. Stoney Run Park. The means by which the end will be achieved include the following:

1. Conduct a site analysis of the property.
2. Develop a facilities program based on the City of Newport News Staff and Citizen input regarding current and anticipated user needs.

3. Evaluate the opportunities and constraints of the site.

4. Prepare alternative plans.

5. Review the plan with:
   a. City Staff
   b. Citizens Advisory Committee
   c. General Public

At a time when communities are struggling with the balance between providing essential solid waste removal services for an ever growing population while protecting the environment and improving the quality of life, the conversion of the landfill to a positive land-use function, such as Stoney Run Park, is a responsible environmental function. The Park will be a beneficial addition to the community, and serves to further enhance the quality of life of the City of Newport News.
EXISTING PARKS AND SCHOOLS
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Section 3: Analysis and Program Development
7. It would be the desire of the SWD to relocate any ongoing operations to the area currently designated as Proposed Cell 4. This would be desirable from a park facilities perspective and would fit well with a proximally located Interpretive Center. The proposed composting area would require approximately 14 asphalt-paved acres.

8. The residents of Courthouse Green, located at the south boundary of the property, have expressed opposition to having an access connection to the site. PBS&J felt that clarification was necessary to determine if this meant any connection at all, or if residents of Courthouse Green were only against vehicular access. (After a site reconnoiter later that same week by PBS&J, a pedestrian connection seemed both logical and desirable.)

9. The stormwater basin at the SE corner of the property was expendable, as the composting operation with which it is associated would be moving to the Proposed Cell 4 area. The feasibility of maintaining this basin within the park design, and amending it to assure acceptable water quality, would be studied during the site analysis.

10. The park is currently planned to fall within the City’s ‘District Park’ classification, and a set program has not been established to date. No special recreational interests are precluded at this time. Planning of park facilities should recognize and compliment, rather than duplicate, those recreational features already developed in other City parks, especially nearby Newport News Park.

PBS&J requested the following information:

1. Bike route information from the Engineering Department.

2. Engineering information pertinent to the lake proposed for Cell 5, as proposed water elevation, and the degree of flexibility in reshaping the pond’s outline would be of particular importance. It was understood by PBS&J that any reshaping will be through the use of fill, as the pond was lined in the event that landfill operations again become necessary.
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

II. May 22: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1: Task Force Input

Immediately following the Project Kickoff Meeting with the City Staff, the group was joined by members of the Citizen’s Advisory Committee. Present at the meeting were Randy Ray of ‘The Virginia Living Museum’; Committee members William Harness, Mary Ann Welton, Joe Leming, Henrietta Archiey, Jennifer Brown of the Mayor’s Youth Commission; Dick Tyson of the City of Newport News Public Schools; Tan Young, Sue Hogue, David Sinclair, Michael Poplawski, and Bob Baldwin from the City of Newport News; and Tom James, Dale Siska and Bruce Brodsky of PBS&J.

The following is a summary of the issues and concerns that were raised by the Citizen’s Advisory Committee:

1. General safety considerations associated with any landfill to park conversion project.

2. The augmentation of existing and proposed parks within the City’s Parks and Recreation system.

3. Park security and the potentiality of attracting undesirables.

4. Lack of playing fields that are not associated with schools.

5. Facilities for youth leagues.

6. Natural appearance of the Park.

7. Inclusion of bike trails, walking trails, and large open spaces for play.

8. Phasing and funding of the Park.


10. Availability of grants.

11. Balance Park activities.

12. ADA standards.
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III. May 23: Meeting with Michael Poplawski, Administrator of Parks, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism

On May 23, PBS&J met with Michael Poplawski to discuss the expectations of the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism regarding the program for the Stoney Run Park. The following is a list of program elements that are corroborated by a significant user interest -- and for which a deficit in adequate City facilities currently exists. It was noted that many of these elements would be well suited to the landfill site.

1. Golf driving range.
2. Lighted soccer fields. There exits a good supply of daytime soccer fields that are associated with local schools.
3. A lighted, adult softball complex with 4-5 fields.
4. Lighted tennis courts.
5. A high demand exists for basketball courts. Lighted courts would be a great bonus. According to Mr. Poplawski, basketball facilities, due to their potential for generating loud noise and language, should be located away from less active facilities such as picnic areas and childrens’ playgrounds.
6. Locations for rollerblading and street hockey would be desirable.
7. The Parks and Recreation Department is currently constructing a new recreation center and has plans for at least two others. It would be desirable to associate one of the proposed centers with a new park. PBS&J requested a floor plan for the recreation center that is currently under construction.
8. Unlike Virginia Beach’s Mount Trashmore, the City of Newport News does not have a strong demand for skateboard ramps.
9. Children’s playgrounds would be desirable. The equipment would need to meet state-of-the-art safety requirements.
10. Mountain biking facilities would be desirable.
11. Picnic facilities in general, and accommodations for large picnic groups in particular (more than 100 people), are desired.
12. Although snow is rare in this area, Mr. Poplawski mentioned that provision to accommodate ‘Sled Riding’ would be desirable.
13. Model rocketry, while in fair demand, should not be included because of the explosive nature of rockets and the potential presence of methane gas.

14. An Interpretive Center associated with the ongoing landfill activities would offer excellent educational opportunities.

15. It would be desirable to design extra-wide aisles and islands within parking areas for safety reasons. It was suggested that PBS&J review parking areas within existing Newport News Parks.
Opportunities and Constraints Analysis
As a framework for the development of the Stoney Run Park Program, PBS&J developed the following site opportunities and constraints analysis prior to the formation of the five Citizens Workshop groups. Each group was asked to consider this information while developing their individual Park Program.

Existing Entrance at Warwick Road:
Opportunities: Provides access to Warwick Road, a major thoroughfare for Newport News. Good park entrance location with existing median break. Electric and potable water hookups can be found here.

