

---

## Survey Overview

---

The Morris Leatherman Company is pleased to present the results of this study to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. This section provides a brief introduction to the specifications of the survey and a guide to the organization of the written analysis.

While the most statistically sound procedures have been used to collect and analyze the information presented herein, it must always be kept in mind that surveys are not predictions. They are designed to measure public opinion within identifiable limits of accuracy at *specific points in time*. This survey is in no way a prediction of opinions, perceptions, or actions at any future point in time. After all, in public policy analysis, the major task is to impact these revealed opinions in a constructive fashion.

The Principal Investigator for this study was Dr. William D. Morris; the Project Director overseeing all phases of the research and analysis was Mr. Peter Leatherman.

---

## Research Design

---

This study contains the results of a telephone survey of 500 randomly selected residents of the City of Minneapolis. Survey responses were gathered by professional interviewers across the community between November 2<sup>nd</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

The average interview took seventeen minutes.

All respondents interviewed in this study were part of a randomly generated sample of the City of Minneapolis. In general, random samples such as this yield results projectable to their respective universe within  $\pm 4.5$  percent in 95 out of 100 cases.

Interviews were conducted by **Morris Leatherman Company** trained personnel from telephone banks in St. Paul, Minnesota. Approximately twenty percent of all interviews were independently validated for procedure and content by a Morris Leatherman Company supervisor. Completed interviews were edited and coded at the company's headquarters in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Statistical analysis and cross-tabulations were produced by the company's CfMC Mentor Analysis System and SPSS 24.0 FOR WINDOWS.

---

## Organization of the Study

---

The results of this study are presented in the following order:

The *Analysis* consists of a written report of the major findings. The results contained herein were also presented verbally to the client.

Any further questions the reader may have about this study which are not answered in this report should be directed to either Dr. Morris or Mr. Leatherman.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One: Residential Demographics</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Residential Demographics .....	7
Longevity in the Community .....	7
Home Ownership .....	8
Household Income .....	9
Year Born .....	9
Employment .....	9
Languages .....	10
Ethnicity .....	12
Lived in the United States .....	12
Children at Home .....	13
Gender Identity .....	13
Commissioner District .....	13
Service Area .....	14
Summary and Conclusions .....	14
<b>Chapter Two: Attitudes and Impressions</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Attitudes and Impressions .....	16
Like Most .....	16
Like Least .....	17
Overall Quality .....	18
Appearance and Maintenance .....	19
Service Ratings .....	20
Importance of Services .....	29
Summary and Conclusions .....	32
<b>Chapter Three: Recreation Centers</b> .....	<b>33</b>
Recreation Centers .....	34
Use in the Past Two Years .....	34
Rating of Recreation Center .....	36
Inside Programs .....	37
Outside Programs .....	41
Best Time of Day .....	43
Summary and Conclusions .....	46
<b>Chapter Four: Getting to a Park</b> .....	<b>48</b>
Getting to a Park .....	49
Modes of Transportation .....	49
Summary and Conclusions .....	54
<b>Chapter Five: Facilities and Offerings</b> .....	<b>55</b>
Facilities and Offerings .....	56
Frequency of Use .....	56
Meet Needs of Household .....	59
Summary and Conclusions .....	60

