

# **QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH**

## **REGARDING**

### **MINNEAPOLIS PARKS**

Project #26042, January, 2007

PREPARED BY: CJ Olson Market Research, Inc.  
901 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 218  
Minneapolis, MN 55401

(612) 378-5040  
admin@cjolson.com

PREPARED FOR: Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board  
2117 West River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55411

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

OBJECTIVES .....	1
METHODOLOGY .....	2
DETAILED FINDINGS .....	4
LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS .....	4
HOW WELL THE PARK BOARD IS PROVIDING FOR RECREATION NEEDS....	5
IMPORTANCE OF OPPORTUNITIES .....	6
FREQUENCY OF USE.....	9
IMPORTANCE & SATISFACTION.....	11
VISITED RECREATION CENTER.....	15
SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE RECREATION CENTERS .....	17
SUGGESTIONS FOR NEW OR IMPROVED PROGRAMS .....	18
LIMITATIONS TO USING PARKS .....	19
AMOUNT WILLING TO INVEST .....	20
ATTITUDES TOWARD PARTNERING .....	22
REASONS FOR ATTITUDES ON PARTNERING .....	23
INFORMATION SOURCES .....	24
FUTURE FOCUS.....	25
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	26
DEMOGRAPHICS .....	28
VERBATIM RESPONSES THAT DO NOT FIT CODE	
QUESTIONNAIRE	
DATA TABLES	

## OBJECTIVES

---

The primary objective of this quantitative research was to determine the community's need for parks and recreation. The results of this study will be used for planning by the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board.

To accomplish these objectives, the following information was gathered, processed and analyzed:

- Frequency of use during cold and warm weather
- Importance and satisfaction with services offered
- Suggestions for improving the value of recreation centers
- Suggestions for new or improved programs
- Limitations to using parks, trails, programs and activities
- Attitudes toward partnering with businesses to help fund operations
- Suggestions on what the Park Board should focus in the future
- Demographics
  - service area
  - gender
  - own home or rent
  - household make-up
  - country of birth
  - household income

The primary objective of this study was to determine the community's need for parks and recreation.

## METHODOLOGY

---

After definition of research objectives with Jennifer Ringold of the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board and Kathy Schoenbauer of Schoenbauer Consulting, Olson Research formatted a first draft questionnaire for pre-testing. This first draft was pre-tested with 20 Minneapolis residents. The purpose of the pre-test was to test the length and communication capability of the questionnaire. Kathy Schoenbauer was present during pre-testing while the interviews were conducted from the Olson Phone Center. Pre-test results were reviewed and necessary questionnaire revisions were made before full data collection began.

A listed sample of phone numbers within each of the three Service District Areas was purchased from a professional sampling service. Additional sample targeted areas with high concentrations of foreign-born residents of Hmong, Russian, Somalian, and Hispanic descent.

A total of 400 interviews were completed from December 11, 2006 to January 4, 2007, resulting in statistical reliability at the 95% confidence level of  $\pm 4.8\%$ . The number of completed interviews by Service District Area were:

- 136 River;
- 133 Lakes;
- 131 Minnehaha.

All interviewing took place at the Olson Phone Center, which is equipped with a silent monitoring system. This system allows supervisors to monitor 10 to 15 percent of each interviewer's work per shift to ensure accurate data collection. Completed questionnaires were edited by supervisors for full probing and clarifying of open-ended responses and complete recording of structured responses.

Completed questionnaires were again edited in the data processing department where open-ended responses were coded and all responses entered into a database. The data were processed using SPSS software resulting in multivariate data tables. The data were analyzed and a written report of the findings is presented in this document.

A total of 400 interviews were completed with Minneapolis residents.

Five-point rating scales were used in this survey. Using an importance scale as an example, the labels for the points on the scale were understood to be:

- 1 Not at all important
- 2 Somewhat not important
- 3 Neutral/ neither important nor unimportant
- 4 Somewhat important
- 5 Extremely important.

## DETAILED FINDINGS

---

### LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS (Q1)

Survey participants were read a couple of statements and then were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 5-point scale where 1 meant strongly disagree and 5 meant strongly agree.