Constraints: Although a sidewalk exists on both sides of Warwick Boulevard, it does not meet ADA requirements and will need to be made handicapped accessible with the addition of wheelchair ramps. Right turn lane may need to be added for northbound traffic.

Existing Entry Road:
Opportunities: Provides wooded access to interior of site. Raising the elevation of the road can provide scenic views to proposed lake at Cell 5.

Constraints: Bicycle lanes or a separate bike path will need to be added to connect Warwick Boulevard to the park facilities. When constructed, the proposed Lucas Creek Road would be a safer Park entry point.

Proposed Lake at Cell 5:
Opportunities: Proposed 15 acre lake can provide fishing and boating opportunities as well as a visual amenity.

Constraints: Lake edge will need to be redesigned to create a more natural appearing water body. Water quality will need to be carefully monitored to assure a healthy medium for proposed activities.

Existing Vegetation Around Site Perimeter
Opportunities: Excellent, dense buffer of hardwoods and evergreens provides visual and noise screen to surrounding neighborhoods. Sports field lighting may be filtered or blocked by tree cover. This Virginia coastal forest provides a strong visual amenity.

Constraints: Dense buffer of trees visually isolates site from Warwick Road and surrounding neighborhoods, increasing the need for Park Ranger patrolling.
Existing Vegetation Interior to Site:
Opportunities: Lack of vegetation, other than grass species, allows the use of large, unobstructed open spaces for siting of sports facilities.

Constraints: Ambitious tree planting plan will be necessary to provide relief from large, open spaces. Sufficient quantities of fill dirt are required where trees are desired.

Closed Landfill Cell:
Opportunities: Large, open area where sports facilities can be sited. All cells are capped with varying depths of low permeability soil, general fill, and topsoil. Height above surrounding landforms, as well as steep cell side slopes, provide visual and recreational opportunities.

Constraints: Grading can be done through the use of fill only. No cutting is permissible into the closed landfill cell. Potential for cell settlement can disrupt desirable field grading. Methane gas odors may be found around the gas extraction wells. Landfill closure structures, such as gas extraction wells, will need to be considered when siting facilities. These utilities may create both physical and visual obstructions. Gas vents may need to be lowered in some locations. Buildings and facility lighting are not feasible on closed cells since their height will result in prohibitively expensive foundation costs.

Existing Internal Road System:
Opportunities: Forms an excellent starting framework for access throughout the park.

Constraints: Some sections of the road are paved, but many areas are unpaved and will require extensive improvements.

Existing Stormwater Management System:
Opportunities: Site is already graded for the landfill’s drainage and stormwater management. A system of swales, berms, basins, and outfall structures are in place and will serve as a starting point for the Park’s future stormwater management needs. Large, flat stormwater basin at east boundary of property offers potential site for a Railroad Transit Station.

Constraints: System will need to be adapted to accommodate Park facilities while still servicing the requirements of the closed landfill cells.

Adjacent 103 Acre City Owned Property:
Opportunities: Large tract of adjacent property that can be co-designed with the Park. This could assure the best possible integration of the two locations.
Stoney Run Park Master Plan Report

Constraints: Not considering the tract’s potential uses (Middle School Facility, Recreation Center, or School Bus Depot) while planning the Park could create future conflicts.

Lucas Creek Road:
Opportunities: If designed in conjunction with the Park facility and adjacent 103 acre tract, can provide the framework for a well-integrated circulation system.

Constraint: If designed without consideration for the Park and adjacent 103 acre tract, may conflict with these elements and require otherwise unnecessary retrofit expenses.

Proposed Cell 4 Location, Leachate Lagoon, Pump Station, and Flare:
Opportunities: Offers excellent, out-of-the-way site for the relocation of any on-going landfill operations. These facilities can be accessed via the existing landfill road and can provide for interpretive educational experiences.

Constraints: Landfill operation structures and facilities will need to be secured to assure public safety.

CSX Railroad Line:
Opportunities: Railroad’s tangency to the Park’s northeast perimeter creates the potential for the siting of a Transit Station. This can add a valuable dimension to the site’s accessibility.

Constraints: Railroad line will need to be secured for safety. Transit Station could require additional on-site parking, thus giving up valuable Park lands.

Additional Information:

Prevailing Winds: From the SW at 10-15 MPH from February through November
From the NE at 15-20 MPH for the months of December and January

Police and Fire stations are located approximately 1-2 miles south of the site, just off of Warwick Boulevard.

The sewer connection point is at the end of Deputy Lane in the Courthouse Green Townhouse Complex. There is also an electrical connection point located here.

Electrical and potable water connection points can be found at the site’s entrance on Warwick Boulevard. There is an additional electrical connection point at the north end of the site that is currently servicing the Flare tower.
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IV. June 25: Public Meeting No. 1: Grassroots Program Development Workshop: Presentation Opportunities and Constraints Analysis

On Wednesday June 25, 1997, PBS&J facilitated a Citizens Workshop at the Reservoir Middle School in Newport News, with the goal of obtaining grassroots direction for the design of the Denbigh Landfill to Park Conversion Project. Approximately 50 local citizens participated with Tom James and Dale Siska of PBS&J. The citizens were divided into 5 groups and asked to consider the following four issues: 1) Potential Recreational Activities ranked by priority (1, 2, or 3). These activities could be active, passive, or educational in nature and should be subdivided into children and adult categories; 2) Desired access and linkages with surrounding land uses; 3) Noise, Safety, and Security concerns; 4) Relationship of the Park to other Public Lands.