<b>Chapter Six: Barriers to Use</b> .....	<b>61</b>
Barriers to Use .....	62
Considerations .....	62
Summary and Conclusions .....	73
<b>Chapter Seven: Importance of Park Services</b> .....	<b>75</b>
Importance of Park Services .....	76
Importance of Services .....	76
Importance of Police Protection .....	83
Satisfaction with Programs and Activities .....	84
Summary and Conclusions .....	85
<b>Chapter Eight: Revenue Generation</b> .....	<b>86</b>
Revenue Generation .....	87
Revenue Generation .....	87
Summary and Conclusions .....	91
<b>Chapter Nine: Volunteer Opportunities</b> .....	<b>92</b>
Volunteer Opportunities .....	93
Increase the Number of Volunteer Opportunities .....	93
Summary and Conclusions .....	95
<b>Chapter Ten: Taxes and Funding</b> .....	<b>96</b>
Taxes and Funding .....	97
Percentage of Taxes .....	97
Value of Services for Taxes Paid .....	98
Tax Increase to Maintain .....	99
Tax Increase to Enhance .....	100
Parkways .....	101
Stormwater Fees .....	103
Endowment Program .....	106
Summary and Conclusions .....	110
<b>Chapter Eleven: Communications</b> .....	<b>111</b>
Communications .....	112
Preferred Source of Information .....	112
Summary and Conclusions .....	113
<b>Chapter Twelve: Key Findings and Implications</b> .....	<b>114</b>
Key Findings and Implications .....	115

**Analysis**

# **Chapter One: Residential Demographics**

# Residential Demographics

Adult residents of the City of Minneapolis were asked a series of questions about their demographic backgrounds. These questions were asked for two reasons: first, to validate this sample against updated 2020 U.S. Census findings; and, second, to track any differences between subgroups and the rest of the population. And, throughout the course of this study, subgroup differences will be discussed.

## Longevity in the Community

Respondents were asked:

*Approximately, how many years have you lived in Minneapolis?*

Forty-one percent report living in Minneapolis for ten or less years, while 34% say they resided there for over twenty years.

FIVE YEARS OR LESS	17%
SIX TO TEN YEARS	24%
11 TO 20 YEARS	24%
21 TO 30 YEARS	17%
OVER 30 YEARS	17%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

The median residential longevity in the city is 13.8 years.

“Less than five years” is posted at a higher rate by:

- renters
- residents currently not working
- residents born after 1980
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- East African and Somalis

“Six to ten years” is cited more often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- monthly visitors to regional parks

- East African and Somalis

“Eleven to twenty years” is reported more frequently by:

- homeowners
- households with children
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Twenty-one to thirty years” is cited more frequently by:

- homeowners
- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often

“More than thirty years” is indicated most frequently by:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- homeowners
- self-employed residents
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- households without children
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

---

## Home Ownership

---

Interviewees were queried:

*Do you own or rent your present residence?*

Fifty-one percent rent their current residences.

OWN	.....	49%
RENT	.....	51%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	.....	0%

Forty-nine percent own their present abode.

---

## Household Income

---

Residents were asked:

*Which of the following categories contains your total household income for last year – less than \$25,000, \$25,001-\$50,000, \$50,001-\$75,000, \$75,000-\$100,000, \$100,001-\$150,000 or over \$150,000?*

The median total household income for last year is \$56,250.00:

LESS THAN \$25,000 . . . . .	16%
\$25,000 TO \$50,000 . . . . .	27%
\$50,001 TO \$75,000 . . . . .	28%
\$75,001 TO \$100,000 . . . . .	20%
\$100,001 TO \$150,000 . . . . .	4%
OVER \$150,000 . . . . .	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%

Forty-three percent report incomes less than \$50,000.00 and 27% post incomes over \$75,000.00.

---

## Year Born

---

Respondents were asked:

*Were you born before 1946, between 1946 and 1964, between 1965 and 1980 or after 1980?*

Twenty-seven percent report being born before 1965.

BEFORE 1946 . . . . .	7%
1946 TO 1964 . . . . .	20%
1965 TO 1980 . . . . .	32%
AFTER 1980 . . . . .	41%

Forty-one percent indicate being born after 1980.

---

## Employment

---

Next, employment was considered:

*Are you employed by a public entity, such as a government agency, state or local government or a school district, a business or corporation, own a business or are self-employed, retired, or currently not working?*

A 59% majority report they are employed by a business or corporation.

PUBLIC ENTITY.....	14%
BUSINESS/CORPORATION.....	59%
OWN BUSINESS/SELF-EMPLOYED.....	7%
RETIRED.....	14%
NOT WORKING.....	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Fourteen percent are retired; fourteen percent work for a public entity; and seven percent own a business or are self-employed. Another seven percent report they are not currently working.

