

Master Plan for the Renewal and Management of **CHICKASAW PARK**



**Prepared for the City of Louisville, Kentucky
David L. Armstrong, Mayor**

By the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc.
In conjunction with
Metro Parks of Louisville & Jefferson County

January 2001

Master Planning Team

ENVIRONS/INC, Louisville, KY – Landscape Architects, Master Plan Team Leaders
LANDSCAPES LA.Planning.HP, Charlotte, VT – Historic Preservation
Arleyn Levee, Belmont, MA – Historic Resources
Smith Architecture, Louisville, KY – Architecture

TABLE OF CONTENTS**Acknowledgments**

Summary	1
Costs & Phasing	2
I. Introduction	
A. Project Scope and Origin	4
B. Project Goals	5
C. Guiding Principles	5
D. The Planning Process	6
E. Project Issues	7
II. Context	
A. Geographic Location	11
B. Park History	11
C. Existing Conditions	18
1. Existing Conditions Plan	24
III. Historic Landscape Analysis	
A. Olmsted Design Concepts for Chickasaw Park	26
B. Aerial Photograph Record	26
C. Historic Landscape Character	27
D. Park Use Zones and Landscape Types	33
E. Park Spaces, Organization and Circulation	38
F. Summary Historic Analysis Findings and Directions	38
IV. Renewal Strategies:	
A. The Pond	44
B. Riverfront Access	44
C. Lodge Area	45
D. Active Recreation Area	45
E. Parkway Shelter	46
F. Miscellaneous Improvements	46
G. Master Plan	48
V. Expansion Opportunities	49
VI. Appendices	
A. User Research	
B. Historic Timeline	
C. Proposed Lodge Architecture	
E. Resource Documents	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the following people and agencies for their participation in and support of the Master Plan for the Renewal and Management of Chickasaw Park.

Chickasaw Park Community Committee

Frank Woodlee, Chairman
Alderwoman Cheri Hamilton
Alderman Reginald Meeks
Evelyn & James Glass
Frank Wimberly, Sr.
Fran & Virgil Thomas
Dr. J. Robinson
Robert W. Calbert
Linda Thomas
Mark Mitchell
Michelle Harbin-Williams
Eboni Neal Cochran
Louise Easley
Myra Friend-Ellis
Flora & Raymond Ponder
Eder Crenshaw
John A. Jackson
Angeline Charleston
Sue Gentry
Jodie Cox
Clarence Oglesby
Carrie Johnson
Brandon McKinley
Beatrice Brown
Joyce Johnson
Delois Mitchell
Beverly Woodlee
Molly Leonard
Annie Friend
Gerald Hagan
Greg Sutton
John T. Harris
Lavena Moss
Edward E. Barnes
Kenneth Warrick
Donnie Morris
Clydeen Thompson
Lavonia Sellers
Lee Prucia Shipley
Charles Torain
Lavena Moss
Daryl E. Artis
Delores J. White
Ryan & Eleanor Foreman

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc.

1297 Trevilian Way, P. O. Box 37280
Louisville, KY 40233-7280
Edwin H. Perry, Chairman
Susan M. Rademacher, President

Louisville & Jefferson County Metro Parks

1297 Trevilian Way, P. O. Box 37280
Louisville, KY 40233-7280
M. Brigid Sullivan, Director
John Swintosky, Project Manager

Master Planning Team***Landscape Architecture & Project Management***

Michael L. Smiley, ASLA
ENVIRONS/INC.
Environmental Planning & Design
Louisville, KY

Landscape Architecture & Historic Preservation

Patricia M. O'Donnell, FASLA, AICP
LANDSCAPES
LA.Planning.HP
Charlotte, VT and Westport, CT

Historic Resources

Arleyn Levee, Landscape Historian
Belmont, MA

Architecture

Jeff Smith, AIA
Smith Architecture
Louisville, KY

SUMMARY

The process of developing a master plan for the renewal and management of an important community resource, such as Chickasaw Park, must be rooted in the community that considers it their own. The Louisville Board of Park Commissioners developed this Olmsted Brothers designed park in the late 1920s with local engineer W.C. Horrigan. Chickasaw Park has served the neighborhood and the larger Louisville community for over 70 years. The development of this master plan addresses the comprehensive renewal of this important community recreation space for the first time since its construction. The master planning process involved widespread community involvement from the Chickasaw neighborhood and extensive research into the unique history, existing conditions, and use of the park. Information was gathered from a variety of sources on the park history, existing conditions, and user needs. The information was analyzed, mapped and documented to determine and uncover any significant relationships or important attributes.

A host of major issues important to the park community were identified during the first two public meetings. The community committee then prioritized these issues to provide distinct goals and direction for the design team as they progressed through the master planning process. The master planning team used this prioritization combined with extensive research into the history of the park use to develop a plan for revitalization of the park. Areas of the park determined to have the greatest support and need for renewal were the pond area, access to the river, and the lodge and parkway shelter buildings.

With the historic research, analysis and existing conditions phases of the project complete, the master planning team set out to develop specific strategies and recommendations for restoration of the park and its facilities. Design ideas were developed and reviewed during a series of four public meetings over a period of four months with the Chickasaw Park Community Committee, Metro Parks, and the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy. The strategies were continuously refined over this period so that they reflect, as closely as possible, the community's vision and needs for the park. The following list details some of the major recommendations included in the master plan:

- ❖ Undertake a major redevelopment of the pond area by expanding and improving the existing pond, building a new shelter/bandstand, and restroom near the pond, improving the parking situation, drainage, lighting, picnic areas and the walking path.
- ❖ Improve access to and views of the river by adding trails along the lower terrace closer to the river, and a continuous walk with overlooks along the upper terrace. Provide access between the upper and lower levels with a series of walk and trail connectors. Include a modest picnic area on the lower terrace and a boat dock for the Spirit of Jefferson to load and unload passengers. Manage the riverbank vegetation to create view corridors and provide benches and picnic tables for viewing the river in this area. Develop plans and strategies for the long-range stabilization of the riverbank.
- ❖ Enlarge the existing lodge building to accommodate large gatherings such as community events, family reunions and church picnics. Design the lodge to include a wide porch to accommodate outdoor seating and informal gathering space. Renovate the restrooms, lighting, kitchen, furniture, and provide heating and air-conditioning. Improve the walkways around the lodge, parking for the lodge area and recreate the old flower garden in the circle drive near the lodge.

- ❖ Improve the parkway shelter building in its present location. Renovate the restrooms and improve the children's playground, volleyball court, picnic facilities, and drainage in this area. Install a drinking fountain near the shelter and picnic areas.
- ❖ Reconstruct the existing asphalt tennis courts and improve the tennis court area. Enlarge the tennis courts to be regulation size. Construct a small shelter along the walking path just north of the tennis courts to provide a gathering place for tennis and smaller group and family picnicking activities.
- ❖ Improve the children's playground near the lodge by upgrading the play equipment to meet current playground safety guidelines. Install a fence to aid in keeping children in the play area and away from the park drive.
- ❖ Improve the drainage along the walking path by re-grading the low areas where standing water is common. Upgrade the fitness equipment and lighting along the walking path. Provide drinking fountains and benches at key locations.
- ❖ Tell the story of this important park by providing written and graphic interpretations of the park history. Display historic photos, maps, and descriptions in or near the lodge by way of a brochure on park history, an interpretive park sign or other means.
- ❖ Approach Ashland Oil about acquiring the adjacent refinery property for park expansion. This area could provide additional opportunities for river access such as a boat ramp, viewing, fishing, and additional parking.
- ❖ Provide attractive, appropriate signage to orient and educate park users about respecting the park as a shared resource and a special community place. Post the park rules and regulations in obvious places. Specific language on signs regarding pets and their behavior should be included as well as speed limits, directional traffic signs, noise control and park quiet hours. Use as few signs as possible and select wording that is positive and instructive.
- ❖ Provide underground electrical service to the lodge, park shelter building, tennis courts, and pond area, and remove all existing overhead electrical lines.

COSTS AND PHASING

The estimated costs for the recommended improvements were derived from the final design plan dated August, 2000. These costs are based on certain assumptions regarding the desired materials, finishes, styles, and furnishings as well as on experience with similar projects in the City parks.

The overall cost associated with each area includes all direct costs to the contractor such as materials, labor, shipping and taxes, as well as the indirect costs of the project such as contractor mobilization, overhead and profit, and project management, consulting fees for design development and preparation of construction documents, as well as construction administration and a contingency.

As each area of work in the master plan is undertaken there will be additional requirements for surveying and more detailed design based on accurate site information. Additional cost estimating will be done at the design development and construction document phases for each project.

All costs are estimated in year 2000 dollars and do not include any increase for inflation should the project or parts of the project not be undertaken for some time in the future.

<i>GRAND TOTAL</i>	<i>\$ 5,538,000</i>
<i>COST SUMMARY BY AREA:</i>	
<i>1. POND AREA</i>	<i>\$ 850,000</i>
<i>2. RIVERFRONT ACCESS</i>	<i>\$ 2,010,000</i>
<i>3. LODGE AREA</i>	<i>\$ 1,625,000</i>
<i>4. ACTIVE RECREATION AREA</i>	<i>\$ 568,000</i>
<i>5. PARKWAY SHELTER AREA</i>	<i>\$ 485,000</i>
<i>TOTAL COST - ALL AREAS</i>	<i>\$ 5,538,000</i>

Phases of the proposed project are listed here in order of priority as identified by the Chickasaw Park Community Committee early on in the project. The project was designed to allow for a phased implementation as funding becomes available. Any of the proposed project areas can be taken on as a separate project without any of the other areas having to be done first.

The consulting team strongly recommends however, that Metro Parks and the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc. continue the practice established by the 1994 *Master Plan for Louisville's Olmsted Parks and Parkways*, of comprehensively renovating a complete area of the project as identified here before moving on to the next area. This has been an important factor in the success of other projects completed to date in Shawnee, Iroquois, and Cherokee Parks.

The basis for these recommendations and details about future improvements are described in the full report. Plans and diagrams are incorporated into the report to help the reader understand the vision and intent of the Master Plan.

Reclaiming the special character of Chickasaw Park will undoubtedly transform it into the beautiful, useful park it was originally intended to be. This park is envisioned to be a healthy, thriving landscape, with graceful trees, places to play and exercise, spaces to gather and to enjoy friends, family and neighbors, see wildlife and find peace. This renewal of Chickasaw Park will require taking a long view, working steadily, and using the Master Plan as a road map to bring about these positive changes. Progress each year will add up over time. Volunteer work programs can be an essential part of instilling and maintaining the community pride and involvement that has always been an important part of the spirit of Chickasaw Park.

I. INTRODUCTION

Prepared by ENVIRONS/INC, Louisville, KY

A. PROJECT SCOPE AND ORIGIN

The purpose of the Chickasaw Park Master Plan is to create a long-term strategy for the renewal and management of an important and historic community resource. It is a plan that looks back in time yet reaches forward to capture the spirit of community and pride that is the soul of Chickasaw Park. The intent of the project is to establish clear direction and priorities for the long-term improvement, use and management of Chickasaw Park that can be implemented over time as funding becomes available and community advocacy and volunteer efforts activate.

The project scope called for a master plan that integrates the historic, cultural, and ecological restoration of Chickasaw Park toward enhanced use and management of the park into the future. Project tasks included an historic resource inventory and evaluation, an infrastructure inventory and evaluation, a natural resource inventory and evaluation, user research and user needs assessment, and cultural history inventory and interpretation. The master planning team worked closely with the park user community to develop an approach that addresses the historic design intent as well as current and future community needs.

Park facilities and elements identified at the beginning of the project for inclusion in the project scope were:

- ❖ Lodge, picnic shelter, and restroom facilities.
- ❖ Pond area improvements.
- ❖ Access to and views of the Ohio River.
- ❖ Pedestrian walkways and circulation.
- ❖ Parking and vehicular circulation.
- ❖ Drainage & utilities.
- ❖ Tennis courts.
- ❖ Playground facilities.
- ❖ Picnic areas.
- ❖ Planting and tree maintenance.
- ❖ Historic and cultural interpretation.

The project was made possible by funding from the Lila Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation, the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc., and the City of Louisville. It was initiated by the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc. as an important next step in improving Louisville's historic parks. The Chickasaw Park master plan follows on the great progress with master planning and major project improvements to Louisville's three oldest Olmsted parks, Shawnee, Iroquois, and Cherokee.

B. PROJECT GOALS

The following goals were developed to help steer the master plan for the renewal and restoration of Chickasaw Park:

- ❖ *Renew and restore the landscape and facilities of Chickasaw Park for the long-term benefit and enjoyment of the park community.*
- ❖ *Involve the park community in the planning process to ensure that renewal strategies and design recommendations are tailored to their needs and desires.*
- ❖ *Explore the unique history of Chickasaw Park and provide guidelines for its interpretation and preservation.*
- ❖ *Establish strategies for the long-term use and management of Chickasaw Park that can be implemented over time as funding becomes available.*

C. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

These guiding principles address all aspects of the park and were established in the early stages of the project to help provide direction and reason for all design decisions.

- ❖ *All actions must be guided by respect for the inherent physical and social qualities of the park. The historic development of the park has shaped places for public use and enjoyment, guided by a strong community commitment to the park. Current and future efforts must respect and renew this legacy.*
- ❖ *The history of Chickasaw Park is unique in its development as a park for the black community of Louisville. This history must be respected, preserved, and interpreted for the benefit of current and future generations.*
- ❖ *The park is a living system formed by nature and its processes. All decisions must sustain these processes so that the natural features of the park are preserved and enhanced.*
- ❖ *The park is a unique and valued component of the City fabric, a contributing factor to the quality of life for all citizens. Future efforts must understand the larger setting, both in terms of community perception and physical environment.*
- ❖ *People of all ages and abilities should be able to enjoy a variety of recreational opportunities that can be supported by the landscape and facilities.*
- ❖ *Ultimately, the character and quality of the park will depend on how it is managed. Skills, training, staffing, volunteer coordination, and a stable funding base are needed to ensure the fulfillment of these principles over time.*

D. THE PLANNING PROCESS

The process of developing a master plan for the long-term renewal and management of an important community resource such as Chickasaw Park is a crucial step to developing lasting strategies and recommendations that address the needs of the community.

The Chickasaw Park Master Plan was developed through an open planning process. This process included public meetings, interviews and surveys, site tours, and extensive coordination between Metro Parks, the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc., the master planning team, and the Chickasaw Park Community Committee. The planning process was completed over a ten-month period from January to October 2000 with six public meetings to gather community input and develop project recommendations.

The Chickasaw Park Community Committee, comprised of community leaders, park users, neighbors, user group members and others, was an essential component in helping to facilitate community involvement and gather information about the park, as well as guide development of the plan, and give feedback throughout the planning process.

The planning process involved these steps:

1. **Research Phase** – This phase began with an in depth investigation of the park's cultural history and design intent, existing site conditions, and social needs. Inventories completed in this phase include; historic documentation, infrastructure and facilities, natural resources, and social aspects. The research phase was divided into three categories, as follows:

Historic Inventory – Historic plans, photos, letters, news articles, publications, and minutes were gathered from a variety of sources to gain insight on the park's development and use history. Information for this phase was gathered from the U. S. National Park Service Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site, Metro Parks, The Filson Club Historical Society, the U. S. Library of Congress, the University of Louisville Archives, City of Louisville Archives, Jefferson County Archives, the Louisville Free Public Library, The Courier Journal, The Louisville Defender, The Louisville Leader, the Transit Authority of River City (TARC), Park Aerial Surveys, Inc., and park users and neighbors.