The following is a group by group breakdown of the issues:

**Group 1:**
Joann Camm, Al Jewell, Moody A. Harp, Jr., Marie Laubach, John McMillan, Alton Glass, Judi Harness, Ray Keegan, and Glenn Oder

1) **Recreational Activities:** (Priority rating is in parentheses)
   - Fort Fun Children's Playground (1)
   - Children's Sand Pool (1)
   - 4 Lighted Soccer Fields (1)
   - 3 Lighted Baseball Fields (1)
   - Basketball Courts (1)
   - Batting Cage (3)
   - 9 Hole Golf Course with Training Center for Schools
   - Concession Area (1)
   - Picnic Shelters (1)
   - Lake (1)
   - Mountain Bicycle and Walking Trails (1)
   - Cross Country Track (1)
   - Paved Trail (1)
   - Benches (1)
   - Interpretive Center (1)
   - Tennis Courts (1)

2) **Access and Linkages:**
   - Pedestrian access from Courthouse Green (closed or monitored at night)
   - Pedestrian access from all neighborhoods (closed or monitored at night)
   - Curbs throughout Park to restrict parking areas
   - Specifically designated parking areas
   - Keep cars away from playing areas
   - One, large parking lot with many trees
Lots of paths throughout
Natural and paved walking trails
Mountain biking trails
Educational trails
Public transportation bus loop to the Park entrance
Light Rail, if possible

3) Noise, Safety, and Security:
Maintain 200' tree buffer to surrounding areas
Add understory trees and shrubs beneath existing canopy
Berms for screening
Safety Call Boxes
Lighting at a pedestrian scale
Ranger patrol
Control the hours that the Park is open
First aid station at Interpretive Center

4) Relationship to Public Lands:
Design Park in relation to adjoining 100 acre Public Tract
25 acres for Middle School Facility
Recreation Center
School Bus Facility (must be screened)
Possible Police and Fire Stations

Group 2:
John Dawson, Madeline McMillan, Shukita Whitaker, Yenica Armstrong, Dot Clement, and Judith Tarbox

1) Recreational Activities: (Priority rating is in parentheses)
Children's Play Park and or Playground (1)
Snow/Grass Sledding Hill
Paddle Boats (1)
Children's Fishing Pier
Mini-pond for radio controlled model boats
Rollerblading Facilities
Established Camping Facilities (similar to Sandy Bottom)
Children's Gardens
Recreation Building (1)
Arts and Crafts/Wildlife Center
Volleyball Courts
Basketball Courts
Soccer Fields
Baseball Fields
Tennis Courts
Outdoor Cooking Facilities
Horse Stables
Putt Putt Golf
Sailing

2) Access and Linkages:
   Vehicular access from Snadow Blvd.
   Vehicular and Public Transportation to current main entrance or Lucas Creek Road.
   Pedestrian and bike access from Old Courthouse Way and Circuit Lane
   Rail access (light rail) at midway point of Park or at Cell 4
   Bike, walking, and jogging trail access
   Trolley or mini-bus system for transportation within the Park

3) Noise, Safety, and Security:
   Noise Barrier Wall
   Security Stations at residential access points
   Ranger/First Aid Station
   Fire Truck/Ambulance access
   Emergency Phones
   Restroom Facilities
   Maps, Directional Signs, and Instructional Signs

4) Relationship to Public Lands:
   School site would be financial advantage to the Park
   Park would be advantage for school activities
   No bus facility - distracting next to a recreational park and dangerous to children
   Bus facility is not a compatible use

Group 3:
Katie Vreeland, Matthew Bane, Whit McKinney, Valla Oliver III, W. M. Randolph, Bill McCullough,
and Wade Malhotra

1) Recreational Activities: (Priority rating is in parentheses)
   Basketball Courts (1)
   Baseball Fields (1)
   Skate Board Facilities and Ramps (3)
   Tennis Courts (1)
   Unmarked field for sports (e.g., Soccer, Lacrosse, Field Hockey) (1)
   Mountain Biking Trails (1)
   Fishing Pier (1)
   Children’s Recreation/Picnic Area (1)
   Fort Fun Children’s Playground (1)
   Kite Flying Area (1)
   Beach Area for sunning (3)
   Hiking Trails (1)
   Horse Trails (3)
Horseshoe Area (1)
Sand Volleyball Court (1)
Viewing Area on top of hill (1)
Wildlife Viewing (e.g., birds, beavers) (1)
Interpretive Signage for different wildlife locations (1)
Biking Trails - dirt (1)
Running Track (1)
Signing to explain composting facility, including cross-section (1)

2) Access and Linkages:
   Major entrance from existing landfill entrance
   Pedestrian crossing from Courthouse Green
   Bus stops at main entrance and other convenient places
   Light transit stop off of CSX line
   Connect bike trails with Newport News Park
   Pedestrian walkways along roads to Park

3) Noise, Safety, and Security:
   Buffers for noise control
   Local input in safety patrol (e.g., bike patrols by intern kids with communications)
   Ranger Station

4) Relationship to Public Lands:
   Field trips from area schools
   Bike linkages
   Education trips

---

Group 4:
Bertha Oliver, Guy Levy, Larry Ricks, Travis Anderson, and Staci Boone

1) Recreational Activities: (Priority rating is in parentheses)
   Playground (1)
   Fort Fun Children’s Playground (1)
   Bike Trails (1)
   Monument Theme (2)
   Cross Country Trails (1)
   Basketball Courts, Tennis Courts, etc. (1)
   Concession Stand (1)
   Nature Trail with Tours (1)
   Fitness Center (1)
   Lake Activities (e.g., fishing, boating) (1)
   Picnic Area (1)
   Greenhouse (1)
   Community Pool with swimming lessons (1)
   Horseback Riding (1)
Note: Use recyclable materials to build the Park

2) Access and Linkages:
   Pedestrian access from Courthouse Green
   Separate entrances for trucks and Park users
   Accessible to public transportation
   Greenway between parks and schools

3) Noise, Safety, and Security:
   Lighting at night for certain areas
   Blue Lighting system
   Park Rangers