---

## **Languages**

---

Respondents were asked about the main language spoken in their homes:

*What is the main language spoken in your home?*

Eighty percent report “English” is their home language.

ENGLISH.....	80%
SPANISH.....	8%
SOMALI.....	5%
HMONG.....	4%
SCATTERED.....	3%

Eight percent report “Spanish;” five percent state “Somali;” while four percent indicate “Hmong.”

Those indicating a language other than English were asked the following sets of questions.

*What types of information would you like to see in your language?*

Twenty six percent would like to see “registration and schedules;” while sixteen percent would like to see “park and recreation brochures” in their primary language spoken at home.

NONE . . . . .	35%
JOB POSTINGS . . . . .	3%
EVENTS . . . . .	9%
REGISTRATION/SCHEDULE . . . . .	26%
PARK AND RECREATION BROCHURES . . . . .	16%
TRAFFIC/ROAD SIGNS . . . . .	5%
PROGRAM INSTRUCTORS . . . . .	4%
RULES AND REGULATIONS . . . . .	3%

*For each of the following language services, please tell me if you or members of your household would be very likely to use, somewhat likely, or not too likely to use it?*

***Translated materials?***

Eighty-two percent would be at least somewhat likely to use translated materials; forty-one percent would be very likely to do so.

VERY LIKELY . . . . .	41%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY . . . . .	41%
NOT TOO LIKELY . . . . .	17%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%

***In-person interpreters?***

Fifty-six percent would be at least somewhat likely to use in-person interpreters; twenty-two percent would be very likely to do so.

VERY LIKELY . . . . .	22%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY . . . . .	34%
NOT TOO LIKELY . . . . .	43%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%

***Phone interpreters?***

Fifty-three percent would be at least somewhat likely to use phone interpreters; twenty-five percent would be very likely to do so.

VERY LIKELY . . . . .	25%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY . . . . .	28%
NOT TOO LIKELY . . . . .	44%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	3%

***Staff who speak your language?***

Eighty-seven percent would be at least somewhat likely to interact with staff who speak their language; forty-three percent would be very likely to do so.

VERY LIKELY .....	43%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	44%
NOT TOO LIKELY .....	12%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

---

## Ethnicity

---

Minneapolis residents were asked for their ethnicity:

*Which of the following best describes you?*

Fifty percent report they are “white.”

AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE .....	4%
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER .....	5%
BLACK/AFRICAN-AMERICAN .....	21%
WHITE .....	50%
HISPANIC .....	9%
EAST AFRICAN/SOMALI.....	6%
HMONG.....	5%
REFUSED .....	0%

Twenty-one percent are “Black/African-American,” and nine percent are “Hispanic.” Six percent are “East African/Somali,” five percent each are “Asian/Pacific Islander” or “Hmong.” Four percent report they are “American Indian/Alaskan Native.”

*Are you, yourself, of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?*

Nine percent state they are of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin.

YES .....	9%
NO .....	91%
REFUSED .....	0%

---

## Lived in the United States

---

Next, respondents were asked:

*How long have you lived in the United States?*

Seventy-eight percent report living in the United States all of their life.

LESS THAN ONE YEAR. . . . .	2%
ONE TO FIVE YEARS . . . . .	6%
SIX TO TEN YEARS. . . . .	6%
MORE THAN TEN YEARS. . . . .	8%
ENTIRE LIFE. . . . .	78%
REFUSED . . . . .	0%

Fourteen percent have lived in the United States for ten years or less.

---

## **Children at Home**

---

City residents were queried:

*Do you have pre-school or school-aged children living at home?*

Twenty-four percent report a pre-school or school-aged child living at home.

YES . . . . .	24%
NO . . . . .	75%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%

Seventy-five percent have no pre-school or school-aged children living at home.