Physical Inventory – The park was surveyed to assess its existing conditions including; infrastructure and facilities, existing and historic trees, general riverbank stability, condition of recreational facilities, walking path drainage, parking and traffic control needs, tennis court needs, pond condition, and planting needs. These surveys resulted in the preparation of a general existing conditions plan and a tree inventory plan.

Social Inventory - User information was gathered through the public meetings, by interviews and surveys, and by general observation. Additional user information was collected by on site interviews in advance of the master planning project by Horizon Research International, a professional user research firm.

2. **Analysis Phase** - Using the extensive information gathered in the research phase, the master planning team prepared detailed analyses of the research findings including a historic landscape analysis (including spatial organization, landscape types and historic zones), existing conditions analysis, natural features analysis, infrastructure and facility analysis, and social (user) analysis.
3. **Design Phase** - Based on the results of the research and analysis phase, the master planning team began to prepare restoration concepts and recommendations that would address all the identified program issues. Design concepts and recommendations were refined over the course of four months and four public meetings.

E. PROJECT ISSUES

The first task accomplished with the community committee was to identify the issues considered important to their overall satisfaction with the park. This "issues list" would become a prime reference for the upcoming phases and would help to ensure that the renewal strategies and recommendations would address the concerns and needs of the park community. The list that follows was developed during the first two public meetings.

Lodge/Shelter

- ❖ The lodge is too small. It should be big enough to hold 100 to 200 people. Not necessarily inside, but under a roof. The former lodge had a wide porch to accommodate additional seating that is lacking in the existing lodge.
- ❖ Both the lodge and picnic shelter need to accommodate large family reunions and church picnics.
- ❖ The lodge should be heated and air-conditioned with good lighting, an equipped kitchen, good quality tables and chairs, and a fireplace.
- ❖ Consider adding (or replacing) the screened porch on the lodge.
- ❖ Recreate the old flower garden near the lodge.

Pond

- ❖ Drainage problems from the pond are affecting the walking path.
- ❖ More benches are needed.
- ❖ There are too many ducks and water lotus in the pond.
- ❖ Better parking is needed near the pond.
- ❖ Restrooms are needed near the pond.

Restrooms

- ❖ Winterized restrooms are needed somewhere in the Park.
- ❖ Both the lodge and shelter restrooms are in poor condition.
- ❖ The restrooms are not properly maintained.

River Access

- ❖ Acquire the adjacent Ashland Oil property for a boat ramp.
- ❖ Add trails and access to the river with a picnic area on the existing park property.
- ❖ Build a boat dock for the Spirit of Jefferson to load and unload passengers.

Immediate Improvements/Maintenance

- ❖ Lights are continually out on the walking path.
- ❖ Animal Control Dept. has not been responsive in dealing with the stray dogs living along the river. There are also too many off-leash dogs. Signage and enforcement is needed.
- ❖ Trees should be pruned and/or removed and missing trees should be replanted.
- ❖ Cars go the wrong way on the one-way road sometimes exiting through the entrance.
- ❖ Grass gets too long between cuttings and grass under the benches doesn't get mowed.

Safety

- ❖ Dogs are a concern, both strays and off-leash dogs.
- ❖ Speeding is a problem. Cruising is not a problem in Chickasaw.
- ❖ People indicated that they generally feel safe in the Park.
- ❖ A security patrol along the River Walk was suggested.

Children's Play Areas

- ❖ There is a dangerous conflict between the roadway and the children's playground near the lodge. Children run cross the road to go from the play area to the tennis courts.
- ❖ One solution to the traffic conflict that seemed to have consensus was to limit parking to one side of the road in the vicinity of the play area.
- ❖ The spray pool needs repairing.
- ❖ The play areas near the parkway shelter and near the lodge, need updating and upgrading.

Tennis

- ❖ The tennis club needs a building with showers.
- ❖ Consider putting a dome over the clay courts.
- ❖ Consider adding more clay courts instead of asphalt.
- ❖ Improve the tennis practice backboard.
- ❖ Clean up the parking area.

Sports

- ❖ Make a multi-purpose field rather than a baseball or softball field.
- ❖ One volleyball net is adequate near the parkway shelter.
- ❖ One basketball court is adequate in its present location.

Walking Path

- ❖ The lights along the walking path are not sturdy enough and are too easily damaged.
- ❖ Drainage improvements are needed.
- ❖ The walking path is too narrow. It should be 8-10' wide.
- ❖ Fitness equipment should be upgraded. It is used often.
- ❖ More drinking fountains and benches are needed along the walking path.

Picnicking

- ❖ Picnic area grills are in poor shape. They should be repaired and more should be added.
- ❖ More picnic tables are needed and they should be fixed to the ground.
- ❖ Create a picnic area on the lower bank with steps, lighting, river viewing area, benches, picnic tables, and fencing at the ledge for safety.

Drainage

- ❖ There are significant amounts of standing water in the park after a hard rain.
- ❖ The floodwall traps water on the east side inhibiting drainage back into the river.

Drinking Fountains

- ❖ There are only two drinking fountains in the park and they are near each other. One is needed at the pond, two along the walking path, and one at each shelter.

Bandstand

- ❖ The existing bandstand is in poor condition and needs improvement.
- ❖ The current location doesn't have enough space. Consider moving it toward the pond at the curve in the roadway.

Bicycling

- ❖ Bike racks are needed for bike parking. No other improvements are needed for bicycling.

Historic Interpretation

- ❖ Historic interpretation is a very important issue. Old pictures, stories, and signs and events in the park would help.

Other

- ❖ Acquire Ashland Oil site for park expansion.
- ❖ There is concern about the water quality in the pond and hazardous materials from Ashland Oil property.
- ❖ More trees, shrubs, and flowers are needed.
- ❖ Move the pay phone closer to the lodge, away from the residences, or remove it completely.

Priorities

After the discussion session, the participants were asked to help prioritize the issues. Each participant was given 10 sticky dots to place on the issues they felt were the most important. Results of that exercise were as follows:

Issue	0	5	10	15	20	Priority
Pond Area Improvements	_____					17
River Access Improvements	_____					16
Lodge/Shelter Improvements	_____					16
Picnicking & Family Reunions	_____					14
Walking Path Improvements	_____					13
Play Area Improvements	_____					13
Safety & Security	_____					12
Restroom Improvements	_____					11
Tennis Court Improvements	_____					10
Drinking Fountains	_____					10
Drainage Improvements	_____					10
Maintenance Improvements	_____					10
Park Expansion (Ashland Oil)	_____					10
Historic Interpretation	_____					9
Parking Improvements	_____					4
Basketball Opportunities	_____					3
Bicycling Opportunities	—					2
Ball field Opportunities (Baseball, softball)						0

II. CONTEXT

Prepared by ENVIRONS/INC, Louisville, KY

A. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

Chickasaw Park is located in the far west end of the City of Louisville at the corner of Southwestern Parkway and Greenwood Avenue, six blocks south of Broadway. It is bordered on the north by single family housing, on the east by Southwestern Parkway and single family housing, on the south by the former Ashland Oil Refinery, and on the west by the Ohio River.

The dominant feature of the park's geography is the Ohio River. The park is situated on a stretch of the Ohio River that runs north south with beautiful views across and down the river. The terrain is a relatively flat river terrace that was easily flooded before the construction of a floodwall that now protects much of the City.



B. PARK HISTORY

Chickasaw Park has a rich and important history in the development of the City of Louisville. When the park was developed in the early 1920's, it was the largest City park to date to be designated specifically for the black population of Louisville.

Although what is now known as Chickasaw Park was farmland until 1922, the lands surrounding it had been used for recreation and amusement since the early 1900's. The land that many Louisvillians fondly know as Chickasaw Park was originally settled in the early 1800's by a German immigrant named Jacob Gaar (later spelled Garr). Garland Avenue, 3 blocks north of Chickasaw Park, was named after the Garr family.

Joseph Garr and Horace Garr, descendants of Jacob Gaar, called their land "Riverview". The land to the south of Greenwood Avenue, where Chickasaw Park would later be developed, was "Riverview Farm". Horace Garr's place, on the other side of Greenwood Avenue became "Riverview Park", an amusement park.

The 1905 Sandborn Fire Insurance Map shows "Riverview Park Beer Garden" located on land along the river just north of Greenwood Avenue. This map shows several structures including; the Beer Shed, Bar, Refreshments Stand, Dance Platform, Band Stand, Dining Room, Kitchen, Stable Wagon & Storage Shed, and Water Tank. By 1907 Riverview Park had become "White City" park, an amusement park sporting a bathing beach, scenic railroad, dance pavilion, restaurant, vaudeville theater, skating rink, roller coaster, and 250,000 lights.

It is not known how many years this amusement park was in operation, but at some point the park closed and was redeveloped into a residential area. The "Riverview Farm" property just to the south of Greenwood where Chickasaw Park would later be developed remained farmland.

These amusement parks were not public parks and, though guesses can be made, their racial climate is not specifically known. Although racial segregation had begun in Louisville in the 1880's and 1890's, it was far from complete. On weekends and holidays it was not uncommon for both black and white people to be seen in Louisville's public parks picnicking and playing baseball and other games side by side. Blacks also used the public swimming pools and tennis courts. There were repeated attempts to oust blacks from the public parks, but official segregation did not occur until the 20's.

In October 1911 racial tensions began to rise in the city of Louisville when the West End Improvement Club requested the Parks Board to ban Negroes from Shawnee Park. The Parks Board explained that they had no right to exclude any citizen from the public parks and denied the request. By 1913, however, Shawnee Park had a playground designated for "colored fellow citizens", and the Parks Board directed that Cherokee and Iroquois parks have similar facilities.

Racial tensions in Louisville City parks steadily increased and in April 1916 the Parks Board received a request from black citizens for "more adequate colored parks and playgrounds". Again in 1918 the Parks Board got a letter from black citizens asking for a park in west Louisville. Finally by 1920 Ballard Park and Baxter Square were designated "colored playgrounds" with a third playground (Sheppard Park) provided at 17th and Magazine streets.

Tensions, hardly abated by these additional playgrounds, continued to rise and protests became more evident. The City administration's views had changed in regard to park segregation, and in the spring of 1921 signs appeared designating black areas within the parks. In July, Noah W. Williams, Pastor of Quinn Chapel AME Baptist Church was ejected from Cherokee Park for not using the "colored" area. Later that year, the 53 acre John Whalen property, formerly "Riverview Farm", was purchased for \$81,000. Upon purchase, the land was designated to be a black park and the Smithsonian Institute suggested the name "Chickasaw".

Chickasaw Park was then formally dedicated as a park for blacks in June of 1922. All plans, however, did not go smoothly for the new park. The community had mixed emotions on the development of this parcel for the use of black citizens. Several black community leaders warned that by accepting the park, blacks were agreeing to segregation. As a result of this dissention, several articles were published in the Louisville Leader at this time condemning the new park and its backers for promoting segregation.


Even though controversy was high, the Parks Board contracted with the Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architecture firm to develop a general plan for Chickasaw Park early in 1923. Upon recommendation of the Olmsted firm, in June 1923 a twenty acre parcel on the south side of the park was bought from Louisville Petroleum Refining Company for \$30,600, and a three-acre square insert was bought from the Walker's in October for \$5,500 making 76 acres of land for Chickasaw Park. The Olmsted Brothers then provided a Preliminary Plan for the park improvements in December of 1923.

In a close of the year report, the Park Board noted that for Chickasaw Park to be developed *"in accordance with [the] landscape architect's plans, including construction of shelter house, swimming pool, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, wading pool, and installation of lighting system ... [would cost] \$100,000.00"*. The President of the Board of Park Commissioners wrote to the Olmsted Brothers in March of 1924, *"It will be impossible for us to do any development at Chickasaw Park ... We have had two fires and a lot of road expense ... [we are] very short of funds ... and will have to abandon the idea of spending any more money at present."*

Edward Clark Whiting of the Olmsted firm replied that they had regrets that there would be a curtailment of park development activities, especially at a time when so much was needed for newer park projects. This reply could not have been more true. On June 13, 1924, Margaret Taylor and Naomi Anthony, two black teachers from Coleridge-Taylor Elementary School, took twenty-two students to a picnic at Iroquois Park. The children remained at the park for several hours without incurring any white resentment, but upon arriving at the bus stop to return to the downtown area, they were met by park security guards and a group of over 100 white people. The teachers were informed that since Iroquois park was reserved for whites only, they had been in violation of laws controlling picnicking in the area. Both teachers, after expressing amazement at such an ordinance, said that they would investigate the matter upon returning to town. The two guards, being upset that their word had been challenged, placed both women under arrest, with loud urgings from the white crowd behind them, causing a near riot to occur. By the time they arrived at police headquarters, a large black crowd had gathered to express their anger at the arrests. A spokesman for the crowd warned the mayor *"Negroes are not going to stand for park segregation"*.

This pivotal incident involved not only the Louisville mayor and the Park Board, but the Louisville NAACP and the Board of Education had become actively involved in the conflict as well. The statements that blacks visiting the parks were violating the law outraged Louisville's black leaders. In a letter published in the Louisville Leader July 4, 1924 these leaders said, *"There has never been a law in the city of Louisville restraining certain groups from visiting certain parks or sections of parks."* Bowing to pressure from the white community, the Parks Board officially segregated the parks in June of 1925. In 1929, a man named Warley filed a lawsuit to open all of the city's parks to Negroes. Warley had been involved in public outcry during the 1924 Anthony and Taylor case and had continued to support desegregation of the public parks. After losing his suit in both the county and state courts, Warley was unable to raise the necessary funding to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Chickasaw Park, as most of the other "colored" parks of the time, was not much more than an open field when it was dedicated. Park structures and play equipment were only found in the park areas reserved for whites. At the time of official segregation, Chickasaw Park



contained two tennis courts, two baseball diamonds, and one football field. Although it was very limited, this was more than the other black parks in the city of Louisville. Playgrounds and shelters were still to come.

The Parks Board gave the official go ahead for implementation of Olmsted plan for the park in June 1927. In September of 1928, \$500 of a \$100,000 bond issue was set aside for colored parks and playgrounds and for a shelter-shed at the entrance to Chickasaw Park. W. J. Horrigan presented plans for Chickasaw Park road that were accepted by the Park Board although they varied from the original Olmsted plans for the park. Then the Chickasaw Park road was constructed in 1928.



The original Chickasaw Park lodge building opened in 1929. It was a one-story structure with an Italian style portico around the entire building. It was a remodeling of the former two-story structure believed to have been the Whalen house and included a recreational room and separate toilets for men and women. A new wading pool was also constructed near the lodge building.

By September 1930 the Olmsted Brothers only unfinished work is completing the planting plan for Chickasaw Park. The limited funding available at the time of the original plans caused the planting plan to be omitted, and the road had not been constructed as the Olmsted brothers had designed. They nevertheless agreed to finish the plan for \$150.00. In February of 1931 construction of the park walks in Chickasaw Park began. Soon thereafter a proposal for constructing a lower road to the riverside was submitted and approved.