**“Public parks and recreation are important to my household”** received a mean rating of 4.38, which indicates that the respondents agree with this statement.

A breakdown of the ratings was as follows:

- 60% Strongly agree;
- 24% Rating of 4;
- 12% Rating of 3;
- 3% Rating of 2;
- 1% Strongly disagree;
- <1% Don't know/ refused.

**“Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board is doing a good job of providing for my household's park and recreation needs”** was given a mean rating of 3.86, which indicates that the respondents agree with this statement.

A breakdown of the ratings was as follows:

- 28% Strongly agree;
- 37% Rating of 4;
- 23% Rating of 3;
- 6% Rating of 2;
- 2% Strongly disagree;
- 3% Don't know/ refused.

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

- Residents in the Lakes area thought the Park Board was doing a better job than did residents in the River area (4.03 vs. 3.65). [Minnehaha, 3.89, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters thought the Park Board was doing a better job than did homeowners (4.04 vs. 3.77).

Residents agreed that parks and recreation are important to their households and that the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board is doing a good job to meet those needs.

## HOW WELL THE PARK BOARD IS PROVIDING FOR RECREATION NEEDS (Q2)

When asked to compare how well the park board was providing for park and recreation needs today versus two years ago, more than half of the survey participants said it was about the same. The details of their responses were as follows:

- 23% Better;
- 55% Same;
- 12% Worse;
- 9% Don't know/ refused.

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

- Renters were more likely than homeowners to say there has been improvement over the past two years (32% vs. 19%).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely than U.S. born residents to say there has been improvement (39% vs. 20%).
- Homeowners were more likely than renters to say things are about the same (60% vs. 45%).

More than half of the survey participants think the park board is doing about the same as two years ago in providing for park and recreation needs.

About one-fourth think there has been improvement.

**IMPORTANCE OF OPPORTUNITIES (Q3)**

Respondents were asked, “Please tell me how important it is to your household that the park board provides opportunities for each item on the list.” A 5-point scale was used where 1 meant not at all important and 5 means extremely important. The table below shows the mean ratings for each item.

TABLE 1: IMPORTANCE OF OPPORTUNITIES

<u>OPPORTUNITY</u>	<u>MEAN IMPORTANCE RATING</u>
Involving children and youth in positive activities	4.45
Protecting or spending time in the natural environment	4.35
Pursuing health and physical fitness	4.31
Sharing time with family and friends	4.09
Experiencing arts and culture through programs and/or events	3.94
Socializing with others of all ages	3.92
Giving back to the community/ volunteering	3.88
Experiencing different cultures	3.83
Learning new skills	3.66
Helping you get to know people in your community	3.63

There were no significant differences found for the first three items listed.

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

**Sharing time with family and friends**

- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (4.35 vs. 3.98).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (4.51 vs. 4.03).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 thought this was more important than did those in households with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (4.49 vs. 3.95).

Survey participants indicated that it was most important for the park board to provide opportunities for:

- Involving children and youth in positive activities,
- Protecting or spending time in the natural environment,
- Pursuing health and physical needs.

Higher importance ratings for opportunities tended to be generated from:

- River area residents,
- Renters,
- Foreign-born residents,
- Households with incomes under \$15,000.

Experiencing arts and culture through programs and/or events

- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (4.23 vs. 3.80).

Socializing with others of all ages

- River area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the Lakes area (4.16 vs. 3.72). [Minnehaha, 3.88, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (4.22 vs. 3.79).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 thought this was more important than did those in households with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 and \$75,000 or more (4.31 vs. 3.69 and 3.74).

Giving back to the community/ volunteering

- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (4.20 vs. 3.74).

Experiencing different cultures

- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (4.16 vs. 3.68).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (4.28 vs. 3.76).

Learning new skills

- River area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the Lakes area (3.93 vs. 3.38). [Minnehaha, 3.68, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (3.99 vs. 3.51).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (4.20 vs. 3.58).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 thought this was more important than did those in households with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (4.05 vs. 3.39).