---

## **Gender Identity**

---

The gender of each respondent was asked:

MALE. . . . .	46%
FEMALE . . . . .	50%
NON-BINARY . . . . .	3%
SOMETHING ELSE. . . . .	1%

Women outnumber men by four percent in this sample.

---

## **Commissioner District**

---

The residence of each respondent was noted by Commissioner District:

DISTRICT ONE .....	17%
DISTRICT TWO .....	17%
DISTRICT THREE.....	17%
DISTRICT FOUR.....	17%
DISTRICT FIVE.....	17%
DISTRICT SIX.....	17%

Each Commissioner District is equally represented in the sample.

---

### **Service Area**

---

The Service Area of each residence was also noted:

NORTH .....	17%
NORTHEAST.....	19%
DOWNTOWN .....	6%
SOUTHEAST.....	30%
SOUTH.....	28%

The Southeast Service Area is the largest proportion of the sample, at 30%. The smallest is the Downtown Service Area at six percent.

---

### **Summary and Conclusions**

---

The median longevity of adult Minneapolis residents is 13.8 years. Forty-one percent lived here for less than ten years, while 34% resided here for over 20 years. Twenty-seven percent were born before 1964, while forty-one percent were born after 1980. Fifty percent of the sample indicate they are “White,” 21% are “Black/African-American,” and 9% are “Hispanic.” Six percent report they are “East African/Somali,” five percent are “Asian/Pacific Islander,” five percent are “Hmong,” and four percent report they are “Native American/Alaskan Native.” Fourteen percent have lived in the United States for ten years or less. Fifty-nine percent are employed by a business or corporation, fourteen percent work for a public entity, and seven percent own their business or are self-employed. Fourteen percent are retired. Seven percent are currently not working.

Fifty-one percent rent their current residence and forty-nine percent own their home. Twenty-four percent report the presence of pre-school or school-aged children living at home. The median total household income for last year is \$56,250.00. Sixteen percent indicate incomes of less than \$25,000.00, while 24% report incomes over \$75,000.00. Eighty percent report the main language spoken in their home is English. Eight percent speak “Spanish”; five percent speak “Somali,” and four percent speak “Hmong.”

Seventeen percent live in each of the six Commissioner Districts. Thirty percent reside in the Southeast Service Area, 28% in the South Service Area, 19% in the Northeast Service Area and 17% in the North Service Area. A smaller six percent reside in the Downtown Service Area.

# **Chapter Two: Attitudes and Impressions**

# Attitudes and Impressions

Minneapolis residents were asked a series of questions about their attitudes on and opinions of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System. The aspects of the park system respondents like most and least were discussed. Finally, their overall impression of the System and specific services was ascertained.

---

## Like Most

---

Respondents were initially asked:

*What do you like most about the parks and opportunities for recreation within Minneapolis?*

Five responses dominate, together accounting for 64% of the responses: “variety of programs,” at 19%; “trails,” at 16%; “variety of locations,” at 12%; “natural/open spaces,” at 9% and “playgrounds/parks,” at 10%.

VARIETY OF LOCATIONS .....	12%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	19%
TRAILS .....	16%
PLAYGROUNDS/PARKS .....	8%
ATHLETIC FACILITIES.....	5%
NATURAL/OPEN SPACES.....	9%
WELL-MAINTAINED.....	7%
LAKES.....	2%
SAFE .....	2%
COMMUNITY GATHERING AREAS.....	6%
PICNIC AREAS .....	5%
EVENTS.....	3%
SCATTERED.....	6%

“Variety of programs” is reported most frequently by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- homeowners
- self-employed residents
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users

“Trails” is cited most frequently by:

- households without children

- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

---

## Like Least

---

Next, respondents were queried:

*What do you like least about the park and opportunities for recreation within Minneapolis?*

Ten percent are concerned about “crime/unsafe,” while seven percent cite “not well-maintained.”