4) Relationship to Public Lands:
   Greenway between parks and schools

Group 5:
Mary Joyner, Henrietta Archey, Bob Hood, and Amy Probsdorfer

1) Recreational Activities: (Priority rating is in parentheses)
   Lighted Soccer Fields (1)
   Lighted 4+ Field Softball/Baseball Complex (1)
   Tennis Courts (1)
   Basketball Courts (2)
   Playground (1)
   Sled Riding (2)
   Bicycle Trail - Casual and Mountain (1)
   Concession Stand/Picnic Area (1)
   Fishing/Water Activities (3)
   Community Events (e.g., 4th of July, ‘Fun Days’ Concerts) (1)
   Running Trail/Health and Fitness (1)

2) Access and Linkages:
   Multiple pedestrian and vehicular entrances
   Light Rail access
   Bus stop
   City bike path throughout the area
   Adequate parking
   Separate entrance for landfill operations (e.g., recycling, etc.)

3) Noise, Safety, and Security:
   Ranger Station
   Concern about noise when active recreation located near residential areas
   Restrictions on hours
   Gate at all entrances
Separate access to Light Rail

4) Relationship to Public Lands:
Light Rail Station by Snidow Extension
City Recreation Center on adjacent Public Tract

The following is a matrix summary of each group’s recreational activity preferences:
### Citizens Workshop Group Summary Matrix

**July 1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreational Activity</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fun/Children's Playground/Tot Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Sand Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Field</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball and Softball Fields/Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Hole Golf Course with Training Center for Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession Area/Recreation Building/Restrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Areas and Shelters/Cooking Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Activities (Peddle Boats, Sailing, Fishing Pier, Beach)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding/Hiking/Running Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country/Running Track</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Trails (Biking and Rollerblading)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Center/Arts and Crafts/Wildlife Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive/Nature/Educational Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleigh Riding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Pond for Radio-Controlled Model Boats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campfire Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Garden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Stables/Horseback Riding Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putt Putt Golf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard Facilities and Ramps</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse/Field Hockey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite Flying Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewing Area on Top of Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Theme</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Fitness Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pool with Swimming Lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfield Cage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key:

The numbers within each box represent the priority assigned to each activity by the group. If an + appears in the box, the group indicated this as a desired activity, but did not provide a rating. The ranking summary in the next column acknowledges these priority ratings.

#### Ranking Summary:

**Activities Identified by All Five Groups:**
- Fort Fun/Children's Playground/Tot Lot
- Soccer Fields
- Baseball and Softball Fields/Complex
- Picnic Areas and Shelters/Cooking Facilities
- Tennis Courts
- Basketball Courts
- Lake Activities (Peddle Boats, Sailing, Fishing Pier, Beach)

**Activities Identified by Four Groups:**
- Concession Area/Recreation Building/Restrooms
- Paved Trails (Biking and Rollerblading)

**Activities Identified by Three Groups:**
- Mountain Biking Trails
- Cross Country/Running Track
- Interpretive Center/Arts and Crafts/Wildlife Center
- Walking/Hiking/Running Trails
- Horse Stables/Horseback Riding Trails
- Interpretive/Nature/Educational Trails

**Activities Identified by Two Groups:**
- Sleigh Riding
- Health/Fitness Center
- Kite Flying Area

**Activities Identified by One Group:**
- Lacrosse/Field Hockey
- Kite Flying Area
- Horseshoe Area
- Viewing Area on Top of Hill
- Greenhouse
- Community Pool with Swimming Lessons
- Sleigh Riding
- Putt Putt Golf
- Skateboard Facilities and Ramps
- 9-Hole Golf Course with Training Center for Schools
- Children's Sand Pool
- Benches
- Monument Theme
- Ballfield Cage

---
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Stoney Run Park Program

Based upon a combination of feedback from the Citizens Workshop, and the Opportunities and Constraints Analysis conducted by PBS&J, the following is a recommended Program for the development of Denbigh Park:

The Park logically conforms to the following general areas:

- Cell 4 and Vicinity
- Cells 1, 2, and 3
- Cell 5 (Lake)
- Cell 6 and Vicinity
- Warwick Road Entrance to existing Maintenance Facility

Each of these areas contains distinct opportunities and constraints based upon their individual landform, location, and prior use. The Program that follows designates a scenario of potential Park uses for each of these zones.

Cell 4 and Vicinity:

Ongoing composting operations should be moved to this location and the area secured for public safety. Composting facilities, recycling programs, and any landfill maintenance structures should be relocated and sited near the current Blower/Flare and Pump Station.

An interpretive area with displays that address landfill operations, recycling, and general ecology topics should be integrated among the above facilities. This area can offer an outstanding field trip destination for Newport News schoolchildren.

Access is available from the proposed Snidow Boulevard extension and from a road that connects into the Park along the west perimeter of Cells 1, 2, and 3. Fences with gates for controlled entry can provide security. Recycling and maintenance truck traffic should be kept separate from the Park’s traffic.

Cells 1, 2, and 3

The large, open, relatively flat nature of the top of these cells provides an excellent opportunity for the siting of sports fields. Recommended facilities include unlit, half-size practice soccer fields, a running track, and undefined open areas for general play and kite flying. The existing gas extraction wells will need to be addressed when designing these program elements.

The steep side slopes of the closed landfill cells provide opportunity for the introduction of sleigh riding runs and mountain biking ‘challenge’ trails. Switchback trails can add an interesting dimension to the Park’s overall path system.

Access to the top of Cells 1, 2, and 3 will be across the western side slope. Unpaved parking can be sited on top. Landfill settling precludes the construction of permanent structures in this area.
Stoney Run Park Master Plan Report

Cell 5 (Lake)
All of the Workshop Groups rated Lake associated recreational activities as desirable Park features. Paddle boats, a sand beach for sunning, sand volleyball courts, and a floating fishing pier, can be included. Trails for biking, walking, rollerblading, etc. can surround the lake and connect into an overall Park path system.