Helping you get to know people in your community

- River area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the Lakes area (3.86 vs. 3.36). [Minnehaha, 3.65, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters placed more importance on this opportunity than did homeowners (3.90 vs. 3.50).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (4.27 vs. 3.53).

FREQUENCY OF USE (Q4)

The survey participants were first asked how often they used Minneapolis parks, trails and recreation facilities in warm weather. They were next asked their frequency of use in cold weather. The following table shows the results of these two questions:

TABLE 2: FREQUENCY OF USE

<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>WARM WEATHER</u>	<u>COLD WEATHER</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400	400
Daily	25%	7%
Several times a week	37%	22%
Several times a month	21%	26%
Several times a year	9%	15%
About once a year	4%	4%
Not at all	4%	24%
Don't know/ refused	<1%	2%

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

Warm weather

- Residents of the Lakes area were more likely to use the parks 'daily' than were those in the River and Minnehaha areas (35% vs. 20% and 21%, respectively).
- Those with household incomes under \$15,000 were more likely to say they use the park system 'about once a year' than were those with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (12% vs. 1%).

As might be expected, residents use the park system more often during warm weather than cold weather.

Residents of the Lakes area tend to use the parks more often than those living in the River or Minnehaha areas.

Those with the lowest household incomes tend to use the parks less frequently than households with higher incomes.

Cold weather

- Residents of the Lakes area were more likely to use the parks 'several times a week' than were residents of the River area (30% vs. 12%). [Minnehaha, 23%, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Residents of the River area were more likely to say 'not at all' than were residents of the Lakes area (35% vs. 16%). [Minnehaha, 22%, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to say 'not at all' than were U.S. born residents (43% vs. 22%).
- Those with household incomes of \$75,000 or above were more likely than those with incomes under \$15,000 to use the parks 'several times a month' (38% vs. 16%).
- Those with incomes under \$15,000, \$15,000-\$24,999 and \$25,000-\$34,999 were more likely to use the parks 'not at all' than were those with incomes of \$75,000 or more (48%, 34% and 26% vs. 7%, respectively).
- Those with household incomes under \$15,000 were more likely to say 'not at all' than were those with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (48% vs. 18%).

**IMPORTANCE & SATISFACTION (Q5 & Q6)**

The residents were read a list of services offered by the Park Board and were asked to rate the importance of each to their households using a 5-point scale where 1 meant not at all important and 5 meant extremely important. For each rated 3, 4 or 5, they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the item. The table below shows the ratings.

TABLE 3: IMPORTANCE & SATISFACTION

<u>SERVICE</u> BASE	MEAN IMPT. <u>RATING</u> n=400	MEAN SAT. <u>RATING</u> (n=)	<u>GAP</u>
Natural areas	4.46	4.07 (374)	-0.39
Boulevard/ street trees	4.36	3.72 (382)	-0.64*
Neighborhood parks	4.34	3.96 (321)	-0.38*
Regional parks	4.32	4.22 (325)	-0.10
Parkways	4.10	4.06 (351)	-0.04
Trails	4.04	4.07 (348)	0.03
Environmental programs	4.03	3.68 (340)	-0.35*
Community events & celebrations	3.60	3.87 (316)	0.27*
Arts & cultural programs	3.49	3.71 (296)	0.22
Recreation centers	3.41	3.88 (287)	0.47*
Athletic fields	3.40	3.83 (266)	0.43*
Adult programs	3.14	3.65 (246)	0.51*
Meeting spaces	3.08	3.80 (245)	0.72*
Courts	3.07	3.58 (235)	0.51*
Children's programs	3.01	3.78 (211)	0.77*
Senior's programs	2.78	3.79 (193)	1.01*
Teen programs	2.78	3.55 (182)	0.77*

\*Importance and satisfaction ratings are significantly different.

Highest in importance were:

- Natural areas,
- Boulevard/ street trees,
- Neighborhood parks,
- Regional parks,
- Parkways,
- Trails, and
- Environmental programs.

The services that exceed expectations, that is, the satisfaction ratings are significantly higher than the importance ratings were:

- Recreations centers,
- Athletic fields,
- Adult programs,
- Meeting spaces,
- Courts,
- Children's programs,
- Senior's programs,
- Teen programs.