Construction of a lake for canoeing and skating was approved in 1934, and completed by 1936. The lake was placed where earth excavations had been made by



Municipal relief workers for other park improvements. The Board of Park Commissioners Annual Report for 1936 – 37 includes a description of the new artificial lake in Chickasaw Park “to give the Negroes of Louisville canoeing facilities in the summer and a place for skating in the winter months.”

The community surrounding Chickasaw Park developed a great deal of pride in their park and were continually making requests to better it. Chickasaw and Sheppard parks were the only two parks in Louisville’s system that had even the most basic facilities such as water fountains and bathrooms. It seemed to many of the black citizens that the only way to improve upon their outdoor facilities was to improve on the parks to which they had access. One of the



improvements implemented by citizens in the Chickasaw Park community at the time was a flower garden in the driveway loop near the lodge. In April of 1934 blacks from the Citizens Recreational Advisory Council asked for four more tennis courts, a concrete bandstand (constructed in 1943), and more comfort stations. There were six tennis courts at that time for an estimated 48,000 blacks using the park. Tennis was one of the favorite sports of the time, and the courts at Chickasaw were host to the Negro Tri-State tennis tournament held in August of 1939.

Dr. T. R. Spellman of the Young Men’s Civic League asked for additional recreation equipment in May of 1940. More swings, seesaws, sliding boards, and a croquet court. He estimated that 30,000 children were using the park. At the time 6 swings, 4 seesaws, a sliding board and an outdoor oven were being added to the recreational facilities. He also asked that a shelter house, and a concrete road along the river be constructed to enjoy the scenery. Although the Ohio River was reported to be one of the park’s greatest assets, it was difficult to enjoy.

Though the City park system was being expanded and improved upon, black citizens were still limited to only five parks. These five parks combined had only 154 acres, so half of the parkland available to blacks was located in Chickasaw Park. Black citizens groups requested use of the entire park system in 1939 and requested more recreational facilities again in 1941. Both attempts against segregation were denied.

Chickasaw Park was completely inundated by the waters of the great flood of ‘37, as was most of the rest of the City of Louisville. The Parks Board approved plans in 1938 for a floodwall through the park that would protect the City from experiencing such extensive damage again. The Olmsted firm disagreed with this decision and warned the mayor that both Chickasaw and Shawnee parks would be greatly affected by it, but as the design had been approved and there was considerable pressure from the public, the wall was built as planned. The portion of Louisville’s floodwall through Chickasaw Park was completed in 1947 and the park was essentially split in two.

Three City tennis tournaments were held in Chickasaw Park in 1947. Two courts were rendered useless due to floodwall construction, but the remaining ones were playable. The tournament went on as scheduled.

Tragedy hit the park late in 1950 when the original park lodge burned down. The new park lodge building, which is seen today, was dedicated in May of 1952. The new lodge met with considerable opposition. Several articles were published at this time voicing concerns about the lodge being "private, for reservation only" and not providing an adequate place for people to get out of the rain. The public sorely missed the portico of the former lodge, not being present in the new building.



Beginning in the late 1940's and continuing throughout the 1950's park use increased dramatically. Chickasaw Park was the place to be for large company picnics, family gatherings, and summer programs and carnivals. Picnics and reunions were so commonplace on the grounds that in the year 1953 several changes came to the park. The use of Chickasaw Park had increased to the extent that something had to be done to accommodate the large numbers of people visiting the park. Bids for a new parkway shelter house were opened and one-way traffic on the park road was initiated in July of 1953.

The growing population in the City of Louisville spent more and more time in the city parks. With segregation still being enforced, the black population was seriously overcrowding the available parks. The City's parks were officially integrated in 1955.

Chickasaw Park had been the only park so many people had been able to enjoy for so long that park integration didn't really change things for these individuals. A vast group of people had always chosen Chickasaw park for their weekend picnics and family outings and would continue to do so week after week and year after year. That is what makes this park a special place for so many. The ability to share our public places with our friends and neighbors and for all to feel a sense of ownership is what makes us become one with our community. For a part of our community, this park always has been and always will be "our park".



C. *EXISTING CONDITIONS*

Chickasaw Park is situated on approximately 76 acres of relatively flat ground along the Ohio River. It has 2,200 feet of shoreline along the river with a difference of almost 70 feet in elevation between the river and the main body of the park. The upper level of the park has very little topographic change except for the pronounced berm of the floodwall that cuts through the park from north to south.

The park is poorly drained in many places due to the slightly undulating nature of the ground surface. A cursory investigation of the original topographical survey of the park from 1923 shows two areas labeled pond and a third area labeled swamp. The two areas shown as ponds were combined in the 1930's to create the current pond area. The area shown as swamp, located between the current pond and Southwestern Parkway, is where the current walking path is regularly inundated after a big rain event.



Many of the original drainage structures built to drain the park drive are no longer functional, as they have been filled in and abandoned over the years with the creation of additional lay by parking along the edges of the park drive. Surface drainage was further impeded with construction of the floodwall in the 1940's that bisects the park with a six-foot high berm.

Construction of the floodwall through the middle of the park had long lasting impacts on the spatial characteristics, use patterns and visual qualities of the park. It is a physical and visual barrier that seriously limits the ability of people to flow freely from the east side of the park along Southwestern Parkway to the west side of the park along the Ohio River. A perimeter walking path around the park has alleviated this situation to a small degree by allowing park users to access and experience more of the park than they could before.




The walking path circles the park in a large loop that is slightly over one mile in length. The path is approximately seven feet wide and constructed of asphalt paving. There are several places along the path where the poor drainage situation causes water to pond. This is a serious problem for the many ardent users who cannot get exercise and enjoy their park without getting their feet wet. Ten fitness stations are located in various spots around the walking path to give the park user additional options for exercise. Many of the existing fitness stations are in poor condition and need repair or replacement.

The park is vegetated with a variety of large shade trees, some of which were there long before it was designated as a park. The perimeter of the park is vegetated with large masses of trees with the heaviest areas of vegetation on the river slopes and along Southwestern Parkway. Tree masses on the north and south ends of the park are much thinner due to the spatial constraints in those areas. The main body of the park is more open with large areas of grass and scattered large trees. Groves of large trees, used for picnicking, punctuate the open areas in several places. Many of these trees will need attention in the years to come as they decline in health and require major pruning or removal.

A network of above ground electrical lines, poles and transformers serve the lodge, shelter, tennis courts, old ball field, and other facilities in the park. Wiring for the existing walking path and park drive lights was installed underground. The light poles and fixtures along the walking path are poor quality and in constant need of repair.

The park lacks appropriate signage to orient and educate park users about the park and its rules and regulations. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations seems to also be lacking in the park. As a result, several negative events occur in the park including, vehicles speeding and/or going the wrong way on the park drive, excess noise and activity during and after park use hours, and unleashed or stray animals.

There are a variety of specific facilities that serve the different needs and interests of the park users. These facilities are located in various areas throughout the park and have been grouped into one of five distinct regions that are discussed in detail as follows:



The Pond

The pond area is located in the southeastern corner of the park between Southwestern Parkway and the floodwall. It is a highly used area of the park where many people fish, watch the wildlife, picnic, and relax. Facilities in this area include; the 1-1/2 acre pond, two picnic areas and parts of the walking path and park drive.

The pond itself is in somewhat poor condition with eroded banks from the overabundance of waterfowl, too much aquatic vegetation (water lotus) clogging the water, poor access, and poor drainage. The water quality in the pond has been suspect of toxic chemicals for several years after fish taken from the lake tested positive for certain types levels of dioxin. The City, after several years of testing, has determined that there is little risk to the public as long as people do not eat fish caught in the pond.



The water source for the pond is a 2-inch City water line located at the extreme north end of the pond. This line has no backflow prevention and no direct shut-off valve without turning off most of the other water supplies in the park. The drain for the pond is a 6-inch overflow pipe that connects to the storm drain along Southwestern Parkway. This line is insufficient for extreme flows and causes the pond to overflow toward Southwestern Parkway, flooding a broad swath of park as well as a significant length of the walking path.

Parts of the walking path in this area are inundated with as much as 6 inches of water after heavy rains even when the pond remains within its banks. The lights along the walking path are easily damaged and need routine repair. There are only a few benches and no drinking fountain.

Parking in this area is insufficient, unorganized and unsightly. The only parking available is along the edge of the park drive where perhaps fourteen or fifteen cars can park on gravel that was strewn along the edge of the park drive. Drainage along the park drive is nonfunctional due to the deterioration and covering up of the original drainage structures.

The pond area has no shelter or restroom facilities although there is typically one portable toilet facility available during the high use months.



Riverfront

The park is blessed with a long stretch of riverfront along its entire western boundary. This area of the park is currently underutilized and hard to access but many people want to make it more accessible. The riverfront is comprised of the riverbank slope made up of two sections divided by an intermediate terrace about half way up the bank. The intermediate terrace is relatively flat and varies in width from around fifteen feet to more than fifty feet. A short stretch of road is currently the only accessible route to the intermediate terrace but people make their own paths down the steep slope from the lodge area causing severe erosion. There is no direct access to the river itself. Views of the river from the upper level are hard to achieve through the dense vegetation. More than half of the shoreline is severely eroded with vertically sloughing banks that threaten to impact the up slope features of the park as they eat into the park landscape.



Lodge Area

The lodge area is located along the top of the riverbank in the southwest corner of the park. It is one of the most heavily used and congested areas in the park. Facilities in this area include; the lodge, a picnic pavilion, a basketball court, the bandstand, a parking lot, and parts of the walking path and park drive.

The lodge building is in poor condition and is too small for the large family reunions that occur here. The building can currently hold only 50 people under its shelter. The bathrooms are in need of plumbing repairs and the kitchen is inadequate for the intended use. The interior space of the lodge, although small, has a nice fireplace but very poor acoustics. The heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, and lighting are also in need of repair and improvement.



The basketball court is in a good location but may need resurfacing within a few years. The old bandstand, which was cut off from its audience by the floodwall, is quickly deteriorating and unsafe.

The walkways near the lodge building are in very poor condition with uneven surfaces, large cracks, and potholes. Surface drainage in this area is also bad.

The existing parking area near the lodge is disorganized with too much pavement and easy access to the riverbank. Because it is so easy to access the top of the riverbank, people often dump trash, yard waste, and other garbage over the bank causing a huge mess on the scene below.


Active Recreation Area

The active recreation area is located along the top of the riverbank just north of the lodge area. It is another heavily used and congested location in the park. Facilities in this area include; twelve tennis courts, a children's playground, a spray pool, a half basketball court, several picnic areas, and parts of the walking path and park drive.

The tennis courts are a highly used feature of the park. Six of the courts are clay and six are asphalt. The clay courts were reconstructed in 1994 and have irrigation to keep the clay moist. The asphalt courts are in poor condition with significant cracking and poor drainage. The asphalt courts are scheduled to be reconstructed later this year.



The children's playground has old equipment with little play value, limited accessibility, and is not in compliance with current playground safety guidelines. The spray pool nearby needs plumbing repairs and upgrades to the drainage system.



The parking in this area is unsafe, unorganized and unsightly. Gravel on both sides of the park drive allows patrons to parallel park. This has caused many people to express concerns for the children that run between parked cars from the play area to the tennis courts on opposite sides of the park drive. The gravel parking has also covered up the original drainage structures along the park drive. Drainage is therefore nonfunctional due to the additional deterioration of these structures.

Parkway Shelter

The parkway shelter area is located in the northeast corner of the park between Southwestern Parkway and the floodwall. Facilities in this area include; the parkway shelter, a small children's play area, a volleyball net, large open spaces, a deteriorated ball field, parking for 30 cars, and parts of the walking path and park drive.

The parkway shelter is in fairly good condition although the restrooms need some updating and repair. There is no drinking fountain in this area.




The children's playground is small and old with very little play value, limited accessibility, and is not in compliance with current playground safety guidelines. A volleyball area near the existing shelter is little more than a net set upon open grass.

There are two parking areas, one for parallel parking along the park drive and a newer one for 30 cars near the shelter. The parallel parking along the park drive is insufficient, unorganized and unsightly. Drainage along the park drive is nonfunctional due to the deterioration and covering up of the original drainage structures. Surface drainage in this area is also very poor.



The existing ball field in this area is very old, unused, and deteriorated.

There is a pay phone located near the park entrance that causes some distress for park neighbors.



CHICKASAW PARK EXISTING CONDITIONS

LOUISVILLE, KY. - AUGUST 2000



III. HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

Prepared by LANDSCAPES, Charlotte, VT

A. Olmsted Design Concepts for Chickasaw Park

This neighborhood park, designed by the Olmsted Brothers, Landscape Architects, is a part of a quality tradition of park design based on sound concepts. The 1923 Preliminary Plan developed by the Olmsted Brothers is the record of their design ideas and is included as Figure III.1. The first important design idea is developing this park to take the best advantage of the location fitting the design to the geography and existing conditions. At Chickasaw Park the chosen location and the design shown in this Olmsted plan provided:

- a beautiful, scenic landscape developed as a composition of large, shade trees, lawn, groves, woodlands, screen planting, playfields and gardens;
- a well drained, upland area of relatively level land that could be adapted to recreational uses;
- views over the broad, Ohio river that increased to apparent size of the park by visually adding the river to it;
- a system of paths and drives that provided access to all areas of the upland park and river access down a drive and system of paths. The paths and drives were cleverly placed around edges of the park to leave a large, green interior space;
- a design for a variety of uses for a range of ages and interests and the inclusion of facilities to support these uses;
- separation of activities in appropriate locations to avoid conflicts and foster positive park experiences;
- separation of spaces in a logical, pleasing sequence with transition zones designed between spaces.

The park that was developed varied from the Olmsted design in several ways but many of the same concepts applied to the park that was built. A reference for the as-built condition of the drives and paths is the Plan of Proposed Roadway, by W.J. Horrigan & Associates Engineers, dated November 1928, included as Figure III.2. This plan documents the construction of the U-shaped perimeter drive, three drive segments and a limited system of park walks. Two small ponds are located to the southeast and a low area is marked as a depression. Park buildings include a small shelter centered on the riverfront and two buildings near the trolley loop. The trolley car line enters the park along its northern edge.

B. Aerial Photograph Record

Historic aerial photographs also provide evidence of the park as it existed and as it changed. Included here are three selected aerial photographs dating to 1931, 1937 and 1951. The 1931

image, Figure III.3, shows all but the northern edge of the park and confirms the construction of the park drive and paths in a slightly different configuration than the Horrigan plan. Also noted are the ballfields, a large tennis court grouping and a round wading pool both seen to the upper right in the photograph. This view is especially useful because it also shows the refinery operation to the south with an array of tanks and several settling basins.


The 1937 aerial, Figure III.4, records the receding of the flood waters from the massive flood of that year. The park is seen as relatively free of water with the exception of the lower riverbank where trees stand in high water. The two ponds are joined by a narrow channel to form a single water body. Perimeter drives, central shelter, wading pool and ball fields are also discernable. This flood event led to the construction of an earthen flood wall across the park which remains as a dividing element in the topography today.

Figure III.5, the 1951 aerial photograph, is especially clear. The east-west oriented floodwall is visible dividing the park in riverfront and parkway sections. Lines of parkway trees and clusters of shade trees can be seen. The semi-circular drive near the park shelter is highly visible with its evergreen trees inside and shade trees along the eastern edge. The trolley line and turnaround at the north edge is also discernable as are the tennis courts and one ballfield. The second ballfield, seen in both 1930s photographs, was lost with the floodwall installation. These three aerial photographs provide useful information about the appearance of the park and its features as it developed.