UNSURE . . . . .	10%
NOTHING . . . . .	24%
NOT WELL-MAINTAINED . . . . .	7%
TRASH/LITTER. . . . .	4%
CRIME/UNSAFE . . . . .	10%
CROWDED . . . . .	5%
LOITERING YOUTH/GANGS . . . . .	6%
HOMELESS PEOPLE . . . . .	4%
NOT ENOUGH PARKING . . . . .	4%
NOT ENOUGH SEATING. . . . .	3%
NOT ENOUGH LIGHTS . . . . .	3%
CLOSED RESTROOMS . . . . .	3%
HIGH FEES . . . . .	5%
LIMITED HOURS . . . . .	2%
SCATTERED . . . . .	10%

A large 24% report there is “nothing” they dislike about the park and recreation opportunities within Minneapolis. These respondents are “park system boosters” who form the core support for the system; the size is over four times higher than the norm.

“Nothing” is stated more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation

“Crime/unsafe” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

“Not well-maintained” is a concern among:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- Whites

---

## Overall Quality

---

Residents were asked for an overall judgment:

*What is your overall impression of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System – excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

Eighty-six percent rate the System as either “excellent” or “good.”

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	32%	27%	17%
GOOD . . . . .	62%	64%	69%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	5%	8%	13%
POOR . . . . .	0%	0%	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Seventeen percent rate the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System as “excellent.” Fourteen percent are more critical in their evaluations.

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Hispanics

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- renters
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for five years or less
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

## Appearance and Maintenance

Respondents were asked to focus their rating on the appearance and maintenance of the Park and Recreation System:

*What is your overall impression of the appearance and maintenance of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation system -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

Seventy-three percent rate the System favorably.

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	32%	.. 30%.	13%
GOOD . . . . .	61%	.. 51%.	60%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	6%	.. 18%.	23%
POOR . . . . .	0%	... 0%..	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	... 1%..	3%

Thirteen percent rate the System as “excellent.” Twenty-four percent are more critical in their evaluations, an increase of 6% over the three year period.

Ratings increase among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- homeowners
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

They decrease among:

- Commissioner Districts Five and Six residents
- residents currently not working

Those giving a rating were asked a follow-up query:

***Why did you rate the appearance and maintenance as  
(excellent/good/only fair/poor?)***

One response dominates: “clean/well-maintained.”

TRASH/LITTER . . . . .	9%
CLEAN/WELL-MAINTAINED . . . . .	52%
NOT WELL-MAINTAINED . . . . .	7%
HOMELESS ENCAMPMENTS . . . . .	3%
RUN-DOWN FACILITIES . . . . .	3%
VANDALISM/GRAFFITI . . . . .	2%
WELL-MAINTAINED LANDSCAPING/GRASS . . . . .	10%
UP-TO-DATE FACILITIES . . . . .	7%
WELL-MAINTAINED TRAILS . . . . .	5%
SCATTERED . . . . .	2%

“Clean/well-maintained” is stated most frequently by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents working for a public entity
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Not well-maintained” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- renters
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- Whites

“Well-maintained landscaping/grass” is posted most frequently by:

- Commissioner Districts Three and Four residents
- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

---

## **Service Ratings**

---

***For each of the following services, please tell me if  
you would rate the Minneapolis Park and Recreation  
system as excellent, good, only fair or poor.***

***Snow removal on trails?***

A high 74% rate snow removal on trails favorably.

	<b>2019</b>	<b>2022</b>
EXCELLENT . . . . .	34%.	21%
GOOD . . . . .	45%.	53%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	8%.	15%
POOR . . . . .	0%.	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	13%.	11%

Ratings are higher among:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents currently not working
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

***Snow removal on sidewalks?***

An even higher 77% rate snow removal on sidewalks favorably.