Services that may need more attention were:

- Boulevard/ street trees,
- Neighborhood parks,
- Environmental programs.

Keep in mind that only those who rated a service as important were asked their satisfaction with the service.

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

Natural areas (lakes, creeks, wetlands, woods, prairies)

- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.36 vs. 4.04).

Boulevard/ street trees

- U.S. born residents were more likely to think this was important than foreign-born residents (4.40 vs. 4.08).

Neighborhood parks

- U.S. born residents were more likely to think this was important than foreign-born residents (4.38 vs. 4.04).
- Lakes area residents were more satisfied than were residents of the River area (4.19 vs. 3.81). [Minnehaha, 3.89, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]

Regional parks, like the city lakes and Minnehaha Falls

- Minnehaha area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the River area (4.50 vs. 4.15). [Lakes, 4.32, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- U.S. born residents were more likely to think this was important than foreign-born residents (4.38 vs. 3.90).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.53 vs. 4.18).

Environmental programs

- Renters were more satisfied with this service than were homeowners (3.93 vs. 3.57).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 were more satisfied than were households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (4.11 vs. 3.53).

Community events and celebrations

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (4.09 vs. 3.37).

Arts and cultural programs

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.88 vs. 3.31).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.08 vs. 3.66).

Recreation centers

- River area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the Lakes area (3.63 vs. 3.18). [Minnehaha, 3.42, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.70 vs. 3.27).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.80 vs. 3.34).
- Renters were more satisfied with this service than were homeowners (4.04 vs. 3.79).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.31 vs. 3.81).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 gave a higher satisfaction rating than households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (4.20 vs. 3.63).

Athletic fields

- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.86 vs. 3.33).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.32 vs. 3.76).

Adult programs (18-64)

- River area residents thought this was more important than did residents of the Lakes area (3.38 vs. 2.89). [Minnehaha, 3.13, was not significantly different from the other service areas.]
- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.46 vs. 2.99).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.62 vs. 3.06).
- Renters were more satisfied with this service than were homeowners (3.83 vs. 3.54).
- Households with incomes of \$15,000-\$24,999 were more satisfied than were households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (4.15 vs. 3.36).

Meeting spaces

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.42 vs. 2.94).

Courts

- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.65 vs. 2.99).
- Renters were more satisfied with this service than were homeowners (3.87 vs. 3.44).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.03 vs. 3.50).

Children's programs (0-12)

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.35 vs. 2.85).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (4.21 vs. 3.71).

Senior's programs (65 and older)

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.32 vs. 2.53).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.32 vs. 2.69).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 and those with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 thought this was more important than households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (3.38 and 3.32 vs. 2.27).
- Renters were more satisfied with this service than were homeowners (4.00 vs. 3.63).

Teen programs (13-17)

- Renters placed more importance on this service than did homeowners (3.07 vs. 2.65).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to think this was important than U.S. born residents (3.40 vs. 2.69).
- Households with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 thought this was more important than households with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (3.45 vs. 2.52).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to be satisfied than U.S. born residents (3.96 vs. 3.47).
- Households with incomes of \$15,000-\$24,999 were more satisfied than were households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (4.21 vs. 3.19).

## VISITED RECREATION CENTER (Q7)

Survey participants were asked which age groups in their households had visited a recreation center in the past year.

Their answers were as follows:

- 27% Under 18 years old,
- 51% Ages 18-64 years old,
- 10% Ages 65 years old or better,
- 38% No one has visited,
- 1% Don't know.

When looking at the data, there were some differences to note:

### Under 18 years old

- Residents in the River and Minnehaha areas were more likely to have youth visit a recreation center than were residents of the Lakes area (36% and 28% vs. 16%).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to have youth visit than were U.S. born residents (53% vs. 23%).
- Households with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 were more likely to have youth visit a recreation center than were households with incomes of under \$15,000, \$15,000-\$24,999, and \$35,000-\$74,999 (38% vs. 26%, 26% and 18%, respectively).