C. *Historic Landscape Character*

The history chapter has set forth the chronology of park development. Here the quality and character of the park over time is analyzed using the historic plans and aerial photographs to discuss the park character as intended in the Olmsted design, as constructed and as altered over time up to the present. The character of a landscape is understood to include a number of elements and features as enumerated in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (Guidelines)*. These aspects of landscape character include spatial organization, views and visual relationships; topography and drainage; circulation drives and walks; landscape structures; furnishings, objects and small scale elements. All the physical elements of Chickasaw Park make up its character. The character of a landscape is also about the way it feels, the condition it is in, the care it receives, and what is around it that makes up its setting. Historic photographs show a generally attractive, well cared for landscape that is used by the community. One of the biggest changes in the park we experience today is a deterioration of conditions that leaves the park with a worn, shabby appearance. The intended beauty of this public landscape is less visible today.

Figure III.1



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy


Preliminary Plan

Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architects, 1923

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ART ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BETH MONT MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY


Figure III.2



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
 Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy
Plan of Proposed Roadway
 W.I. Horrigan & Associates, 1928
CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
 HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BEL MONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

Figure III.3



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department


Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy

Portion of Aerial Photo, 1931

Park Aerial Surveys, Inc.

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy

Aerial Photo, 1937

Park Aerial Surveys, Inc.

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARTFVN I FVFF- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy

Aerial Photo, 1951

Park Aerial Surveys, Inc.

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ART FYN I EVFF- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

D. *Park Use Zones and Landscape Types*

The zones within the park are the definable spaces that together comprise the whole landscape. While these different areas of the park are not entirely separate, it is useful to define them in order to gain a better understanding of how the park landscape worked and was experienced through time. Three, color diagrams describe the park zones in 1923, 1946 and as existing. Each color represents a park zone. Same color selections are used to compare comparable spaces for each era.

The 1923 Olmsted plan is shown colored into a series of distinct park use zones in Figure III.6. Beginning with the edges, a green parkway frontage and green north and south sides demonstrate the intent to enclose the park with the foliage of trees creating a green enclosure and limiting views out to the surrounding streets and residences. The yellow central area is the green heart of the park designed for intensive sports use with 6 baseball fields and 2 football/soccer fields. No ponds are shown and presumably the intent was to underdrain the areas that were wet. This large turf area is crossed by two paths and edged with shade trees. The magnet in this Olmsted park design is the central complex with gardens, pavilion, river overlook. This formally organized area is designed for passive enjoyment and the gregarious activities of meeting and greeting, seeing and being seen. The 3 light purple zones that extend along the riverfront are each focused on enjoyment of river views in informal spaces with turf and shade trees.

The lower riverfront level, shown in blue, includes the drive, steps and walks that extend down to this lower shelf near the water. It is designed to match the shape of the ground as a linear expanse of tree-covered landscape. Strolling, swimming and boating were intended in this part of the park. Proceeding northward, the orange area includes the trolley tracks, turnaround, shelter and shrub edged lawn panels. It is designed to serve as a gracious entry to the park from the trolley line but was not constructed as shown. The red area is a carefully sited play area divided into two zones by a Fieldhouse. Each half served a specific use. The playground to the west was arranged around a rectangular wading pool, while ten tennis courts attested to the popularity of that sport. Each of these uses requires a separate zone that is free of conflict from other uses and this design achieves the desired separation. Again, however, this area was not constructed as designed. The dark purple area is a compact maintenance yard that is also well separated from other park uses. As a whole, the Olmsted plan envisioned the development of a park that served various interests in appropriate settings, without conflict. Although Chickasaw Park was not constructed to this precise design, it served as the basic inspiration for the park and several aspects of it were built.


Figure III.7, the park zones colored over 1946 aerial photograph, readily portrays the differences between the designed and built park. As constructed the park was somewhat simpler and less well organized than intended. The same color codes are used and they reveal the proximity of the shelter and semi-circular drive to the tennis courts and playground, which provides less separation and positions these activities for more conflict. The perimeter drive, intended to align away from the north edge, is instead almost at the park boundary. The defined space to the north, which would have resulted from the proposed alignment, is, therefore, absent. The large central area, colored again in yellow, contains both open turf, trees and playing fields and the pond. The green edge along parkway and north/south

boundaries is in place. Fewer paths were built than intended making park users find their way to various areas rather than being directed to them. For example, while the river overlooks are still present, no riverview edge path or overlook areas with seating are noted making it less desirable to walk and sit along this area. The trolley line and turnaround are present, but a gracious park entry from the trolley was not constructed. While the park as-built functions and serves recreational needs, the concept of separation, the system of paths for access and the gracious qualities of the design are less apparent than in the proposed Olmsted plan.

Figure III.8, the existing park zones colored over a current base plan, shows what we have today. The central space, once an unbroken expanse of turf, trees, water and playing fields, is partitioned into smaller spaces first by the flood wall which divides the space physically and visually by mounded earth. The internal road, parking and shelter to the northeast near the parkway dominate the park's largest open space. The tennis complex, semicircular drive and basketball court segment the spaces west of the floodwall. The green edges of the park are weaker with less screen planting to the north and south. The riverview areas are also more fragmented, with the central shelter, large parking lot and playground space creating sub-areas. The lack of an edge path and the density of view blocking vegetation along the slope also make this area less desirable to use. Likewise, the lower riverfront area is less accessible with only the former, deteriorated drive as a route, and is therefore, less used. This comparison of three timeframes provides useful insights. The purpose of comparing park zones over time is to understand origins, intent and use over time as one set of data to inform the planning process.

Figure III.6

O H I O R I V E R



Louisville and Jefferson County Parks Department

· Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy

Park Zones

Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architects, 1923

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY




Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy
Park Zones

As-Built, 1946

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

Figure III.8



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy

Park Zones

Existing Conditions, 2000

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

E. *Park Spaces, Organization and Circulation*

A series of four plans, dating from 1923 to the present, were analyzed to understand spaces, views and circulation as intended, and how they changed over time. The 1923 Olmsted Brothers plan, Figure III.9, proposed a detailed system of drives and paths. The yellow colored, U-shaped, main drive was augmented by two half-loops, one at the central flower garden and flagpole and the other to the south providing an overlook to the river. This second loop required a bridge structure over the lower riverfront drive, which was not built. The path system, colored in purple, provided access to, through, and around all areas of the park. Notice especially the paths along the upper and lower level of the riverfront that provided scenic river views and river access. The enclosure of the trees along the park edges, north, west and south serves to define the park as a separate space from the surrounding city and to focus attention internally over the park landscape and toward the river.

As seen in Figure III.10, the same overlay of colors is provided on the 1928 Horrigan plan. This plan shows the U-shaped drive shifted closer to the north edge of the park. It also shows the south drive extension as a cul-de-sac turnaround with an overlook area toward the river. The pedestrian paths are shown extending along the parkway frontage, crossing through the center of the open space and edging the U-shaped drive. Three additional segments provide access to two river overlook areas and around the edge of the flower garden.

The 1946 spatial organization and circulation overlay shows the lesser system of drives and paths created. (Figure III.11) The paths system provides one crossing movement from the parkway to the shelter and one drive edge route that extends to the route moving down to the river level. No overlook drive cul-de-sac is in evidence. The drawing also indicates that a screen of trees covering the riverfront slopes breaks up views along the river edge. Edge screening does provide separation of the parkland from the surrounding neighborhood.


Today's spatial organization and circulation systems reflect the 1946 conditions with a few additions. A drive segment and parking area extend into the open space along the parkway. A large, asphalt parking area to the southwest replaces the intended river overlook. A more articulated path system provides access around the interior space and path segments extend around the pond and to the shelter. This path system does provide additional park access, although a riverfront overlook path is still lacking. Views along the upper river overlook area are partial and this important park feature is less valuable than intended. (Figure III.12).

F. *Summary Historic Analysis Findings and Directions*

The process of looking at the park as it has evolved over time provides an historical basis for considering function and enjoyment of this public landscape. The *Guidelines* provide four possible treatment alternatives to address historically valued landscapes- preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The basic stewardship responsibility that we have in renewing Chickasaw Park is to identify and understand what remains that is historic and to safeguard those elements and features into the future. We can also consider the application of historic design principles as we develop strategies for the future. Rehabilitation is the most appropriate treatment to select since it directs toward respect for the historic, while current and future needs are met. For Chickasaw Park the historic design, as well as

remaining spaces, systems and features provide inspiration for the future. The analysis indicates that there is greater potential for conflict between these activities due to adjacent locations. Attempts to resolve conflict due to site locations should be made as a portion of the master planning considerations, based on the Olmsted principal of separation of park uses by design. These analysis concepts are carried into the following chapters where alternatives are explored and recommendations put forward. An important aspect to remember is that this park was intended to be beautiful and restorative to the spirit as well as functional and that beauty, and the care and respect it implies should be returned to Chickasaw Park.


Figure III.9



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
 Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy
Spatial Organization & Circulation Plan
 Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architects, 1923
CHICKASAW PARK


ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
 ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

Figure III.10



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
 Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy
Spatial Organization & Circulation Plan
 W.I. Horrigan & Associates, 1928
CHICKASAW PARK
 ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
 ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

Figure III.11



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy


Spatial Organization & Circulation Plan

As - Built, 1946

CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
ARLEYN LEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

Figure III.12



Louisville and Jefferson Country Parks Department
 Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy
Spatial Organization & Circulation Plan
 Existing Conditions, 2000
CHICKASAW PARK

ENVIRONS/INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY • LANDSCAPES-LA.PLANNING.HP - CHARLOTTE, VT
 ARLEYN LEEVEE- HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA • SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

IV. RENEWAL STRATEGIES:

The master plan recommends the strategies listed below to upgrade and improve the park. The master planning team working closely with the Chickasaw Park Community Committee, Metro Parks, and the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy developed these strategies. The proposed strategies are based on the issues and information gathered during the extensive research and analysis phase of the project and grouped according to the park regions described previously in this report.

A. THE POND

The community committee identified the pond area the highest priority area needing improvement in the park. These strategies involve a major redevelopment and addition of facilities to serve the pond area, as follows:

- ❖ Enlarge and deepen the pond and improve the pond edges. Investigate and consider using a pond aeration system to provide oxygen and improved water quality.
- ❖ Provide five access points where people can get closer to the pond for fishing, feeding the ducks, or observing.
- ❖ Reconfigure the walking path between the pond and Southwestern Parkway to be closer to the pond. Add a walk around the south end of the pond to connect with the existing path.
- ❖ Improve the pond overflow and drainage so it does not impact the walking path.
- ❖ Build a picnic shelter near the pond that can also be used as a bandstand for events.
- ❖ Build a small restroom near the parking and picnic area.
- ❖ Build an angled pull in parking lot for 22 cars along the park drive.
- ❖ Provide lay-by parking for 7 cars within view of the pond.
- ❖ Plant more trees in groves to better define the spaces in this area.
- ❖ Add more picnic tables and grills in picnic grove area.
- ❖ Organize an urban fishing program to teach children about fishing.
- ❖ Control the waterfowl and water lotus in the pond.
- ❖ Add more benches and a drinking fountain in this area.

B. RIVERFRONT ACCESS

The community committee identified riverfront access as the second highest priority for improvements to the park. The master plan recommends the following strategies to upgrade and improve this area:

- ❖ Build a path on the lower river terrace with overlooks and a picnic area.
- ❖ Build three connector walks with steps to access the lower level from the upper level.
- ❖ Build a boat dock for the Spirit of Jefferson to load/unload passengers.
- ❖ Acquire Ashland Oil property for a boat ramp.
- ❖ Correct severe erosion along the riverbank.

C. LODGE AREA

The community committee identified improvements to the lodge and shelter as the third highest priority for improvements to the park. The master plan recommends the following strategies to upgrade and improve this area:

- ❖ Enlarge the existing lodge and add a wide porch all the way around the building so that the lodge is big enough to hold 100 to 200 people. Not necessarily inside, but under a roof.
- ❖ Improve the interior spaces in the lodge, including the kitchen and bathrooms. Provide year round restrooms and a fireplace in the lodge.
- ❖ Improve the heating, air conditioning, plumbing, electrical systems, and lighting in the lodge. Provide appropriate furniture in the lodge.
- ❖ Improve the walkways and add a plaza area and overlook on the river side of the lodge.
- ❖ Reconstruct the abandoned drainage structures and improve surface drainage in this area.
- ❖ Construct a 46-car parking lot out of the existing parking lot and remove the existing shelter in this area.
- ❖ Recreate the old flower garden in the circle drive in front of the lodge.
- ❖ Build a new walkway that loops along the top of the bank from the parking lot to the southern overlook and back.
- ❖ Manage the riverbank vegetation to create view corridors in this area.
- ❖ Provide benches and picnic tables for viewing the river in this area.

D. ACTIVE RECREATION AREA

The community committee considered many of the facilities in the active recreation area as important components of the park. The master plan recommends the following strategies to upgrade and improve this area:

- ❖ Construct a small shelter along the walking path just north of the tennis courts.
- ❖ Move and improve the tennis practice court.
- ❖ Plant trees in groves to better define the spaces in this area.
- ❖ Add more picnic tables and grills in picnic grove area.
- ❖ Build an overlook on the old interurban streetcar ridge in this area.
- ❖ Build new walkways along the river side of the park drive to access 47th street, the northern overlook and other activity areas in the park.
- ❖ Provide historic interpretation of the old Interurban Streetcar Line at the northern overlook
- ❖ Provide lay-by parking for 16 cars on the river side of the park drive in this area.
- ❖ Reconstruct the asphalt tennis courts. Enlarge these courts to regulation size.
- ❖ Beautify area around the tennis courts with container plantings.
- ❖ Improve the children's play area and install a fence to keep kids out of the park drive.

- ❖ Build new walkways along the river side of the park drive to access the various activity areas and provide views of the river.
- ❖ Construct a raised crossing to help kids cross the street safely and control speeding.
- ❖ Remove the gravel lay-by parking along the west side of the park drive.
- ❖ Provide lay-by parking for 24 cars along the east side of the park drive.
- ❖ Improve the half basketball court in this area for use by children.
- ❖ Improve surface drainage in this area.
- ❖ Provide two drinking fountains in this area.
- ❖ Repair the spray pool.

E. PARKWAY SHELTER


The community committee identified improvements to the lodge and shelter as the third highest priority for improvements to the park. The master plan recommends the following strategies to upgrade and improve this area:

- ❖ Improve the parkway shelter in its existing location.
- ❖ Build a new play area for children near the existing shelter.
- ❖ Improve the volleyball court near the existing shelter.
- ❖ Plant more trees in groves to define the spaces in this area and buffer the shelter.
- ❖ Install a drinking fountain near the existing shelter in this area.
- ❖ Remove existing lay-by parking along the park drive in this area.
- ❖ Consider providing parking off of the park drive near the park entrance.
- ❖ Install a one-way sign across from the entrance to the drive that goes to the shelter.
- ❖ Improve surface drainage in this area to alleviate ponding.
- ❖ Move the pay phone to the lodge or tennis area.

F. MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENTS

- ❖ Improve surface drainage along the walking path.
- ❖ Upgrade the fitness equipment along the walking path.
- ❖ Provide drinking fountains and benches at key locations.
- ❖ Repair and improve the lighting along the walking path.
- ❖ Rebuild drainage structures along the park drive.
- ❖ Install under-drainage in poorly drained open areas.
- ❖ Regrade low areas to eliminate ponding.
- ❖ Remove all above ground electrical lines, poles and transformers.
- ❖ Install new underground electrical service.

- ❖ Improve water service to the pond area.
- ❖ Provide written and graphic interpretations of the park history. Display historic photos, maps, and descriptions in the lodge, in a brochure, or on interpretive park signs.
- ❖ Gather oral histories on videotape from a variety of park users.
- ❖ Protect the African Slit Drum from additional deterioration.
- ❖ Approach Ashland Oil about using their property for park expansion.
- ❖ Remove dead limbs and trees and replant missing trees.
- ❖ Provide appropriate signage to orient and educate park users about the park and its rules and regulations.
- ❖ Control vehicles going the wrong way on the park drive.
- ❖ Enforce rules about excess noise and hours of operation.
- ❖ Enforce rules about keeping dogs on a leash.
- ❖ Install bike racks at key locations around the park.



0 50 100 150 200 250 300
SCALE: 1" = 150'

CHICKASAW PARK MASTER PLAN


LOUISVILLE, KY. - AUGUST 2000

ENVIRONS, INC. - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY

LANDSCAPES - LA PLANNING, HP - CHARLOTTE, VT

ARLEYN LEVEE - HISTORIC CONSULTANT - BELMONT, MA

SMITH ARCHITECTURE - ARCHITECTS - LOUISVILLE, KY



V. EXPANSION OPPORTUNITIES

Chickasaw Park is bounded on the north by residences, on the east by Southwestern Parkway, and on the west by the Ohio River. The only opportunity for expansion of the park is to gain access to and use of the Ashland Oil property immediately to the south of the park.

There has been quite a bit of discussion by the community of the need for a boat ramp in this stretch of the river. The Chickasaw Park Community Committee considered this to be an important issue and it has also been identified in several past planning documents such as the *Ohio River Corridor Master Plan*, the *Parks and Open Space Master Plan*, and the *Master Plan for Louisville's Olmsted Parks and Parkways*. However, there is not enough room for such a facility in Chickasaw Park. A public boat ramp where someone can launch their own boat requires a great deal of space for maneuvering, stacking, and parking. To do this in Chickasaw Park would require turning a great deal of the park into driveway and parking lot.

Other active recreation activities, such as baseball, softball, and soccer fields that would benefit the community but do not fit in the historic landscape of Chickasaw Park could also be located on the Ashland Oil property

There are several issues however, in addition to ownership, that must be addressed before the park could be expanded into this property. Since the property was used as an oil refinery for many years, there is undoubtedly some level of environmental clean up that would be required to make the site safe for the public and the cleanup costs associated with this issue may make the site undesirable from an economic standpoint. There is also quite a bit of old infrastructure remaining that would have to be removed or made safe before opening the area to the public.

The benefits of expanding the park to the south could be great however, giving the community a strong connection and access to the river while allowing room for active recreation and team sports activities right next door to the community's premier place to commune with nature, play games, and gather with friends and family in Chickasaw Park.

VI. APPENDIX A – USER RESEARCH

**LOUISVILLE
CHICKASAW PARK VISITOR
INTERCEPT SURVEY**

SUMMARY REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc.
1297 Trevilian Way
Louisville, Kentucky 40233-7280

HORIZONRESEARCH
International

PREPARED BY:

Horizon Research International
1930 Bishop Lane
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

JUNE, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
OVERVIEW AND IMPLICATIONS	i
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	iii
Research Methodology	iii
Demographic Profile	v
Visits To The Park	v
Activities At The Park	vii
Satisfaction With The Park	ix
Preferences And Improvements	xi

OVERVIEW AND IMPLICATIONS

The Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy retained Horizon Research International to conduct a survey among visitors at Chickasaw Park in Louisville. A total of 200 intercept interviews, 7 to 8-minutes in length, were conducted by trained and professional interviewers from May 6 to May 17, 1999. Following are the implications and conclusions from the research:

- Chickasaw Park enjoys the status of a vital community resource among its visitors. Given the lower than average income of most of its users, this park has become a frequently visited and actively used community resource for recreation. Thus, any improvements made to its facilities and activities would greatly influence the wellbeing of the local community that uses this park.
- Almost three in five visitors to Chickasaw Park were satisfied with it overall. This is twice the number of visitors who were satisfied with the neighboring Shawnee Park. One of the reasons Chickasaw Park has a higher satisfaction than Shawnee Park may depend upon the history of the two parks. Chickasaw Park may be considered more of a historic community resource among the African American visitors than Shawnee Park.
- Chickasaw Park users are frequent park visitors. On average they visited it about seven times a month, almost equally for passive and social activities such as walking and picnics, and more strenuous activities such as sports. Keeping in mind the various uses for the park and the types of visitors, a well-rounded development strategy would have to be executed to provide improvements across the areas used by these visitors.

OVERVIEW AND IMPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

- This park is an extremely valuable resource for those with children. The great majority of visitors with young children bring their children to this park. As a matter of fact, many adults without young children of their own, bring grandchildren or other children to this park. Any improvements to make this park a better place for children, through increased activities and improved facilities, would positively impact the usage by the visitors.
- Chickasaw, unlike the three larger parks, has many frequent users who are 55 years of age or older (particularly males). It also has more usage per person among those with disabilities. Yet both of these groups were less satisfied than the others. Possibly look at the fishing lake as a source of enjoyment and a place for potential improvements to further encourage these two groups of "at risk" users.
- Improvements in facilities were suggested more often than activities by most of the park visitors. The restrooms at Chickasaw Park stood out as the biggest issue among these visitors. They wanted more restrooms and cleaner restrooms at the park. Also, the general cleanliness of the park was an aspect that could be improved.

In summary, Chickasaw Park visitors want better and cleaner facilities for their active and passive park activities. Such improvements may even help increase the frequency of their visitation, as well as overall satisfaction with the park.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The Louisville Olmstead Parks Conservancy retained Horizon Research International to conduct a survey among visitors to Chickasaw Park in Louisville. This research was commissioned from the research plan that the Conservancy designed as part of receiving a grant from the Lila Wallace Foundation. A similar study was conducted among the three larger parks in Louisville (Cherokee, Shawnee, and Iroquois) in July 1998.*

The research objectives of the current study were straightforward. They were as follows:

- Measure overall and attribute-wide satisfaction among visitors to Chickasaw Park.
- Understand the park usage behavior of these visitors.
- Understand any special needs and improvements suggested by the park visitors.
- Shed light on the demographic profile of the visitors to this park.

A total of 200 interviews, 7 to 8-minutes in length, were conducted among visitors to Chickasaw Park from May 6 to May 17, 1999.

Research Methodology

An in-person intercept design was selected, based on the fact that park visitors would be the easiest to locate and interview while they were still at the park. Two areas for interviewing were defined by the Louisville Olmstead Parks Conservancy. The areas identified were as follows:

- The tennis courts area and the surrounding playground area
- The lake area and the walking path area near the lake

* Reports available under a separate cover.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

Due to the smaller size of Chickasaw Park (compared to the three larger parks in Louisville), these two areas covered most of the geography of Chickasaw Park.*

All interviewing was conducted to include at least 10 weekdays and four weekend days. Thus the sample included several days of park usage and represented those using the park on weekdays and weekends. It also allowed for variances of the weather.

The interviewing time for the parks was also systematically divided across morning (8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.), afternoon (12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.), and evening hours (4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.). No interviewing was conducted after 8:00 p.m.

Interviewers trained in the art of person-to-person interviewing were used to conduct the field work, and they followed all industry standards for professional intercept interviewing.

- Only one person per group was interviewed.
- All respondents were handed a response booklet for easy and quick understanding of the answer choices.

The number of interviews per area represented the ratio of the usage of that area (as per Chickasaw Park count results for Spring 1999). Thus, there was no need to add further weights to the data.

In all, the sampling plan and the intercept field work met all methodological objectives for this type of survey.

* The past research conducted in the three larger parks required the use of an observation methodology before deciding on the park areas that would be used to conduct the interviewing. However, due to the smaller size of Chickasaw Park, two areas were identified by the Conservancy and these covered most of the traffic and types of usage (active and passive) in the park.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of these park users was not very different from that of the visitors to Shawnee Park, as observed in the previous survey. Most visitors to Chickasaw Park were African American (94 percent), a fact that goes hand in hand with the profile of the residential areas around the park.

The majority of the visitors to this park were male and had an average age of about 40 years. Most of them did not have any disability that restricted their daily activities. The visitors also represented the socio-economic profile of the area in general, and their average household income was in the mid \$30,000 range. This was lower than the median income in Louisville which is about \$38,000. Most of these visitors were high school graduates and were employed. Only 12 percent of the visitors had a college degree (21 percent in the metro Louisville area). Almost half the park visitors had children.

The past research among Shawnee Park users had also indicated a somewhat similar profile of the visitors to that park. In summary, the visitor demographics represented the socio-economic profile of the area where these parks are located.

Visits To The Park

Chickasaw Park was actively used. In an average month in spring/early summer, visitors made about seven visits to the park.

- The past survey revealed that visitors to Shawnee Park had also made seven visits a month, suggesting that the usage behavior of these visitors was not very different from those at Chickasaw Park.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- The past survey also suggested that about eight in ten Shawnee Park visitors had visited Chickasaw Park in the past 12 months. This survey confirms that there is indeed a high degree of inter-usage among Shawnee Park and Chickasaw Park. Almost two in three Chickasaw Park visitors had visited Shawnee Park in the past 12 months.
- These Chickasaw Park users visited Shawnee Park quite frequently. On average, they had made about 32 visits to Shawnee Park in the past year. This was twice as many visits than they had made to Cherokee Park in East Louisville. In all, these respondents were active park users.

Not only were male visitors more likely to visit the park, they also visited the park more often. The "heavier" users (two to three visits a week) tended to be older men. On average, they made about 10 visits to the park per month in spring/early summer. One explanation for such a high number of visits to the park by this population is that their socioeconomic profile does not allow much discretionary income towards entertainment. Hence the parks are a source of free entertainment and a valuable community resource.

Females were more likely than males to be "light" users (made a trip to this park once a month or less.)

These visitors used Chickasaw Park mostly during the evening hours. Most of them (57 percent) visited the park between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- The 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. slot was also a popular visiting time, especially among those 55 years or older (since many were retired).
- Men were twice as likely as women to stay at the park later than 7:00 p.m. (24 percent versus 12 percent).

In summary, these respondents were active park goers. They considered the park an important community resource and thus used it to the hilt. The older respondents--although a minority in their numbers--were more frequent visitors.

Activities At The Park

Chickasaw Park was used equally by respondents for passive relaxation and social activities, as well as for activities such as sports.

- More than three in four visitors used it to relax by taking a stroll through the park or as a place to unwind and think things over.
- Less strenuous activities such as walking, bird watching, and fishing were also popular among park visitors. Almost three in four also used the park for an outing such as a picnic or just for a drive.

Sports-related usage was also a popular activity at this park. For those who wanted to get some exercise, the use of the exercise stations was an active method of park usage. Basketball and tennis were also played by one in five respondents.

While 48 percent of the respondents had children under 18 years of age in their household, about 52 percent of the visitors stated that they had brought kids to play at Chickasaw Park. As a matter of fact households without any young children stated that they played with children at this park.

- This may be due to the older visitors bringing their grandchildren to the park.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- The 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. slot was also a popular visiting time, especially among those 55 years or older (since many were retired).
- Men were twice as likely as women to stay at the park later than 7:00 p.m. (24 percent versus 12 percent).

In summary, these respondents were active park goers. They considered the park an important community resource and thus used it to the hilt. The older respondents--although a minority in their numbers--were more frequent visitors.

Activities At The Park

Chickasaw Park was used equally by respondents for passive relaxation and social activities, as well as for activities such as sports.

- More than three in four visitors used it to relax by taking a stroll through the park or as a place to unwind and think things over.
- Less strenuous activities such as walking, bird watching, and fishing were also popular among park visitors. Almost three in four also used the park for an outing such as a picnic or just for a drive.

Sports-related usage was also a popular activity at this park. For those who wanted to get some exercise, the use of the exercise stations was an active method of park usage. Basketball and tennis were also played by one in five respondents.

While 48 percent of the respondents had children under 18 years of age in their household, about 52 percent of the visitors stated that they had brought kids to play at Chickasaw Park. As a matter of fact households without any young children stated that they played with children at this park.

- This may be due to the older visitors bringing their grandchildren to the park.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- At least 70 percent of those with children have brought them to the park. In any case, this usage speaks volumes about the importance of Chickasaw Park among the families that have children.

The various population sub-groups used the park differently.

- Women were less likely than men to be involved in sports such as basketball or tennis. They were more likely than men to use the park for less strenuous activities such as walking, bird-watching, walking a pet, or playing with children.
- The older park visitors were more likely to use Chickasaw Park to walk around and relax and engage in activities such as fishing. However, the younger visitors were more likely to be involved in active sports and exercise activities, and also to play with children.
- Those visitors who had children were more likely to bring children to the park to play. They were also more likely to play sports such as softball or baseball, and go on picnics.
- The disabled were less likely to play active sports or play with children. However they were more likely than the non-disabled to use the lake for fishing.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

- Those with less than \$25,000 in annual household income preferred cycling to tennis, when compared to those with at least \$40,000 in annual household income. They were also less likely to use the park to be alone and relax.

In summary, Chickasaw Park was used in many different ways by each of the park user segments. Needless to say, this makes it an even more valuable resource for meeting the different types of entertainment needs of various segments in the community.

Satisfaction With The Park

Almost three in five visitors (61 percent) were extremely or very satisfied with Chickasaw Park. This is almost twice as high as the satisfaction number noted among those visiting Shawnee Park in the previous survey.

There was not much difference in the satisfaction of the various groups, except that the less affluent segment was slightly more satisfied than those with incomes over \$40,000.

Satisfaction was the highest for passive usage and areas such as shaded places, parking facilities, and signs and directions. However, cleanliness and facility upkeep seemed to be an issue among these visitors, most dramatically the restrooms.

- Restrooms (only 18 percent satisfied)
- Cleanliness at the park (55 percent satisfied)
- Landscape maintenance and upkeep (57 percent satisfied)

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

In all, the restrooms seemed to be the biggest issue among the other facility-related mentions. In fact they received a lower evaluation than any single activity or facility measured in this survey*.

There were also some differences between the satisfaction levels of the various type of visitors.

- There was not much statistical difference between the satisfaction level of males and females. However, the preponderance of data suggests that females were slightly more satisfied than males on most aspects, except with the facilities for children.
- The older segment (55 years or older) agreed with their younger counterparts about the lower level of satisfaction with restrooms, cleanliness, and general maintenance of roads, etc. However, they were more concerned with safety than the younger visitors.
- Those who had children were less satisfied than those who did not, with facilities such as shaded places to relax and picnic areas that could be used for outings with their children.
- The less affluent segment (\$25,000 or less in annual household income) was more satisfied than the more affluent visitors (\$40,000 or more in annual household income). However, both of these segments agreed the restrooms needed critical reform. Those with a disability were generally as satisfied as those without a disability.