	<b>2019</b>	<b>2022</b>
EXCELLENT . . . . .	41%.	19%
GOOD . . . . .	40%.	58%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	13%.	19%
POOR . . . . .	2%.	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	4%.	4%

Ratings are higher among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents currently not working
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

***Snow removal in parking lots?***

Seventy-one percent rate snow removal in parking lots positively.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	22%
GOOD . . . . .	49%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	20%
POOR . . . . .	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	4%

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents born after 1980
- residents for five years or less
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents working for a public entity
- residents currently not working
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans

***Maintenance of trees in parks?***

By an almost seven to one ratio, residents rate maintenance of trees in parks positively.

	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	35%	32%
GOOD . . . . .	53%	51%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	9%	12%
POOR . . . . .	0%	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	3%	3%

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner Districts One and Three residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- men
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- residents working for a public entity
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Maintenance of trees on boulevards?***

Eighty-four percent rate maintenance of trees on boulevards favorably.

	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	33%	39%
GOOD . . . . .	53%	45%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	11%	15%
POOR . . . . .	0%	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	3%	1%

Ratings are higher among:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks

They are lower among:

- residents working for a public entity
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

***Maintenance of athletic fields?***

Sixty-seven percent rate maintenance of athletic fields favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	27%
GOOD . . . . .	40%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	15%
POOR . . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	18%

Ratings are higher among:

- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1965
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- renters
- residents working for a public entity
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- households with children

***Maintenance of outdoor ice rinks?***

Fifty-four percent rate maintenance of outdoor ice rinks favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	19%
GOOD . . . . .	35%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	11%
POOR . . . . .	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	32%

Ratings are higher among:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly and monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hispanics
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

***Maintenance of playgrounds?***

Sixty-seven percent rate maintenance of playgrounds favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	27%
GOOD . . . . .	40%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	16%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	16%

Ratings are higher among:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- households with children
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

***Maintenance of bathroom facilities?***

Fifty-five percent rate maintenance of bathroom facilities favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	16%
GOOD . . . . .	39%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	28%
POOR . . . . .	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	13%

Ratings are higher among:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks

They are lower among:

- households with children
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Maintenance of natural areas?***

Eighty percent rate maintenance of natural areas favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	38%
GOOD . . . . .	42%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	14%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	5%

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- weekly and monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- East African and Somalis

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans
- Whites

***Maintenance of trails in regional parks, such as Chain of Lakes and Minnehaha Regional Parks?***

Seventy-eight percent rate maintenance of trails in regional parks favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	36%
GOOD . . . . .	42%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	8%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	13%

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks or regional parks often
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

***Maintenance of paths in neighborhood parks?***

Seventy-nine percent rate maintenance of paths in neighborhood parks favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	31%
GOOD . . . . .	48%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	15%
POOR . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	4%

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- men
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Hmong

They are lower among:

- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

***Maintenance of street lights and signage along parkways?***

Sixty-seven percent rate maintenance of street lights and signage along parkways favorably.

EXCELLENT . . . . .	29%
GOOD . . . . .	52%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	15%
POOR . . . . .	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	2%

Ratings are higher among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Hispanics

They are lower among:

- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

## **Importance of Services**

From the list just asked of them, residents were asked to prioritize their top three services.

### *Which service is most important to you?*

Sixteen percent indicate “snow removal on trails,” while fifteen percent report “snow removal on sidewalks” was the most important service.

SNOW REMOVAL ON TRAILS . . . . .	16%
SNOW REMOVAL ON SIDEWALKS . . . . .	15%
SNOW REMOVAL IN PARKING LOTS . . . . .	5%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES IN PARKS . . . . .	4%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES ON BOULEVARDS . . . . .	4%
MAINTENANCE OF ATHLETIC FIELDS . . . . .	9%
MAINTENANCE OF OUTDOOR ICE RINKS . . . . .	1%
MAINTENANCE OF PLAYGROUNDS . . . . .	12%
MAINTENANCE OF BATHROOM FACILITIES . . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF NATURAL AREAS . . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF TRAILS IN REGIONAL PARKS . . . . .	5%
MAINTENANCE OF PATHS IN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS . . . . .	4%
MAINTENANCE OF STREET LIGHTS AND SIGNAGE ALONG PARKWAYS . . . . .	13%
NONE . . . . .	0%
ALL . . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%