### 18-64 years old

- Residents in the River area were more likely to have adults visit a recreation center than were residents of the Lakes and Minnehaha areas (62% vs. 41% and 49%).
- Foreign-born residents were more likely to have adults visit than were U.S. born residents (67% vs. 48%).
- Households with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 and \$75,000 or above were more likely to have adults visit a recreation center than were households with incomes of under \$15,000, \$15,000-\$24,999, and \$35,000-\$74,999 (57% and 66% vs. 43%, 45% and 44%, respectively).

More than half of the households (61%) had someone visit a recreation center in the past year.

The most frequent users tended to be:

- River area residents,
- Foreign-born residents,
- Households with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 and \$75,000 or above

Of the households with children under age 18, 81% had youth visit a recreation center within the past year.

Of the households with adults 18-64, 63% had an adult visit a recreation center.

Of the households with ages 65 or better, 37% had a senior visit a recreation center in the past year.

65 years old or better

- Households with incomes of \$25,000-\$34,999 were more likely to have seniors visit a recreation center than were households with incomes of \$15,000-\$24,999, and \$75,000 or more (17% vs. 5% and 5%, respectively).

No one has visited

- Residents in the Lakes and Minnehaha areas were more likely to have no one visit a recreation center than were residents of the River area (45% and 40% vs. 29%).
- U.S. born residents were more likely to have no one visit than were foreign-born residents (40% vs. 24%).
- Households with incomes of under \$15,000, \$15,000-\$24,999 and \$35,000-\$74,999 were more likely to have no one visit a recreation center than were households with incomes of under \$25,000-\$34,999 and \$75,000 or above (47%, 45% and 44% vs. 28% and 28%, respectively).

**SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE RECREATION CENTERS (Q8)**

When asked, unaided, what suggestions they had to improve the value of recreation centers to their households, about 40% of the respondents had no suggestions or didn't know how things could be improved. Another 6% indicated they did not use recreation centers. Those who had some suggestions gave a wide variety of answers, which can be seen in the table below.

**TABLE 4: SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE RECREATION CENTERS**

<u>SUGGESTIONS</u>	PERCENT
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
More security	9%
More information on what's available/ locations/ hours	8%
Keep centers clean/ maintained/ updated	7%
Longer hours/ evenings/ weekends/ restrooms open longer	6%
More activities & programs for adults/ seniors*	6%
More activities & programs for teens/ after school/ jobs*	5%
More activities & programs for children/ more gyms for children*	4%
Need more supervision/ more staff	4%
Don't allow drinking, drugs, hanging out	2%
Other*	15%
Satisfied/ it's fine	3%
Don't use recreation centers	6%
No suggestions/ can't think of anything	21%
Don't know/ refused	19%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages may be greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

The most frequently mentioned suggestions for improvements to recreation centers were:

- More security,
- More information on what's available/ locations/ hours,
- Longer hours/ restrooms open longer,
- More activities and programs for adults/ seniors/ teens/ children.

Details about suggested activities and programs can be found in the verbatim section of this report.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR NEW OR IMPROVED PROGRAMS (Q9)**

Residents were asked, unaided, what suggestions they had for new programs or to improve existing programs. Again, there were a large number of people (48%) who had no suggestions or didn't know how to improve the programs. Another 4% said they did not use any programs. Program suggestions can be seen in the following table.

**TABLE 5: SUGGESTIONS FOR NEW OR IMPROVED PROGRAMS**

<u>SUGGESTIONS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
Activities and programs for children*	9%
Activities and programs for adults*	9%
Activities and programs for teens/ after school/ summers*	8%
Activities and programs for seniors*	4%
More fields/ courts/ rinks/ pools/ playground equipment/ rentals	4%
Organized sports for youth	3%
Family-oriented activities	2%
Keep parks/ recreation centers clean/ maintained	2%
Environmental programs	2%
Satisfied/ keep it the same	2%
Other*	14%
Don't use programs/ don't know what they offer	4%
No suggestions/ can't think of anything	24%
Don't know/ refused	24%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages may be greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

The most frequently mentioned suggestions for programs were:

- More programs for children/ adults/ teens/ seniors,
- More fields/ courts/ rinks/ pools/ playground equipment/ rentals.