Water quality will need to be strictly monitored to assure public safety. Swimming in the lake should not be allowed, and a fishing program that encourages 'catch and release' should be implemented.

The proximity of the lake to Cell 6 allows for a shared road and parking system (see below).

Cell 6 and Vicinity
This area offers the best opportunity for the siting of a baseball/softball complex that can contain 4 or more fields. A concession stand/recreation building/wildlife interpretive center could be associated with this complex. Additionally, basketball and tennis courts would work well in this location.

The wooded stand just south of Cell 6 offers an excellent venue for picnic shelters, tables, and cooking amenities, as well as a shaded children's playground. Unpaved trails can wind through this area providing mountain biking, hiking, walking, and wildlife interpretive opportunities.

Cell 6 is easily accessed from the Warwick Boulevard entrance (or the future Lucas Creek Road) and can serve as the hub for most of the Park's activities. It's proximity to dense surrounding woods and the proposed lake at Cell 5 present an opportunity for the creation of a scenic Park setting.

Warwick Boulevard Entrance to existing Maintenance Facility
If the proposed Lucas Creek Road extension conforms to the alignment now designated, it will bisect the Park near the existing Scale House. This will create a traffic conflict that must be addressed early in the design process. Additionally, relationship to the future uses of the adjoining 103-acre City-owned property should be acknowledged so that an integrated approach to vehicular and pedestrian management can be implemented.

Basketball courts or an equestrian staging/riding area are potential uses for this area. The location of basketball courts in this area permits nighttime operation when the balance of the Park is closed. This location also minimizes the impact of the lights and noise on the adjacent community.

The separation of this area from the rest of the Park will necessitate the construction of accompanying parking and restroom facilities.

In addition to the above outlined Program, a Light Rail Transit Station can be sited by the stormwater basin at the east end of the property or near the Woodhaven Pump Station at the north end.
Stoney Run Park
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Section 4: Concept Plans
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

V. July 30:  Staff Meeting No. 2: Presentation Concepts 1-4

VL July 30:  Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 2: Presentation Concepts 1-4

On Wednesday July 30, 1997 a meeting was held at the Newport News Department of Public Works for the purpose of presenting to both the City Staff and the Citizen’s Advisory Committee the Preliminary Denbigh Park Master Plan Concept drawings developed by PBS&J. Present at the meeting were Sue Hogue, David Sinclair, Tan Young, Al Riutort, Michael Poplawski and Bob Baldwin with the City of Newport News; fifteen members of the Citizen’s Advisory Committee chaired by Dr. Levy; and Tom James, Dale Siska, and Bruce Brodsky with PBS&J.

Prior to meeting with the Citizen’s Steering Committee, PBS&J presented four Park Conceptual Plans to the City staff. Afterwards, with the Citizen’s Advisory committee present, the Concepts were presented again. The following conclusions were drawn from these sessions:

• Although three of the four Concepts address the adjacent 103 acre City-owned parcel, it is beyond the current scope of this project to make any decisions regarding this area.

• The impact of the Lucas Creek Road alignment on the design of the Park was discussed. Consultant was directed to meet with the Department of Engineering.

• With the exception of discussion regarding the location of basketball and tennis relative to other Park facilities, the types of elements included in the plans and their spatial relationships were favorably received. The most desirable features from the Concepts will be combined into a ‘Consensus Concept’ to be presented at the next meeting (8/27).

• Tennis courts will be shown in a separate location from basketball, allowing for the potential development of a state-of-the-art basketball complex.

• The location, size, and configuration of the Light Rail Transit Station at the north end of the property will need to be further developed after the City of Newport News has finalized the station’s character.

• The consensus of the Advisory Committee was to designate the top of Cells 1, 2, and 3 as ‘open play area’ and to simply list activities that may be appropriate. The committee did not want to limit this area to any specific use.

• The City will require 15 acres, including a 100’ buffer surrounding the compost area, for their ongoing landfill operations. The area designated on each of the Concepts fulfills this need and was viewed as desirable.
Stoney Run Park Master Plan Report

- The representative from Courthouse Green advised that their Association does not desire pedestrian access directly from their complex into the Park. The access shown on the current Concepts will be removed from future drawings.

The next meeting would be an open Citizens Workshop at Woodside High School on Wednesday, August 27. The ‘Consensus Concept’ will be presented at that time for general feedback.
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

VII. July 31: Meeting with City of Newport News Traffic Engineer Tom Slaughter

On July 31, PBS&J met with Tom Slaughter, Chief Traffic Engineer for the City of Newport News, to discuss the future alignment of Snidow Boulevard and Lucas Creek Road, in order to gain a better understanding of how such alignments might affect the Park.

The following items were discussed:

Item 1: Phase I of the Snidow Boulevard Improvements, the extension of Snidow from Warwick to Jefferson, is part of the Virginia Department of Transportation’s (VDOT) six year plan. The project’s cost is $17 million, including construction, and is scheduled for Fiscal Year 2002. This plan does not, however, include plans for an interchange at Interstate 64. VDOT will only put in the interchange if I-64 is widened to eight lanes. Presently, I-64 is being improved south of the Snidow overpass.

Item 2: Phase II of the Snidow Boulevard Improvements, the extension of Snidow from Jefferson to a “T” intersection with Ft. Eustis Boulevard, has not been scheduled (no F.Y.), and is a R.O.W. study only, no construction. This $10 million project is complicated by environmental problems, namely the existence of “sink hole” ponds in this particular part of town. These ponds must have a 500-foot radius setback around them. VDOT is studying the alternatives.