*Satisfaction with restrooms was not measured in the other park surveys.

(CONTINUED)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

In summary, the restrooms and the general cleanliness and maintenance seemed to be the biggest dissatisfiers among visitors to Chickasaw Park. While three in five were satisfied overall with this park, there is significant room for improvements in restrooms and cleanliness.

Preferences And Improvements

Most respondents liked the natural aesthetics and the nature-related aspects of Chickasaw Park. Seventy percent of the respondents mentioned that they liked the park most for its proximity to nature.

The social environment of the park was also an aspect that these visitors enjoyed. Safety did not seem to be as big of an issue in this park as it was for Shawnee Park in the earlier survey.

When asked about the improvements they wanted to see in this park, facility-related improvements were mentioned more often than any other. About 80 percent of the visitors wanted improvements in the park facilities.

- Restrooms were the biggest requirement for these visitors. More restrooms and cleaner restrooms received unaided mentions from almost one third of all visitors (a dramatic number for an unprompted response).
- The general cleanliness of the park was also mentioned as something that could be improved. The creek and the lawn areas were probably the areas that needed the biggest improvement in this direction.
- About one in five visitors suggested improvements for child-related facilities and the sports facilities.

As far as activities were concerned, about 20 percent of the respondents suggested improvements such as organized sports activities, more family and child-oriented activities, musical events, etc.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS (CONTINUED)

In summary, Chickasaw Park was in need of facility-related improvements as suggested by these visitors. The restrooms and general park cleanliness would be the first place to start this improvement. Needless to say, this would also have the biggest impact on the overall satisfaction of these park visitors.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES


- **Measure Overall And Attribute-wide Satisfaction Among Visitors To Chickasaw Park**
- **Understand Park Usage Behavior Among Those Visiting Chickasaw Park In Spring And Early Summer**
- **Understand Park-related Needs Of The Visitors**
- **Understand The Demographic Profile Of Visitors To Chickasaw Park**

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Two Primary Usage Areas Defined By Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy For Conducting Interviews.
 - Lake/Walking Path Area (96 Interviews)
 - Tennis Courts/Playground Area (104 Interviews)
- 7 To 8-minute Intercept Survey Among Visitors To Chickasaw Park Between May 6 and 17, 1999.
- All Interviewing Conducted By Trained Professional Interviewers Systematically Across Morning, Afternoon And Evening Hours.

VISITS TO CHICKASAW PARK IN SPRING AND EARLY SUMMER AMONG PARK VISITORS

At Least Two
To Three Times A Week
(Heavy Users)
62%



Once A Week Or
Once Every Two Weeks
(Medium Users)
20%

Base = (200)
Once A Month
Or Less
(Light Users)
18%

Average Visits In A Month = 7 Visits

TYPE OF USERS AVERAGE VISITS IN A MONTH

Heavy 10*
Medium 3.5*
Light 0.7

GENDER

Male 7.7*
Female 6.1

AGE

Under 34 6.2
35 To 54 7.0
55 Or Older 8.7*

DISABLED

Yes 9.0
No 6.8*

INCOME

Under \$40,000 6.2
\$40,000 Or More 8.5*

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS*

VISITORS TO CHICKASAW PARK

IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER**

	TOTAL (%)	USAGE FREQUENCY		
		HEAVY (2 to 3 Times/Week) (%)	MEDIUM (%)	LIGHT (Once A Month Or Less) (%)
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	59	67	51	43
Female	41	33	49	57
<u>AGE</u>				
34 Years Or Less	35	29	46	43
35 To 54 Years	48	48	46	49
55 Years Or Older	18	23	7	9
[Average Age]	[40 Years]	[42 Years]	[37 Years]	[38 Years]
<u>CHILDREN</u>				
<u>At Least One Child</u>	<u>48*</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>57</u>
1 To 4 Years Old	21	19	27	20
5 To 7 Years Old	18	10	32	29
8 To 14 Years Old	25	22	27	32
15 To 18 Years Old	18	20	12	14
<u>No Children</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>PHYSICAL DISABILITY</u>				
Have A Disability	12	17	5	3
Do Not Have A Disability	88	83	95	97

* Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.

** Among those with a response.



Discernibly Higher At The 90 Percent Confidence Level.

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS*

VISITORS TO CHICKASAW PARK

IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER (CONTINUED)**

	TOTAL (%)	USAGE FREQUENCY		
		HEAVY (2 to 3 Times/Week) (%)	MEDIUM (%)	LIGHT (Once A Month Or Less) (%)
<u>EDUCATION</u>				
High School Or Less	61	59	67	60
Some College/Technical School	27	24	28	34
4 Years Of College Or Higher	12	17	5	6
<u>EMPLOYMENT</u>				
Employed Full Time	54	52	62	51
Employed Part Time	8	7	8	9
Unemployed	4	2	3	9
Retired	21	27	10	9
Homemaker	6	3	13	11
Student	8	9	5	11
<u>ACCESS TO INTERNET</u>				
<u>Have Access</u>	<u>44*</u>	48	32	46
At Home	23	27	12	17
At Work	30	33	24	23
From School	7	7	5	11
<u>No Access</u>	<u>56</u>	52	68	54

* Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.
 ** Among those with a response.



Discernibly Higher At The 90 Percent
Confidence Level.

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS*

VISITORS TO CHICKASAW PARK

IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER (CONTINUED)**

	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)	<u>USAGE FREQUENCY</u>		
		<u>HEAVY</u> (2 to 3 Times/Week) (%)	<u>MEDIUM</u> (%)	<u>LIGHT</u> (Once A Month Or Less) (%)
<u>ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME</u>				
Under \$40,000	71	61	84	86
\$40,000 To \$60,000	18	23	16	5
\$60,000 To \$80,000	7	10	-	5
\$80,000 Or More	4	5	-	5
[Average Income]	[\$35,800]	[\$39,800]	[\$28,200]	[\$32,700]
<u>RACE</u>				
Caucasian	4	-	7	14
African American	94	99	90	83
Other	2	1	3	3

* Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.

** Among those with a response.



Discernibly Higher At The 90 Percent Confidence Level.

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS*

VISITORS TO CHICKASAW PARK

IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER (CONTINUED)**


	TOTAL (%)	USAGE FREQUENCY		
		HEAVY (2 to 3 Times/Week) (%)	MEDIUM (%)	LIGHT (Once A Month Or Less) (%)
<u>EDUCATION</u>				
High School Or Less	61	59	67	60
Some College/Technical School	27	24	28	34
4 Years Of College Or Higher	12	17	5	6
<u>EMPLOYMENT</u>				
Employed Full Time	54	52	62	51
Employed Part Time	8	7	8	9
Unemployed	4	2	3	9
Retired	21	27	10	9
Homemaker	6	3	13	11
Student	8	9	5	11
<u>ACCESS TO INTERNET</u>				
Have Access	44*	48	32	46
At Home	23	27	12	17
At Work	30	33	24	23
From School	7	7	5	11
No Access	56	52	68	54

* Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.
 ** Among those with a response.




Discernibly Higher At The 90 Percent
Confidence Level.

USAGE OF OTHER PARKS BY CHICKASAW PARK VISITORS IN THE PAST YEAR



TIME OF PARK USAGE* AMONG VISITORS TO CHICKASAW PARK IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER



* Totals may not equal 100 percent due to multiple responses.

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN WHILE AT CHICKASAW PARK TOP MENTIONS AMONG VISITORS IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER

	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)	<u>USAGE FREQUENCY</u>		
		<u>HEAVY</u> (%)	<u>MEDIUM</u> (%)	<u>LIGHT</u> (%)
<u>BE ALONE/RELAX</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>57</u>
Just Sat/Walked Around	76	77	85	57
Be Alone/Think Things Over	42	46	44	26
<u>LESS STRENUOUS ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>74</u>
Gone Walking	51	54	44	46
Gone Bird Watching	43	44	42	40
Gone Fishing	24	26	22	20
<u>OUTINGS</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>66</u>
Just Drove Around The Park	57	57	66	49
Gone On A Picnic	51	52	54	43
<u>ACTIVE SPORTS/EXERCISE</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>66</u>
Used Exercise Stations	43	44	42	40
Played Basketball	23	23	22	20
Played Tennis	20	23	15	14
<u>CHILD-RELATED</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>49</u>
Brought Kids To Play	54	50	68	49
BASE =	(200)	(124)	(41)	(35)

* Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

** Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.



Discernibly Higher At The 90 Percent Confidence Level.

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN WHILE AT CHICKASAW PARK TOP MENTIONS AMONG VISITORS IN VARIOUS SEGMENTS

	VISITORS WITH CHILDREN			DISABILITY	
	TOTAL (%)	HAVE CHILDREN (%)	NO CHILDREN (%)	DISABLED (%)	NO DISABILITY (%)
<u>BE ALONE/RELAX</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>79</u>
Just Sat/Walked Around	76	75	76	79	75
Be Alone/Think Things Over	42	43	41	46	42
<u>LESS STRENUOUS ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>
Gone Walking	51	55	47	46	51
Gone Bird Watching	43	46	40	29	45
Gone Fishing	24	21	26	42	22
<u>OUTINGS</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>74</u>
Just Drove Around The Park	57	62	52	50	59
Gone On A Picnic	51	50	52	46	52
<u>ACTIVE SPORTS/EXERCISE</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>72</u>
Used Exercise Stations	43	46	40	29	45
Played Basketball	22	23	21	4	24
Played Tennis	20	17	22	13	21
<u>CHILD-RELATED</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>56</u>
Brought Kids To Play	54	74	34	38	56
Base =	(200)	(96)	(103)	(24)**	(174)


** Caution: Small base size.

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN WHILE AT CHICKASAW PARK TOP MENTIONS AMONG VISITORS IN VARIOUS SEGMENTS

		<u>GENDER</u>		<u>AGE</u>		
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>UNDER 34</u>	<u>35 TO 54</u>	<u>55 OR OLDER</u>
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
<u>BE ALONE/RELAX</u>	79	82	74	70	81	89*
Just Sat/Walked Around	76	78	72	66	78	89
Be Alone/Think Things Over	42	45	37	41	42	43
<u>LESS STRENUOUS ACTIVITIES</u>	75	69	83	67	78	80
Gone Walking	51	45	59	43	59	43
Gone Bird Watching	43	36	53	43	40	51
Gone Fishing	24	31	14	20	20	43
<u>OUTINGS</u>	72	70	74	73	74	63
Just Drove Around The Park	57	58	56	59	58	51
Gone On A Picnic	51	49	54	44	57	49
<u>ACTIVE SPORTS/EXERCISE</u>	69	66	73	79	62	69
Used Exercise Stations	43	36	53	43	40	51
Played Basketball	22	29	12	37	16	9
Played Tennis	20	23	15	21	18	20
<u>CHILD-RELATED</u>	54	43	69	66	54	29
Brought Kids To Play	54	43	69	66	54	29
Base =	(200)	(119)	(81)	(70)	(95)	(35**)

** Caution: Small base size.

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK AMONG THOSE WITH AN OPINION




Base = (200)

* Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED


<u>TYPE OF USERS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)
Heavy	55
Medium	81*
Light	63
<u>GENDER</u>	
Male	58
Female	67
<u>AGE</u>	
Under 34	63
35 To 54	62
55 Or Older	57
<u>DISABLED</u>	
Yes	54
No	62
<u>INCOME</u>	
Below \$40,000	73
\$40,000 Or More	50*

ATTRIBUTE-WIDE EVALUATION OF CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED*



* Among those with an opinion.


SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED BY GENDER*



** No statistically discernible differences were noted.

* Among those with an opinion.


SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED BY AGE**



* Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

**Among those with an opinion.


SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED BY THOSE WITH CHILDREN**



* Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

** Among those with an opinion.


SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED BY INCOME*



* Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

** Among those with an opinion.

SATISFACTION WITH CHICKASAW PARK PERCENT EXTREMELY/VERY SATISFIED BY DISABILITY*



*Statistically discernible at the 90 percent confidence level.

** Among those with an opinion.

TOP MENTIONS OF THINGS LIKED MOST ABOUT CHICKASAW PARK AMONG VISITORS IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER

	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)
<u>NATURAL AESTHETICS</u>	<u>70</u>
Quiet/Secluded/Relaxing	43
Wildlife	15
Pond	12
<u>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>20</u>
Safe	8
Like To See/Meet People	5
<u>SPORTS/ACTIVITIES</u>	
Tennis Courts	<u>11</u>
Basketball	8
	3
<u>CONVENIENCE OF PARK</u>	
Close To Home	<u>8</u>
	8
<u>SPECIAL AREAS</u>	
Areas For Children To Play	<u>7</u>
Picnic Area	4
	2
<u>WALKING/BIKING FACILITIES</u>	
Hiking/Walking Trails	<u>5</u>
	5

Base = (200)

IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED AT CHICKASAW PARK AMONG VISITORS IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER TOP MENTIONS

	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)
<u>FACILITY-RELATED IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED</u>	<u>83</u>
<u>RESTROOMS</u>	<u>37</u>
Cleaner Restrooms	19
More Restrooms In Pond Area	12
More Restrooms	8
<u>CLEANLINESS</u>	<u>28</u>
Clean Up The Creek	13
Clean/Better Lawns	9
Overall Cleanliness	8
<u>CHILD-RELATED</u>	<u>26</u>
Improved Play Area	21
Wading Pool	3
<u>SPORTS-RELATED</u>	<u>22</u>
Stock The Lake	10
Another Basketball Court	5
More Tennis Courts	4
<u>OTHER FACILITIES</u>	<u>20</u>
Concession Stand	6
More Water Fountains	4
<u>PICNIC/OUTINGS-RELATED</u>	<u>17</u>
More Picnic Tables	11
More Grills	4
<u>SIGNAGE-RELATED</u>	<u>9</u>

Base = (200)

IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED AT CHICKASAW PARK AMONG VISITORS IN SPRING/EARLY SUMMER TOP MENTIONS (CONTINUED)

	<u>TOTAL</u> (%)
<u>ACTIVITY-RELATED IMPROVEMENTS</u>	<u>20</u>
Organized Sports Activities	5
More Activities For Children	5
More Musical Events	2
Family Activities	2
<u>OTHER IMPROVEMENTS</u>	<u>11</u>
Better Traffic Control	5
Police Protection	2
<u>NO IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED</u>	<u>3</u>

Base = (200)

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, Inc. retained Horizon Research International during the spring of 1999 to conduct a wide range of research programs to measure attitudes, behaviors, and interest in its park facilities -- both current and in the future. One of the research programs involved counts of park users at selected sites within four of the Olmsted Parks Conservancy's parks targeted for significant improvements in the years ahead. The parks included in this research program were as follows:

- Cherokee Park
- Chickasaw Park
- Iroquois Park
- Shawnee Park

The research program, as well as the planned park improvements, has been funded through a financial grant from the Lila Wallace Foundation. The goal for this research program was to monitor park use in each of these selected parks during 1999-2000, and to do so again in the future, once any park improvements have been made. By so doing, some measurement of success might be established and maintained for the Olmsted Parks Conservancy.