Details about suggested programs can be found in the verbatim section of this report. Some common themes across all age groups were:

- Arts & crafts, and
- Physical fitness classes.

LIMITATIONS TO USING PARKS (Q10)

When asked, unaided, for the main things that limit their use of public parks, trails, and participation in recreation activities and programs, nearly one-third of the respondents (32%) said a lack of time. See other responses below.

TABLE 6: LIMITATIONS TO USING PARKS

<u>LIMITATION</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
Lack of time	32%
Concern about personal safety	14%
Lack of transportation	6%
Health issues	5%
Lack of information about facilities & programs	5%
Weather	4%
Lack of interest/ no interesting classes	3%
Age	3%
Distance to parks/ nothing close	2%
Lack of maintenance	2%
Parking issues/ no parking/ have to pay	2%
Facilities are not physically accessible to me	2%
Cost of programs & equipment	2%
Facilities are not suited to my needs	2%
Language barriers	1%
Lack of companion - no one to do things with	1%
Cultural beliefs & restrictions	1%
Don't feel welcome by park staff	<1%
Other*	13%
Nothing limits use	16%
Don't know	8%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages may be greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

Lack of time was the most frequently mentioned limitation to using the parks, trails, and programs.

Safety tended to be more of a concern to:

- River area residents,
- Foreign-born residents.

About 16% of the survey participants said nothing limited their use of the park system.

AMOUNT WILLING TO INVEST (Q11)

The question was asked, “When considering the programs, services and facilities provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, how much would you be willing to invest per month for the following?” Results are shown in the table below.

TABLE 7: AMOUNT WILLING TO INVEST

<u>SERVICE</u>	<u>\$0/MO</u>	<u>\$3/MO</u>	<u>\$6/MO</u>	<u>\$9/MO</u>	<u>DK</u>
Increased maintenance	28%	32%	17%	12%	11%
Increased energy efficiency	34%	30%	14%	7%	14%
New recreation programs & services	34%	29%	16%	9%	12%
New park and recreation facilities	37%	23%	14%	12%	14%
Increased environmental protection	30%	27%	16%	15%	12%

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

Increased maintenance

- U.S. born residents were more likely to invest \$0/month than were foreign-born residents (32% vs. 6%).

Increased energy efficiency

- U.S. born residents were more likely to invest \$0/month than were foreign-born residents (38% vs. 10%).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000 were more likely to be willing to invest \$0/month than were households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (45% vs. 22%).

Overall, the survey participants would be more willing to invest additional money per month for:

- Increased maintenance, and
- Increased environmental protection.

Between 49% and 61% of the respondents would be willing to invest from \$3 up to \$9 per month for each of the programs and services.

New recreation programs and services

- U.S. born residents were more likely to invest \$0/month than were foreign-born residents (38% vs. 8%).
- River area residents were more likely to be willing to invest \$9/month than were residents in the Lakes and Minnehaha areas (15% vs. 5% and 5%).

New park and recreation facilities

- U.S. born residents were more likely to invest \$0/month than were foreign-born residents (40% vs. 12%).
- Households with incomes of \$15,000-\$24,999 were more likely to be willing to invest \$9/month than were households with incomes of \$35,000-\$74,999 (24% vs. 6%).

Increased environmental protection

- U.S. born residents were more likely to invest \$0/month than were foreign-born residents (33% vs. 4%).
- Households with incomes under \$15,000, \$15,000-\$24,999 or \$35,000-\$74,999 were more likely to be willing to invest \$0/month than were households with incomes of \$75,000 or more (38%, 37% and 32% vs. 13%).

## ATTITUDES TOWARD PARTNERING (Q12)

It was explained to the survey participants that the Park Board occasionally partners with businesses, like Tin Fish, Sea Salt, and the Jim Lupient Water Park to help fund operations within the park system.

Several phrases were read to the respondents and they were then asked which one best described their feelings about the Park Board partnering with businesses. The results of this question were as follows:

- 7% I do not think it is ever appropriate;
- 32% I think it's appropriate, but only on a limited basis;
- 53% I think the park board should actively explore more partnerships;
- 9% Don't know/ refused.