Item 3: Lucas Creek Road is scheduled to receive a $2 million, two-lane bridge next summer, southeast of the high school site, where, at present, Lucas Creek Road dead ends from the north, south of Warwick. In order to link Lucas Creek Road from the Riverview Farm Park to the southeast, all the way to Warwick, a second bridge will have to be built slightly northwest of the aforementioned bridge, the City will have to realign stretches of Lucas Creek Road, and finally construct the section adjacent to the high school. The second bridge has not been designed yet; however, the City does own the R.O.W. at the high school.

Item 4: The final alignment of the CSX railroad crossing is still under study and has yet to be established.

Item 5: Lucas Creek Road will be extended northeast from Warwick Boulevard, along the western boundary of the Park site.

Item 6: Snidow Boulevard will be extended east from Warwick Boulevard.

Item 7: It is yet to be determined whether Lucas Creek Road will either “T” into the extension of Snidow Boulevard or vice-versa. The former would allow for a free right turn movement from Lucas Creek Road, east onto Snidow Boulevard.
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VIII. August 6: Staff Meeting No. 3: Expansion of Concept Plans

On August 6, Tom James of PBS&J met with Sue Hogue, Michael Poplawski, and Tan Young of the City of Newport News. The agenda of the meeting was to encourage PBS&J to expand on the program elements for the Park that were brought out of the user survey data gathered at the Public Meeting Number 1. (PBS&J, to this point, had limited their design concepts to only those elements suggested by citizens at Public Meeting Number 1.) Mr. Poplawski felt that the citizens were possibly overly influenced by the slides of PBS&J's built landfill parks and therefore did not consider any other possibilities (i.e. beyond those ideas that were shown in the slide presentation). City Staff encouraged PBS&J to build on their initial concepts in arriving at a design that would incorporate the citizen suggestions and user needs, but also take full advantage of the unique features and resources of the landfill site. Mr. Poplawski suggested, for example, that alternatives for fountain aeration of the lake area — such as a stream and waterfall — be considered to take advantage of the site's hillside terrain. Staff also encouraged PBS&J to consider incorporating additional compatible activities, such as disc golf. The City wants to insure that the [Stoney Run] Park is designed to its full potential and, as such, will be a unique recreational asset for all citizens.

Mr. James responded that PBS&J would be more than happy to investigate further program options and possibilities. The [PBS&J] Planners, James stated, had quite frankly felt rather restrained by the "Matrix" and welcomed the opportunity to consider a full spectrum of uses. It was agreed that the next series of concept plans would illustrate such an approach.
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

IX. September 22: Public Meeting No. 2: Presentation of Revised Concepts 1, 2, & 3

On Monday evening, September 22, 1997, Tom James and Dale Siska presented three alternative conceptual master plans for the proposed City Park at the Denbigh Landfill to approximately fifty citizens at Woodside High School.

After introductory remarks by Sue Hogue, Project Manager of Public Works, Dale Siska reviewed the process of the master planning effort since the last Public Meeting on June 25; the four additional meetings with the City Staff on July 30, August 6, September 3, and September 10; as well as the two meetings with the Citizens Advisory Committee on July 30 and September 10. Mr. Siska then explained the process by which the citizen group would reach consensus:

1. Tom James of PBS&J would review the three conceptual plans in detail through a slide presentation/narrative.

2. The meeting would adjourn for a break, during which time the citizens were invited to come to the front of the auditorium to review the three plans which were mounted on easels.

3. The meeting would reconvene for a Q&A session.

4. Consensus would be reached in the final dialogue.

Following Mr. Siska, Tom James presented the slides where he reviewed the three conceptual master plans with the group, beginning with the elements common to all three plans:

1. The Light Rail Station with pedestrian/bike access to park under Snidow overpass;

2. The Snidow Overpass;

3. The On-Going Landfill Operations;

4. The Snidow and Lucas Creek Alignments;

5. The Park Access off Lucas Creek.

Mr. James then addressed Plan 1 in detail, including (moving north from the south end of the site):

1. The woodland interpretive trail;

2. The five field softball complex south of the parking area;

3. Park entrance through garden area including Community and children’s gardens;
7. Q: Crime and the city's youth, has anyone considered the value of youth football as a deterrent, practice fields needed, conflict with girls' field hockey, no provision in plans, please support the existing program.
A: Planners will consider.

8. O: Lyme Disease concern. Beware and take measures within the Park to provide for the control of deer ticks.
A: Noted.

9. O: Support for plans 2 & 3 due to the security concern and the most useable acreage after balance of park has been cordoned off for security. Residents in Courthouse Green must be protected.
A: Security will be handled by the Parks and Recreation Department (Rangers).

10. O: Concern over parking loads & traffic circulation.
A: Will study further.

11. Q: Concern over value of features such as the viewing mound and sledding hill. Is it worth the cost?
A: Plan will be value engineered and phased by the City. Decisions will be made at that time.

12. O: Plans 1 and 3 meet softball need for additional fields. Five years ago, Newport News had 100 teams, now 70. Concern over water quality and the fish. Little League fields needed also.

13. O: Basketball court complex on west out-parcel is good (Plan 3) and addresses the shortage of basketball courts in the City. Make sure that it is a good facility.

14. O: Softball is best in Plan 1. Presently teams play five hours/day, 5 nights/week. The areas in town where they play are “packed”, anticipate needing more parking.

15. Q: Please consider the passive softball players as well as the “League” players.

16. Q: Are there program elements relating to trails dedicated to rollerblading and/or skateboarding.
A: Rollerblading, yes; skateboarding, no.

17. O: Plan 1 handles softball well. Plan 2 and 3 most favorably received. Effective use of infrastructure, multi-functional parking, keeps cost down.

18. O: Two or three more playgrounds needed. One “Fort Fun” plus other smaller playgrounds.
   A: SWM provided for closure of Landfill. Detention will have to be provided for in any new development.