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED)

A systematic random sampling plan was developed for completing the park counts. The sampling plan was designed to divide the count periods for the selected park areas by the season of the year (winter, spring, summer, and fall), time of the season (early, mid, or late), days of the week (Sunday through Saturday), and time of the day (morning, afternoon, or evening). The total sampling frame included 2,772 different measurement periods. This number can be calculated by multiplying the following:

- The number of park sites included in the counts (11, as described on the previous page)
- The number of seasons included in the counts (4)
- The time of the season (3)
- The number of days in the week (7)
- The number of times in the day the count was conducted (3)

This stratified/systematic cluster sampling methodology plan helped to reduce any variability in the selection of the count dates and times, thereby reducing potential sampling error. Due to limited budgetary resources, only selected count periods could be assigned toward each of the larger parks (Cherokee, Iroquois, and Shawnee), and even less count periods toward Chickasaw Park. Given the limited budgetary resources for the study, the sampling methodology adopted was the optimum design for conducting such a research program.

Trained and professional field interviewers of Horizon Research International conducted all park counts for this research program. The assigned interviewers visited all identified areas during each count period.

- The objective of the field personnel was to count the number of park users in the specified park areas and record the activity type and selected user profile information on the count sheet.

(CONTINUED)

METHODOLOGY

Olmsted Parks Conservancy defined the selected areas for counting at each of the four parks based on the area's likelihood to experience some improvement in the future. Those selected areas at each park included the following:

- Cherokee Park
 - Big Rock
 - Barringer Hill
 - Walking Path/Trail
- Chickasaw Park
 - Lake/Walking Path
 - Tennis Courts/Playground
- Iroquois Park
 - Rundill Road area
 - Recreation area
 - Jacob's Lodge area
- Shawnee Park
 - Sports Complex area
 - Flower Garden area
 - Lily Pond area

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED)

- Gender, estimated age range, race, incidence of a physical disability, and activity (use of the park) were all recorded.
- All counts lasted four hours each (active time at the park, not including travel time to and from the park)
 - Morning (8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)
 - Afternoon (12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.)
 - Evening (4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)
- Field personnel stationed themselves in the park areas at the assigned times.
 - Each interviewer was instructed to spend an equal length of time in each of the selected park areas during each time period.
 - Once the allotted time had been completed, they moved to another selected park area until the end of the time period (or until all selected park areas were counted).
 - The start times for each selected park area was rotated to minimize any potential bias in the order of the count by area.

The total number of counts was 159, which represented a simple fraction of 1/17, stratified by all the variables listed on the following page.

The following section provides the annual estimates of park use for each of the selected park sites.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES OF PARK USE

The park use estimates provided in the graphs that follow this section of the report were calculated as follows:

- The number of counts conducted in each park area was identified.
- The total number of park periods possible was also determined. For purposes of these estimates, each day over a year's time was multiplied by the three time periods during any given day ($365 \times 3 = 1095$).
- The total number of possible time periods was then divided by the number of counts conducted for each park over the course of the year. That identified a "multiplier" to be used to calculate the estimates of park use if all possible count periods over the course of the year had been conducted.

The end result are annual estimates of park use for the selected park areas included in this research program.

A Review Of The Annual Estimates

Of the four parks included in this research program, Cherokee Park areas had the highest estimated use over the course of the year. Over 98,000 people used the selected park areas in Cherokee. By comparison, . . .

- Chickasaw Park and Iroquois Park target areas had the next highest levels of use (approximately 80,000 and 75,000 persons respectively).
- Shawnee Park areas had less than half the use of Cherokee Park, Chickasaw Park, and Iroquois Park targeted areas (about 40,000).

(CONTINUED)

ANNUAL ESTIMATES OF PARK USE (CONTINUED)

Use of the park areas, as one might have expected, generally followed a logical pattern based on the season of the year.

- The summer months (identified for this research program as June, July, and August) usually had the most significant use.
- Park use for these areas declined as the weather began to cool in the fall (September, October, and November), and was lowest during the winter months (December, January, and February).
- As the weather began to warm during the spring months (March, April, and May), park use for these areas began to increase once again.

In terms of a demographic profile of the park area users, they might be best described as male teenagers, as well as young and middle-age male adults.

- Males were more likely to be park area users, regardless of the park area counted, often by about a 60/40 percent ratio. That ratio was even more pronounced in Shawnee Park areas, where it was closer to 65/35 percent.
- Race was clearly dependent on the park areas counted based on their relative geography. Caucasians were predominant in Cherokee and Iroquois park areas, while African Americans were by far more likely to use Chickasaw and Shawnee park targeted areas.

(CONTINUED)

ANNUAL ESTIMATES OF PARK USE (CONTINUED)

- About seven in ten of the park users were in the 14 to 49 year old age range, with the percentages of those under 14 and those 50 plus usually split fairly evenly. The exception in this case was the Shawnee Park areas, which had more children than older adults by about a four-to-one ratio.
- Very few of the park area users (less than one percent) had a physical limitation of any kind, at least one which could be identified by an interviewer.

Park area users most often were encountered participating in the following activities.

- Walking was a frequent activity in three of the parks' areas (the exception was the Shawnee targeted areas).
- Sitting and relaxing was also encountered often in two of the parks' areas, but not as often in the Cherokee or Iroquois areas.
- Biking, playing sports, picnicking/eating, jogging, or walking a pet was also noted with some frequency, but only in selected park areas.

These annual park area estimates provide an overview of park use for the selected areas chosen for this research program. They are not meant to reflect estimates of the entire park for the year. The graphs that follow present the annual estimates for the park areas included in the park count. For each park, there are estimates presented for all selected areas of that park on a combined basis, and then for each individual park area as well.

CHICKASAW PARK LAKE/PATH AREA TOTAL VISITORS (ANNUAL ESTIMATES)

	<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)		<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)
<u>SEASON</u>			<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
Spring	6,000	15	Walking	16,600	42
Summer	18,400	47	Jogging	2,200	6
Fall	10,000	26	Walking Pet	800	2
Winter	4,700	12	Biking	2,500	6
<u>GENDER</u>			Playing Sport	800	2
Male	22,700	58	Sitting/Relaxing	14,000	36
Female	16,400	42	Picnic/Eating	500	1
<u>RACE</u>			Children Playing/ Playground	300	1
Caucasian	1,400	4	Other	1,400	4
African American	37,700	96			
Other	0	0			
<u>AGE</u>			TOTAL	39,100	100
Under 14	5,400	14			
14 - 49	27,200	70			
50 Plus	6,500	16			
<u>PHYSICAL DISABILITY ("YES")</u>	200	1			

CHICKASAW PARK

ALL COUNTED AREAS COMBINED

TOTAL VISITORS (ANNUAL ESTIMATES)

	<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)		<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)
<u>SEASON</u>			<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
Spring	11,700	14	Walking	31,500	39
Summer	39,200	49	Jogging	3,600	4
Fall	22,100	27	Walking Pet	1,600	2
Winter	7,800	10	Biking	4,500	6
<u>GENDER</u>			Playing Sport	5,300	7
Male	47,200	58	Sitting/Relaxing	21,800	27
Female	33,600	42	Picnic/Eating	3,500	4
<u>RACE</u>			Children Playing/ Playground	7,000	9
Caucasian	2,100	2	Other	2,000	2
African American	78,700	98			
Other	0	0			
<u>AGE</u>			TOTAL	80,800	100
Under 14	13,800	17			
14 - 49	57,300	71			
50 Plus	9,700	12			
<u>PHYSICAL DISABILITY ("YES")</u>	200	*			

* Less than one percentage point.

CHICKASAW PARK

TENNIS/PLAYGROUND AREA

TOTAL VISITORS (ANNUAL ESTIMATES)

	<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)		<u>Number</u> (#)	<u>Percent</u> (%)
<u>SEASON</u>			<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
Spring	5,700	14	Walking	14,900	36
Summer	20,800	50	Jogging	1,400	3
Fall	12,100	29	Walking Pet	800	2
Winter	3,100	7	Biking	2,000	5
<u>GENDER</u>			Playing Sport	4,500	11
Male	24,500	59	Sitting/Relaxing	7,800	19
Female	17,200	41	Picnic/Eating	3,000	7
<u>RACE</u>			Children Playing/ Playground	6,700	16
Caucasian	700	2	Other	600	1
African American	41,000	98			
Other	0	0			
<u>AGE</u>			TOTAL	41,700	100
Under 14	8,400	20			
14 - 49	30,100	72			
50 Plus	3,200	8			
<u>PHYSICAL DISABILITY ("YES")</u>	**	*			

** Less than one hundred.

* Less than one percentage point.

CHICKASAW PARK MASTER PLAN

User Survey:

Thank you for helping us evaluate the future improvements and programs at Chickasaw Park. Please take some time tonight to consider the following questions and issues and return the survey to the table in the front.

If you cannot fill out the survey tonight, please mail it to Karen High at the Louisville Olmsted Parks Conservancy, P. O. Box 37280 Louisville, KY 40233. She can be reached at 456-8197 or by e-mail at khigh@louky.org if you have any questions or comments.

❖ What activities do you do in the park?

Please circle the number between 1 and 5 that best describes how you use the park

	Often		Sometimes		Never
	1	2	3	4	5
Basketball	1	2	3	4	5
Tennis	1	2	3	4	5
Baseball/Softball	1	2	3	4	5
Picnicing	1	2	3	4	5
Fishing/Duck Watching	1	2	3	4	5
Walking	1	2	3	4	5
Family Reunions	1	2	3	4	5
Watching the River	1	2	3	4	5
Children's Play Areas	1	2	3	4	5

❖ What areas of the park need improvement?

Please number from 1 to 5 the areas needing improvement in the park, with 1 being the most important to you and 5 being the least important to you.

	Important		Borderline		Not Important	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Basketball	1	2	3	4	5	
Tennis	1	2	3	4	5	
Baseball/Softball	1	2	3	4	5	
Picnic Areas	1	2	3	4	5	
Pond Area	1	2	3	4	5	
Walking Path	1	2	3	4	5	
Drainage	1	2	3	4	5	
Restrooms	1	2	3	4	5	
River Access	1	2	3	4	5	
Children's Play Areas	1	2	3	4	5	
General Maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	

- ❖ What are your favorite areas of the park?
- ❖ Are there places you don't feel comfortable in the park?
- ❖ Does the park have any special meaning to you?
- ❖ Has the park changed since you first started coming here?
- ❖ Are there any changes you would like to see made in the park?
- ❖ Do you have any other comments?

VI. APPENDIX B – HISTORIC TIMELINE

CHICKASAW PARK – HISTORY

- Early 1800's –** Jacob Gaar (Garr) settled on a vast tract of land in western Louisville that included the old Fairgrounds and Ford plant on Southwestern Parkway (Garland Avenue came from Garr family name).
- Late 1800's –** Joseph Garr's "Riverview Farm" is where Chickasaw Park was built and his brother Horace's place, on the other side of Greenwood Avenue became "Riverview Park" and later "White City Park", both amusement parks.
- 1905 –** Sandborn map shows "Riverview Park Beer Garden" located on land along river just north of Greenwood Avenue. Map shows various buildings including; the Beer Shed, Bar, Refreshments Stand, Dance Platform, Band Stand, Dining Room, Kitchen, Stable Wagon & Storage Shed, and Water Tank.
- April, 1907 –** White City park opens on land where Riverview Park was. Park had a bathing beach, scenic railroad, dance pavilion, restaurant, vaudeville theater, skating rink, roller coaster, and 250,000 lights.
- October 1911 –** West End Improvement Club wants blacks banned from Shawnee. Parks Board explains that it has no right to exclude any citizen from the parks.
- 1912 –** Map shows Broadway street car looping south and Oak car looping north to Greenwood onto 14 acre Riverview Park Co. property north of Greenwood at 48th street. Property south of Greenwood (to be Chickasaw Park) still a farm.
- March 1913 –** Parks Board directs that Cherokee and Iroquois parks have playgrounds for colored fellow citizens, similar to Shawnee.
- April 1916 –** Parks Board gets request for more adequate colored parks and playgrounds.
- November 1918 –** Parks Board gets letter from black citizens asking for a park in west Louisville.
- 1921 –** Noah W. Williams, Pastor of Quinn Chapel AME Baptist Church was ejected from Cherokee Park for not using the "colored" area.
- November 1921 –** Fifty-three acre John Whallen property purchased for \$81,000 for a black park.
- December 1921 –** Letter from Smithsonian Institute suggesting the name "Chickasaw" for the recently purchased Whallen property.
- June 1922 –** Chickasaw Park formally dedicated as a park for blacks.
- The Recreation Committee of the Parks Board is given the power to act on installing amusement devices in Chickasaw Park. The Board recommends installation of electric lights and 50 benches to be put in the park.


- 1922 –** Several articles published at this time in the Louisville Leader that condemned the new park and its backers for promoting segregation.
- March 1923 –** Bids open to tear down a brick building in Chickasaw Park at the southwest corner of Garrs Lane and Greenwood Avenue.
- June 1923 –** Three-acre square insert bought from Walker's in October for \$5,500 and twenty acre parcel on south side of park bought from Louisville Petroleum Refining Company for \$30,600.
- Parks Board contracts with Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architects to develop a general plan for the park at a cost of \$15.00 per acre plus expenses.
- December 1923 –** Olmsted Brothers provide a Preliminary Plan for the park improvements.
- 1925 –** Southwestern Parkway is graded. Area from Winkler to Fairgrounds was renamed Algonquin when money from 1.5 million bond issue allowed paving and planting.
- June 1925 –** Parks Board officially segregates parks.
- October 1927 –** Parks Board gives go ahead for implementation of Olmsted plan for park.
- September 1928 –** \$500 of \$100,000 is to be set aside out of bond issue for colored parks and playgrounds for a shelter-shed at the entrance to Chickasaw Park.
- November 1928 –** W. J. Horrigan presents plans for Chickasaw Park road construction. Roads are not to be over 25 feet wide and cost no more than \$25,000.
- December 1928 –** Bids opened for Chickasaw Park road construction. All bids were too high so section 2 was eliminated and lowest bid was revised and accepted.
- January 1929 –** Two lighting standards installed at the park entrance and five near the building.
- April 1929 –** Plans for "Alterations and Additions to Recreational Building" prepared by Clifford F. Reichert.
- Bids awarded for toilet partitions at new lodge building for \$135.00.
- May 1929 –** Bids awarded for plumbing and electrical for new lodge building for \$1,267.00.
- Summer 1929 –** Two "appointments" made to run summer playground; E. D. Whedbee, Jr. and Mrs Ida Warwick.
- 1929 –** Original Chickasaw Park lodge building opened. One story structure with Italian style portico around entire building. Adapted from former two-story structure believed to have been the Whallen house.
- Lawsuit filed to open all parks to Negroes.