Statistical testing revealed the following differences:

- Homeowners were more likely than renters to say that it is not ever appropriate (9% vs. 2%).
- U.S. born residents were more likely than foreign-born residents to say it was only appropriate on a limited basis (33% vs. 18%).

Slightly more than half of the respondents thought the Park Board should explore more partnerships.

About one-third thought partnerships were only appropriate on a limited basis.

**REASONS FOR ATTITUDES ON PARTNERING (Q13)**

The residents were asked, unaided, why they selected the response they had regarding the Park Board partnering with businesses. Their reasons are listed below.

**TABLE 8: REASONS FOR ATTITUDES ON PARTNERING**

<u>REASON</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
Generate revenue/ increase funding/ financial security	27%
Keep out commercialization/ no signs/ no corporate name attached/ don't want a lot of stores	15%
Benefit parks/ increase programs/ improve parks	14%
Don't want businesses to have too much control/ influence/ to be too involved in decisions	8%
Businesses can / should give back to the community/ reinvest/ get involved	8%
Win-win/ good for parks & businesses/ work together	6%
Good idea/ should explore more opportunities	6%
Like Tin Fish/ Sea Salt/ Water Park	6%
Should be limited/ regulated/ local companies, no chains	6%
Draws more people to the park/ adds to the park	5%
Tax relief/ lower taxes	4%
Parks should do it themselves with taxes/ keep separate	3%
Other*	13%
Don't know/ refused	11%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages may be greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

Overall, respondents most often thought partnering would generate revenue for the park system.

When looking at responses broken out by the phrases chosen in Question 12, the main reasons were:

Not ever appropriate

- Keep out commercialization,
- Parks should do it themselves with taxes.

Appropriate on a limited basis

- Keep out commercialization,
- Don't want businesses to have too much control/ influence.

Actively explore more partnerships

- Generate revenue,
- Benefit parks.

INFORMATION SOURCES (Q14)

Survey participants were read a list information sources and then were asked how they would like to receive information about the Park Board. The percentages of those who would like each information source can be seen in the following table:

TABLE 9: INFORMATION SOURCES

<u>INFORMATION SOURCE</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
Local newspapers	79%
Mail	76%
Neighborhood organizations	72%
Signage outside recreation centers	66%
Information inside recreation centers	65%
Schools	60%
Businesses	53%
Online	49%
Email	32%
Some other way*	9%
None	2%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages is greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

Overall, the most favored sources of information about the Park Board were:

- Local newspapers,
- Mail, and
- Neighborhood organizations.

Foreign-born residents tended to prefer mail (82%) and neighborhood organizations (55%) to local newspapers (45%).

Keep in mind that the respondents could choose more than one source of information.

**FUTURE FOCUS (Q15)**

The respondents were asked, unaided, what they thought the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board should focus on in the future. There were a wide variety of responses to this question, as can be seen in the table below.

**TABLE 10: FUTURE FOCUS**

<u>FOCUS</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
BASE FOR PERCENT	400
Keep parks & water clean/ maintained	18%
More security/ more policing/ keep parks safe	15%
Programs & activities for children*	12%
Preserve natural areas/ environment/ trees	8%
Doing a good job/ keep doing what they're doing	7%
Improve/ update parks, facilities, equipment/ more courts, fields, playgrounds, pools	6%
Programs & activities for adults/ seniors*	6%
Programs & activities for teens/ after school/ jobs*	6%
Accessible to all/ ages/ incomes/ with disabilities	4%
Maintain trails/ paths/ improve trails	4%
More trails/ paths	3%
Maintain facilities/ buildings	3%
Promote awareness of parks/ programs/ better communication	3%
Add more parks/ more green space	2%
More lighting	1%
Make it affordable/ reasonable rates for activities	1%
Programs & activities for families*	1%
Other*	20%
No suggestions/ can't think of anything	4%
Don't know/ refused	14%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.  
Sum of percentages may be greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

The things most often mentioned to focus attention on in the future were:

- Keeping parks and water clean/ maintained,
- More security,
- Programs & activities for children.