   A: Viewing mound is an earth form constructed by surcharge of fill material on top of the landfill. Will move with the landfill, not a rigid system, no perforation of the cap by structural elements.

21. O: No access to the East.
   A: Addressed earlier in program. The existing landfill has a 200-foot buffer to the community to the East which will be maintained.

22. O: Reduce the size of the lake and get more soccer/softball fields.
   A: Planners will consider.

23. Observations by Mike Poplawski, Administrator of Parks, Newport News:
   The City believes in being a good neighbor, as evidenced by the work done to minimize impact in the Riverview Farm Park plan. Security measures are part of the cost of the infrastructure. N.N.E. has very proactive Rangers and Caretakers. This park is an opportunity to alleviate shortages of facilities in certain recreation uses, as well as an opportunity to introduce new ones such as kite flying, disc golf, etc. Areas such as picnicking and Fort Fun are as important as 'sport fields'. Newport News Huntington Park had 90,000 kids at Fort Fun in first year of operation. Parking must be adequate. Security and buffering must be maintained. Recommend isolating basketball courts to the west out-parcel for a number of reasons.

Dale Siska identified the major consensus items (Plans 2 and 3 most favorably received):

1. Keep basketball court complex in the west out-parcel.

2. Reexamine parking load and layout, particularly around soccer and softball fields.

3. Provide five softball fields.

4. Provide at least three, if not four, soccer fields.

5. Cluster other courts/related facilities together as in Plan 2.

6. Lake amenities should be kept.

7. No permanent seating on slope of Cell One. (No amphitheatre.)

8. Stream well received.
9. Summit picnic area well received.

10. Observation mound will be further evaluated, relative to view and cost.

11. Snow sledding as a seasonal use.

12. Mountain biking and BMX well received.

13. Separate and show trails by use.

14. Add more playgrounds, particularly around picnic areas.

It was agreed that Tom James would meet with the Staff and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on October 8, 1997 to review the revised plan.

The next formal scheduled meeting would be the City Council Workshop on October 14.

The next Public Meeting (#3) would be held on October 20, 1997, at which time the final Consensus Master Plan would be presented.
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Section 5: Master Plan
CABANAS ANDIJEAN

STAGE 1

1) Study of Park Cyanization
2) Master Plan Report

Section 2: Phases 1-3
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

X. October 8: Staff Meeting No. 4: Presentation Consensus Plan

XI. October 8: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3: Presentation Consensus Plan

On Wednesday evening, October 8, 1997, Tom James presented the Consensus Master Plan for the proposed City Park to the Staff and the Citizens Advisory Committee at the offices of the Department of Public Works.

After introductory remarks by Project Manager Sue Hogue, Tom James reviewed the process of the master planning effort since the last Public Meeting on September 22, where approximately fifty citizens reviewed the three previous concept plans and voiced their concerns and preferences. Leading concerns from the previous meeting and incorporated into the Master Plan included:

1. Security/access for adjacent neighborhoods.
2. The shortage in the City of:
   a. tournament softball fields.
   b. basketball courts.
   c. Little League fields.
   d. mixed-use fields.
3. Parking.
4. Types of activities on the trails.
5. The number of playground areas and their proximity to parental activities.
7. The viewing mound.
8. Size of the lake and the water quality.

The major consensus items identified in the previous meeting and incorporated into the Master Plan included:

1. Basketball court complex in the west out-parcel.
2. Increased parking load and layout, particularly around soccer and softball fields.
3. Five softball fields provided.
4. Three soccer fields provided.
5. Courts/related facilities clustered west of the lake.
6. Lake amenities maintained.
7. No permanent seating on slope of Cell One. (No amphitheatre.)
8. Stream.
9. Summit picnic area.
10. Observation mound transferred to the north end of the summit due to infrastructural weight restrictions.
11. Snow sledding ancillary to "Mountain biking parcel" at the northeast corner of the capped landfill.
12. Mountain biking and BMX trails separate from pedestrian trails.
13. More playground areas added, particularly around picnic areas (a total of six playgrounds are shown on the Master Plan in the following areas: Summit Picnic Area, between the Beach Volleyball and the Softball Fields, South Multi-use Fields, South Picnic/Children's Garden Area, the Tennis Courts, and the Basketball Complex).

The review of the revised Master Plan by the Staff as well as the Citizens Advisory Committee was very enthusiastic.

The next meeting was to be held on October 27th, at which time the Master Plan would be presented to the Mayor and the City Council for review and comment.
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XII. Oct. 27: City Council Work Session: Presentation Consensus Plan

On Monday afternoon, October 27, 1997, the Consensus Master Plan for the proposed City Park was presented the Newport News City Council at City Hall.

Sue Hogue, Project Manager of Public Works, introduced the members of the Citizens Advisory Committee, the involved members of the City staff, and Tom James of PBS&J. Ms. Hogue gave an overview of the Park’s planning process to date, after which she introduced Mr. James, who presented the Master Plan and Estimate of Probable Construction Cost to the Council.

After a brief question and answer period, Mayor Frank congratulated the entire team for an “outstanding job”.

XIII. Nov. 17: Public Meeting No. 3: Presentation Consensus Plan, Public Endorsement

On Monday evening, November 17, 1997, Tom James presented the Master Plan for the proposed Park at a public meeting at Woodside High School.

Sue Hogue, Project Manager, gave the introduction to the meeting, where she expressed her gratitude, on behalf of the City, to the citizens for their continued interest and participation in the process. Mr. James reviewed the process of the Master Planning effort since the last Public Meeting on September 22; the additional meeting with the City Staff and the Citizens Advisory Committee on October 8th, and the City Council Meeting on October 27th. Mr. James then presented the Master Plan, after which there was a question and answer period.

The Master Plan was favorably received and endorsed by the public forum.