- February 1930** – Four additional lights to be installed in the park.
- March 1930** – Plans for a refreshment stand near the lodge prepared.
- September 1930** – Olmsted Brothers only unfinished work is completing the planting plan for Chickasaw Park. They agree to finish the plan for \$150.00.
- February 1931** – Bids opened for 312 tons of screenings for construction of park walks.
- November 1931** – Proposal for construction of lower road.
- March 1932** – Construction of lower road approved.
- December 1932** – Funding approved for replacement of dead trees, shrubs and flowers.
- May 1933** – List of plants for formal garden presented with cost estimate for their purchase and planting.
- June 1933** – Request for motor boat concession refused.
- January 1934** – Proposal for constructing an ice skating area where earth had been excavated by Municipal relief worker for other park improvements.
- Lake approved for canoeing and skating.
- April 1934** – Blacks from the Citizens Recreational Advisory Council ask for four more tennis courts, a concrete bandstand, and more comfort stations. There were six tennis courts at that time for 48,000 blacks.
- April 1935** – Board asked to consider advisability of repairing existing bandstand.
- 1936 – 1937** – Board of Park Commissioners Annual Report includes a description of the new artificial lake in Chickasaw Park “to give the Negroes of Louisville canoeing facilities in the summer and a place for skating in the winter months.”
- February 1937** – Park damaged by great flood of '37.
- December 1938** – Parks Board approves plans for flood wall near the river.
- 1939** – Board of Park Commissioners Annual Report for 1938-39 includes a description of the new ballfield lights and heating system for the lodge.
- January 1939** – Black group requests use of the entire park system.
- August 1939** – Request to erect bleachers and charge for seats during the negro Tri-State tennis tournament held August 23 - 27.


- May 1940 –** Dr. T. R. Spellman of the Young Mens Civic League asked for additional recreation equipment. More swings, see-saws, sliding boards, and croquet court. He estimates that 30,000 children use the park. Also wants a shelter house, and a concrete road along the river to enjoy the scenery. At the time 6 swings, 4 see-saws, a sliding board and an outdoor oven were being added.
- April 1941 –** Black citizens request more recreational facilities.
- 1943 –** Department of Parks and Recreation Annual Report lists new facilities in Chickasaw Park including the bandstand and 4 horseshoe courts.
- December 1945 –** Trolley car lines replaced by buses.
- November 1946 –** Racially mixed picnic turned down for fear of “trouble”.
- December 1946 –** Corps of Engineers given floodwall easement. Floodwall built in 1947.
- 1947 –** Three City tennis tournaments were held in Chickasaw Park. Two courts were rendered useless due to floodwall construction. The winners were Walter Ray, Clarence Pope, and William Hall.
- 1948 - 1949 –** A summer playground was held in Chickasaw Park that included boxing, drama, folk dancing, story telling and other events.
- 1949 –**irate citizens get Mayor Farnsley to give new tennis equipment.
- December 1950 –** Original park lodge burns down.
- May 1952 –** New park lodge building dedicated. The building cost \$46,000.
- Several articles were published at this time voicing concerns about the lodge being “private, for reservation only” and not providing an adequate place for people to get out of the rain.
- 1951-1954 –** Department of Parks and Recreation Annual Reports mention annual carnivals held during the summer playground season that had booths, pony rides, a merry-go-round, side shows and many other attractions free to the children.” The carnivals apparently attracted up to 650 children each year.
- April 1953 –** Black leaders oppose lighted ballfield in park. Say park is already too cluttered and ballfield would be too close to homes on Western Parkway.
- Bids for parkway shelterhouse opened.
- July 1953 –** One waying of park road initiated due to overcrowding on holidays.
- 1955 –** Parks officially integrated.

- June 1956 –** Courier Journal article that summer playgrounds open with visit of fire trucks to Chickasaw Park and an airplane that towed a banner over the City.
- August 1968 –** Boat ramp dedicated.
- January 1976 –** Letter from West Louisville Jaycees with a list of improvement requests for Chickasaw and Shawnee Parks.
- August 1976 –** Three additional tennis courts dedicated.
- 1984 –** Two hard surface tennis courts were converted to three and a small building to house the tennis court roller and materials was constructed.
- 1986 –** Play equipment was replaced, fencing installed, spray pool renovated, basketball courts reconstructed, washout on riverbank repaired, and bollards installed.
- 1987 –** Exercise stations were installed.
- 1988 –** Renovation of the lodge included; roof repairs, guttering, downspouts, tile floor, make restrooms accessible to handicapped, new heating system, electrical and lighting repairs, and kitchen equipment.
- Reconstructed and stabilized an eroded gully and riverbank just southwest of wading pool and reworked the park drainage.
- 1989 –** The pond was dredged and the concession stand to was converted to a pavilion.
- 1990 –** Tennis court lights were renovated, benches were installed, and the brick walkway at the tennis court entrance was renovated.
- 1992 –** A one-mile lighted walking path with a stone bridge over the lake was constructed. Benches were installed along the walking path.
- 1994 –** The parkway shelter was renovated and a sanitary sewer with lift station and pump was installed from the lodge to 47th street.
- Reconstructed the park's six clay tennis courts which were deteriorated due to ponding water.
- 1997 –** A new drive and parking area are constructed for access to the Parkway Shelter.

VI. APPENDIX C – PROPOSED LODGE ARCHITECTURE



Chickasaw Park Lodge
 Floor Plan 1"=10'-0"
 SMITH ARCHITECTURE




Chickasaw Park Lodge
East Elevation 1/8" = 1'-0"

SMITH ARCHITECTURE




Chickasaw Park Lodge
North Elevation 1/8" = 1'-0"


SMITH ARCHITECTURE



Chickasaw Park Lodge
West Elevation 1/8" = 1'-0"
SMITH ARCHITECTURE




Chickasaw Park Lodge
West Elevation 1/8" = 1'-0"
SMITH ARCHITECTURE




Chickasaw Park Lodge
South Elevation 1/8" = 1'-0"


SMITH ARCHITECTURE




Chickasaw Park Lodge
Section A/5 1/8" = 1'-0"
SMITH ARCHITECTURE



Chickasaw Park Lodge
Section A/6 1/8" = 1'-0"
SMITH ARCHITECTURE





VI. APPENDIX D – RESOURCE DOCUMENTS

CHICKASAW PARK – Document Inventory

List of plans and other documents found for the project:

Plan Title	Prepared By	Date	Plan No./Notes
1. Topographic Map	Stonestreet & Ford	May 1923	1279-1
2. Topographic Map ♦ Tracing of photo reduction of Stonestreet & Ford topo map	Olmsted Brothers	May 26, 1923	1279-2
3. Extensive Field Notes on Copy of Preliminary Plan	Unknown (OBLA?)	No Date	1279-2-pt1
4. Study for General Plan ♦ Rough study drawn by F.B.S. (Smith?) ♦ Experimenting w/ locations for ballfields ♦ Road layout different ♦ Pavillion and walks different	Olmsted Brothers	June 9, 1923	1279-5
5. Survey for Board of Park Commissioners ♦ 20 acre addition @ south end of park ♦ Shown on all previous plans	Stonestreet & Ford	July 24, 1923	1279-7-sh2
6. Preliminary Plan ♦ Drawn by Donovan	Olmsted Brothers	December 1923	1279-10
7. Plan of Proposed Roadway ♦ Shows road layout as it is now ♦ Received by Mische at OBLA on May 2, 1930	W. J. Horrigan & Assoc.	November 1928	1279-15
8. Alterations & Additions to Recreational Building ♦ Remodeling of former 2 story building	Clifford F. Reichert	April 12, 1929	2 sheets
9. Study for Revisions of Preliminary Plan ♦ Change #14 (notes hard to decipher) ♦ Compromise between Preliminary Plan and 1928 road alignment ♦ Drawn by Mische	Olmsted Brothers	February 1930	1279-14
10. Refreshment Stand Plans ♦ Note to "Reuse old doors removed from Shawnee Park refreshment stand"	Clifford F. Reichert	March 13, 1930	1 sheet
11. Planting Plan ♦ Done on layout of park with compromise roadway solution ♦ Drawn by E.T.M. (Mische) – Traced by R. W. (Walsh)	Olmsted Brothers	October 24, 1930	1279-17

12. Plant List	Olmsted Brothers	October 24, 1930	1279-17
♦ 17 pages with 160 planting items			
♦ Accompanies previous plan			
13. Shelter House Plans	Carl Berg	March 7, 1951	1 sheet
♦ Plans for lodge building in park today			
14. Shelter House Pavement Plan	Berg & Dahl	March 11, 1951	1 sheet
15. Shelter House Planting Plan	Berg & Dahl	March 11, 1951	1 sheet
16. Shelter House Construction Plans	Berg & Dahl	July 9, 1951	10 sheets
17. Picnic Shelter & Toilet Building	Berg & Dahl	February 13, 1953	2 sheets
♦ Plans for picnic shelter in park today			
18. Playground Area Improvements	Melillo & Assoc.	March 26, 1986	2 sheets
♦ Various improvements including new play equipment, spray pool repairs, drainage improvements, bank erosion repairs, bollards and planting.			
19. Phase III Improvements	Melillo & Assoc.	April 13, 1988	2 sheets
♦ Various improvements including refreshment stand alterations, tennis court bleachers, bollards in front of lodge and along SW Parkway, and lake improvements.			
20. Lodge Renovation Plan	Melillo & Assoc.	June 21, 1988	3 sheets
♦ Repairs to existing lodge building			
21. Jogging/Walking Trail	Sabak, Wilson & Lingo	March 19, 1991	3 sheets
22. Picnic Shelter/Toilet Renovations	Voelker/Winn	July 21, 1993	2 sheets
♦ New roofing, paint, doors, louvers, columns, siding as needed, and lighting			
♦ Plans included new sanitary sewer line to existing lodge building			
23. Site Analysis - Riverside	Beechwood P & D	April 1998	1 sheet
♦ Includes overlay of OBLA preliminary plan over existing conditions			
24. Concept Plan - Riverside	Beechwood P & D	April 1998	1 sheet
♦ Plan for improvements to the riverfront part of the park including overlooks, vistas, walking paths, parking, shelters, river access, lighting, benches and planting.			
25. Concept Plan Issues	Beechwood P & D	April 22, 1998	List
26. Immediate Improvements Plan	Beechwood P & D	September 18, 1998	Plan
♦ Plan for minor repairs and improvements that could be made by parks staff and/or contractors to achieve quick results.			
27. Immediate Improvements List	Beechwood P & D	September 22, 1998	List
♦ List of minor repairs and improvements that could be made by parks staff and/or contractors to achieve quick results. Accompanies previous plan.			
28. Various Aerial Photos	1928 & 1979 – paper copies 1931, 1937, 1946, 1951, 1963 – digital data		

29. Various Historic Documents – see outline of park history

- ◆ Board of Park Commissioners Minutes from 1920's through 1940.
- ◆ Newspaper articles from 1920's through 1990's.

30. Various Historic Photos

- ◆ Fawcett-Dearing Employee picnics – 1951, 1952, 1953
- ◆ Various park views – date unknown probably late 40's or early 50's
- ◆ Old Lodge – destroyed by fire in 1951
- ◆ New Lodge – dedicated May 21, 1952

CHICKASAW PARK – AERIAL PHOTO INFORMATION

- 1928 –** Paper copy – very poor quality. Shows northern 3/4ths of park only with the following elements visible:
- ◆ Original house and outbuildings.
 - ◆ Streetcar line turnaround.
 - ◆ Tennis courts.
 - ◆ Two ball diamonds.
 - ◆ New tree planting along Southwestern Parkway.
- 1931 –** Digital. Shows southern half of park only with the following elements visible:
- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo except outbuildings near lodge are gone.
 - ◆ New park drive (as built in 1928 and exists today) but it doesn't appear paved.
 - ◆ Walkway from Southwestern Parkway to drive loop near lodge.
 - ◆ Walkways/paths along new park drive and Southwestern Parkway.
 - ◆ Spray pool in same location as it is today.
 - ◆ Refinery, Ford Plant and Fairgrounds.
 - ◆ Property line between the park and the refinery is totally open.
 - ◆ Park edge along SW Parkway is open from park road on south to new walkway except for parkway trees.
 - ◆ Area between park road and the river is heavily treed.
- 1937 –** Digital w/ poor resolution. Shows entire park with the following elements visible:
- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo.
 - ◆ Refreshment stand near lodge as it appears today.
 - ◆ Pond as it appears today.
 - ◆ Bandstand as it appears today.
 - ◆ Property line between the park and the refinery is planted with what looks like evergreens according to the OBLA planting plan. Parkway edge is also planted.
 - ◆ Area between park drive and the river is more open especially where parking lot is today. Parking lot not apparent though.
 - ◆ Areas around the park are flooded, especially the property directly east, part of the refinery and some of the residential property to the north. A photo from three weeks earlier (February 2, 1937) showed nothing but water in this part of town with no visible landmarks.

- 1946 –** Digital w/ good resolution. Shows entire park with the following elements visible:
- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo except the ball diamond near bandstand appears to be gone.
 - ◆ The park drive, walks and parking lot appear paved.
 - ◆ Streetcar turnaround appears to be in the process of being removed.
 - ◆ There are structures on the riverbank below the streetcar loop and a trail along the riverbank.
 - ◆ The lower road appears to be partially completed.
 - ◆ Walks and planting beds in the drive loop area are apparent but the area does not seem to be cultivated.
 - ◆ The ball diamond is lighted.
 - ◆ Trees have been planted around the pond.
 - ◆ There is poor drainage in the area just north and east of the tennis courts where water stands today on the east side of the floodwall.
 - ◆ A small structure along the north edge of the park between Greenwood Ave. and the park drive where the floodwall is today.
 - ◆ Refinery has been expanded with one additional storage tank.
 - ◆ There are 9 houses on the east side of SW Parkway between Greenwood and Sunset and 2 houses on the west side between Greenwood and Westchester.
- 1951 –** Digital w/ good resolution. Shows entire park with the following elements visible:
- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo except the lodge is burned.
 - ◆ The floodwall is apparent and the small structure along the north edge of the park is gone.
 - ◆ The remaining ball diamond appears abandoned.
 - ◆ The half basketball court near the spray pool is built.
 - ◆ A playground is near the spray pool and half basketball court.
 - ◆ There is additional poor drainage in the area just north and east of the tennis courts where water stands today on the east side of the floodwall.
 - ◆ Refinery has been expanded with new structures and parking along SW Parkway.
 - ◆ There are 18 houses on the east side of SW Parkway between Greenwood and Winnrose and 4 houses on the west side between Greenwood and Westchester.
- 1963 –** Digital w/ good resolution. Shows entire park with the following elements visible:
- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo.
 - ◆ The new lodge and walkways.
 - ◆ The parkway shelterhouse and walkway to SW Parkway.

- ◆ The structures on the riverbank near the old streetcar loop are gone.
- ◆ The ball diamond appears fenced and well used.
- ◆ Two additional tennis courts on the north end of the existing tennis courts.
- ◆ The drainline from the pond to SW Parkway is apparent.
- ◆ Refinery has been expanded with the addition of new storage tanks along the park boundary.
- ◆ There are 32 houses on the east side of SW Parkway between Greenwood and Winnrose and 5 houses on the west side between Greenwood and Westchester.

1979 –

Paper copy w/ poor resolution. Shows entire park with the following elements visible:

- ◆ All elements shown on previous photo.
- ◆ The lower road appears completed to what exists today.
- ◆ The riverbank along the lower road looks extremely eroded.
- ◆ The boat ramp area is visible but looks abandoned and covered with silt.
- ◆ The ball diamond appears well used.
- ◆ Three additional tennis courts on the north end of the existing tennis courts.
- ◆ The tennis practice court where it is today.
- ◆ The full size basketball court where it is today.
- ◆ Three rectangular recreation courts near the Parkway Shelter.
- ◆ There are 34 houses on the east side of SW Parkway between Greenwood and Winnrose and 5 houses on the west side between Greenwood and Westchester.