“Snow removal on trails” is stated more by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

“Snow removal on sidewalks” is cited at a higher rate by:

- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- women
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

“Maintenance of playgrounds” is posted more frequently by:

- residents born after 1980
- households with children
- Recreation Center users

- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

*Which service is second most important to you?*

“Maintenance of bathroom facilities” at 13% and “maintenance of natural areas” at 12% leads the list as a second priority.

SNOW REMOVAL ON TRAILS . . . . .	5%
SNOW REMOVAL ON SIDEWALKS. . . . .	8%
SNOW REMOVAL IN PARKING LOTS. . . . .	7%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES IN PARKS . . . . .	5%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES ON BOULEVARDS . . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF ATHLETIC FIELDS . . . . .	5%
MAINTENANCE OF OUTDOOR ICE RINKS . . . . .	3%
MAINTENANCE OF PLAYGROUNDS . . . . .	8%
MAINTENANCE OF BATHROOM FACILITIES . . . . .	13%
MAINTENANCE OF NATURAL AREAS. . . . .	12%
MAINTENANCE OF TRAILS IN REGIONAL PARKS . . .	11%
MAINTENANCE OF PATHS IN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS . . . . .	9%
MAINTENANCE OF STREET LIGHTS AND SIGNAGE ALONG PARKWAYS. . . . .	8%
NONE. . . . .	0%
ALL . . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

“Maintenance of bathroom facilities” is stated more by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- households with children
- women
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Maintenance of natural areas” is cited at a higher rate by:

- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- households without children
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Maintenance of trails in regional parks” is posted more frequently by:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- Whites

*And, which service is third most important to you?*

Finally, “maintenance of street lights and signage along parkways” at 16% and “maintenance of paths in neighborhood parks” at 14% are chosen at a higher rate as a third priority.

SNOW REMOVAL ON TRAILS . . . . .	6%
SNOW REMOVAL ON SIDEWALKS. . . . .	7%
SNOW REMOVAL IN PARKING LOTS. . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES IN PARKS . . . . .	5%
MAINTENANCE OF TREES ON BOULEVARDS . . . . .	3%
MAINTENANCE OF ATHLETIC FIELDS . . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF OUTDOOR ICE RINKS . . . . .	2%
MAINTENANCE OF PLAYGROUNDS . . . . .	6%
MAINTENANCE OF BATHROOM FACILITIES . . . . .	12%
MAINTENANCE OF NATURAL AREAS. . . . .	9%
MAINTENANCE OF TRAILS IN REGIONAL PARKS . . . . .	8%
MAINTENANCE OF PATHS IN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS . . . . .	14%
MAINTENANCE OF STREET LIGHTS AND SIGNAGE ALONG PARKWAYS. . . . .	16%
NONE. . . . .	0%
ALL . . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%

“Maintenance of street lights and signage along parkways” is stated more by:

- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- East African and Somalis

“Maintenance of paths in neighborhood parks” is cited at a higher rate by:

- residents in the South Service Area
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents for over thirty years

“Maintenance of bathroom facilities” is posted more frequently by:

- renters
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- Whites

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

General perceptions of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System prove to be highly positive. The three most-liked aspects of the System are the “variety of programs,” “trails,” and “variety of locations.” These three responses together account for nearly fifty percent of the aspects cited. The most disliked aspects include “crime/unsafe” and “not well-maintained,” at ten and seven percent, respectively. MPRB has a large group of “boosters,” 24%, who dislike “nothing” about the System – impressive at a time when “boosters” in other communities have dropped to less than ten percent. Both the overall impression of the System and the overall impression of the appearance and maintenance of the System are positive: eighty-six percent favorable in the former case and 73% percent in the latter case. However, there is a “softening” of favorable ratings with large shift from “excellent” to “good.” This something to watch in the future. The thirteen specific services tested enjoy strong ratings. Two areas to focus on for improvement would be “maintenance of bathroom facilities” and “snow removal in parking lots.”