XIV. Dec. 3: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 4: Formal Endorsement of official name: “Stoney Run Park”

On Wednesday evening, December 3, 1997, the Citizens Advisory Committee met for the final time in order to select an official name for the Park. Nominations had been solicited through the schools from the general public. Dr. Levy listed the names nominated for the group’s consideration. The Citizens Advisory Committee reviewed the nominations, and after two rounds of voting, “Stoney Run Park” was selected to be the official name of the park.

Sue Hogue and Michael Poplawski thanked the members of the Citizens Advisory Committee for their dedication and hard work throughout the previous six months.
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Section 6: Estimate of Probable Construction Cost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Categories</th>
<th>Sub Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improvements</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site and On-Site Utility Extensions</td>
<td>$367,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Roads/Primary Parking Areas/Site Perimeter</td>
<td>$1,289,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields</td>
<td>$2,976,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Track</td>
<td>$195,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Trail System</td>
<td>$286,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Activities</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Facilities</td>
<td>$645,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Signage</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Landscape</td>
<td>$590,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Site Amenities/Features</td>
<td>$744,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Safety Modifications for Recreational Use</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,556,600.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10% Contingency

TOTAL $8,655,460.00
# Stoney Run Park Master Plan
## Estimate of Probable Construction Cost By Phase
### April 30, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SITE ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Off-Site Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Lucas Creek Road Turn Lanes and Sidewalks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>On-Site Utility Extensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Water Main/Lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Fire Hydrants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Electrical System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Telephone Distribution System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$367,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Finace Roads/Primary Parking Areas/Site Perimeter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Entrance Road Gates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>24' Wide Roads to Parking Lots</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Entrance Road Lighting (1 Fixture per 150' LF)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td>$54,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$825,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Parking Area Lighting</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,289,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artistic Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Baseball Field</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Baseball Field Lighting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>$550,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Press Box / Restroom / Baseball Core Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$325,000.00</td>
<td>$325,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Core Area Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields Lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>General Site Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,145,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Park Trail System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.01</th>
<th>10' Wide Paved Trail</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>$8.00</th>
<th>$80,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>8' Wide Unpaved Trail</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total $143,000.00

### Picnic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.01</th>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>$60,000.00</th>
<th>$300,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>Gazebos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>Picnic Benches</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>Park Grills and Family Cookers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total $368,500.00

### General Signage

| 9.01 | Site Signage Allowance | 1 | LS | $55,000.00 | $55,000.00 |

Sub-Total $55,000.00

### General Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.01</th>
<th>Gardens/Landscape/Irrigation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>$250,000.00</th>
<th>$250,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Non-Athletic Field Turf Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total $270,000.00

### Miscellaneous Site Amenities/Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.01</th>
<th>Administration Bldg./Ranger Station/Interpretive Bldg.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>$300,000.00</th>
<th>$300,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>Park Maintenance Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>Perimeter Fencing</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$260,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>Litter Containers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$11,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total $728,600.00

### Landfill Safety Modifications for Recreational Use

| 12.01 | Security Enclosures for Pump Stations, Wells, etc. | 50 | EA | $2,000.00 | $100,000.00 |

Sub-Total $100,000.00
### Athletic Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Lighted Basketball Courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Basketball Complex Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>General Site Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $305,000.00

### Park Trail System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>10' Wide Paved Trail</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>8' Wide Unpaved Trail</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $143,000.00

### Lake Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Paddle Boat Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>Fishing Pier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Shoreline Creation/Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>Fountains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>Band Shell/Performance Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $500,000.00

### Picnic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>Gazebos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>Picnic Benches</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>Park Grills and Family Cookers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $256,500.00

### General Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>Site Signage Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $35,000.00

### General Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>Gardens/Landscape/Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Non-Athletic Field Turf Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Spiral Observation Mound</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $210,000.00
### Miscellaneous Site Amenities/Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>Litter Containers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE THREE

#### Athletic Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>Lighted Tennis Courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Tennis Courts Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Lighted Basketball Courts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Beach/Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>General Site Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$526,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BMX Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>Fill and Grading for Course Layout</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>Asphalt Pavement for Curves</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>6&quot; Vinyl Clad Perimeter Fencing</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Concession / Repair Building</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>Track Lighting and PA System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$195,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>Site Signage Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>Gardens/Landscape/Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Non-Athletic Field Turf Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$110,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total: $1,200.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases Categories</th>
<th>Sub Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One</td>
<td>$5,562,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two</td>
<td>$1,464,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Three</td>
<td>$842,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10% Contingency</strong></td>
<td><strong>$786,860.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,655,460.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 7: Appendix
STONEY RUN PARK MASTER PLAN CHRONOLOGY

I. May 22: Staff Meeting No. 1: Project Kickoff

II. May 22: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1: Task Force Input

III. May 23: Meeting with Michael Poplawski, Administrator of Dept. of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism

IV. June 25: Public Meeting No. 1: Grassroots Program Development Workshop: Presentation Opportunities and Constraints Analysis

V. July 30: Staff Meeting No. 2: Presentation Concepts 1-4

VI. July 30: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 2: Presentation Concepts 1-4

VII. July 31: Meeting with Tom Slaughter, Assistant Director of Engineering - Traffic, City of Newport News

VIII. Aug. 6: Staff Meeting No. 3: Expansion of Concept Plans

IX. Sept. 22: Public Meeting No. 2: Presentation (revised) Concepts 1, 2, & 3

X. Oct. 8*: Staff Meeting No. 4: Presentation Consensus Plan, Staff Endorsement

XI. Oct. 8*: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3: Presentation Consensus Plan, Citizens Advisory Committee Endorsement

XII. Oct. 27: City Council Work Session: Presentation Consensus Plan, City Council Briefing

XIII. Nov. 17*: Public Meeting No. 3: Presentation Consensus Plan, Public Endorsement

XIV. Dec. 3*: Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting No. 4: Formal Endorsement of park name: “Stoney Run Park”

* Official Endorsement
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