Details about suggested programs can be found in the verbatim section of this report.

It was again seen that security was a high priority for:

- River area residents,
- Foreign-born residents.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

A majority of the survey participants say that public parks and recreation are important to their households. The services rated highest in importance are:

- Natural areas, like lakes, creeks, wetlands, woods, and prairies,
- Boulevard/ street trees, and
- Neighborhood parks.

Those who rated these services high in importance indicated that their satisfaction levels did not meet expectations for Boulevard/ street trees and Neighborhood parks. Preservation and maintenance of these features are important to Minneapolis residents. In addition, Environmental programs were considered important but satisfaction levels were lower, so these programs may need to be enhanced and promoted to the community. When asked, respondents would be most willing to invest additional money per month for increased maintenance and increased environmental protection.

Overall, respondents think the Park Board is doing a good job, with the majority saying the Park Board is doing the same or better in providing for park and recreation needs than two years ago.

Residents most want the Park Board to provide opportunities for:

- Involving children and youth in positive activities,
- Protecting or spending time in the natural environment, and
- Pursuing health and physical needs.

Approximately 60% of the surveyed households had someone visit a recreation center in the past year:

- 81% of the households with children under age 18 had a child visit,
- 63% of the households with ages 18-64 had an adult visit,
- 37% of the households with ages 65 or better had a senior visit a recreation center.

The most frequently mentioned suggestions for improvements to recreation centers were:

- More security,
- More information on what's available/ locations/ hours,
- Longer hours/ evenings/ weekends/ restrooms open longer,
- More activities and programs for adults/ seniors/ teens/ children.

Lack of time was the most frequently mentioned limitation to using the parks, trails, and participating in recreation activities and programs. Also, concern about personal safety was an issue, especially for River area residents and foreign-born residents.

Slightly more than half of the respondents think the Park Board should explore more partnerships with businesses to generate revenue to help fund park system operations. About one-third think partnerships are only appropriate on a limited basis, mainly to keep out commercialization and so that businesses do not have too much control or influence.

Overall, survey participants would most often like to receive information about the Park Board through:

- Local newspapers,
- Mail, and
- Neighborhood organizations.

The most frequently mentioned areas that Minneapolis residents would like the Park Board to focus on in the future are:

- Keeping parks and water clean/ maintained,
- More security, and
- Programs and activities for children.

Based on the results of this survey, the following comments are offered for consideration.

It is important for Minneapolis residents to have public parks and recreational opportunities, and the Park Board is doing a good job of fulfilling those needs. Several themes emerged as areas on which to concentrate:

- Preservation of natural areas and street trees,
- Maintenance of parks and buildings,
- Security in the parks and buildings,
- Programs and activities for youth.

The recreation centers are heavily used by Minneapolis residents. Among suggestions for new programs were more classes in physical fitness and arts & crafts. It was also seen that environmental programs are important so more of these types of programs may need to be developed. Promotion of the programs and activities through newspapers, mail, and neighborhood organizations may increase attendance at the recreation centers.

Finding additional business partnerships may help with funding park operations. Caution should be used when selecting new partners, as over commercialization is a concern for many residents.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

---

### PARK SERVICE AREA

River District.....	34%
Lakes District.....	33%
Minnehaha District.....	33%

### GENDER

Female.....	58%
Male.....	42%

### HOME OWNERSHIP

Own.....	69%
Rent.....	31%

### HOUSEHOLD MAKE-UP

Under 18 years old.....	33%
18-64 years old.....	80%
65 years old or better.....	26%

Sum of percentages is greater than 100% due to multiple responses.

### COUNTRY OF BIRTH

U.S. ....	87%
Europe.....	2%
Southeast Asia.....	3%
Eastern Africa.....	1%
Western Africa.....	1%
Other Africa.....	1%
Latin America.....	4%
Other*.....	1%
Refused.....	<1%

\*Verbatim 'other' responses are available upon request.

### HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Under \$15,000.....	14%
\$15,000 - \$24,999.....	10%
\$25,000 - \$34,999.....	13%
\$35,000 - \$74,999.....	27%
\$75,000 or more.....	25%
Refused.....	11%