# **Chapter Three: Recreation Centers**

# Recreation Centers

The survey focused on the use of and opinions about the 49 Recreation Centers. Use of the Recreation Centers was considered first. And, in particular, opinions of both “inside activities programming” and “outside activities programming” were gathered in detail.

## Use in the Past Two Years

Respondents were told:

*The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board operates 49 recreation centers, located in neighborhood parks across Minneapolis. Keeping this in mind...*

They were then asked:

*Have you used a Recreation Center during the past two years for recreation purposes?*

Twenty-eight percent of the sample used a Recreation Center during the past two years.

	2015	2019	2022
YES .....	27%	.. 31%.	28%
NO .....	73%	.. 68%.	72%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%	... 1%..	0%

Users are more apt to be:

- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- self-employed residents
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- residents for six to ten years
- weekly visitors or monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

Non-users are more likely to be:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- less \$50,000 annual income households

- households without children
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

Center users were asked several follow-up questions.

***How often do you use a Recreation Center – daily, two to three times a week, weekly, two to three times a month, monthly, or less often?***

The typical Recreation Center user visits five to six times per month.

	2015	2019	2022
DAILY . . . . .	4%	6%	14%
2 TO 3 TIMES A WEEK . . . . .	16%	36%	18%
WEEKLY . . . . .	28%	19%	21%
2 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH . . . . .	24%	17%	24%
MONTHLY . . . . .	10%	11%	10%
LESS OFTEN . . . . .	19%	12%	13%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Fifty-three percent use a Recreation Center at least weekly. Thirty-four percent use a Center at least monthly, though less than on a weekly basis. And, 13% visit a Recreation Center more sporadically.

“Daily” is indicated more often by:

- households with children
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- Hispanics

“Two to three times a week” is indicated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- homeowners
- non-binary residents
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

- Whites

“Two to three times a month” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- renters
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- women
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

---

## Rating of Recreation Center

---

Recreation Center users were asked:

*Overall, how would you rate the quality of the Recreation Center – excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

Ninety-four percent rate the quality of the Recreation Center as either “excellent” or “good.”

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	34%	42%	18%
GOOD . . . . .	60%	47%	76%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	6%	9%	6%
POOR . . . . .	0%	2%	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Only six percent rate it lower.

Ratings increase among:

- homeowners
- residents born between 1965 and 1980

- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

They decrease among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- renters
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- East African and Somalis

Those providing a rating were asked a follow-up question:

***Why do you feel that way?***

Four responses, at a combined 65%, dominate the responses: “good staff”; “variety of programs”; “up-to-date facilities” and “well maintained.”

GOOD STAFF .....	26%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	18%
UP-TO-DATE FACILITIES.....	11%
WELL-MAINTAINED.....	10%
COMMUNITY INFORMATION RESOURCE.....	6%
SAFE .....	5%
AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	4%
COMMUNITY ASSET.....	3%
SOCIAL SERVICE EVENTS.....	2%
HOURS OF OPERATION .....	2%
STAFF SHORTAGES .....	3%
RUN-DOWN/NOT WELL-MAINTAINED .....	2%
SCATTTERED.....	6%
UNSURE .....	1%

“Variety of programs” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- Hmong

“Good staff” is mentioned more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- women
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

---

**Inside Programs**

---

Recreation Center users were told:

*The Park Board offers two types of programming: those held INSIDE a recreation center such as basketball, music lessons, tumbling, pottery, yoga, preschool and those held OUTSIDE such as baseball, soccer, tennis lessons, geo-caching, archery, and neighborhood festivals.*

They were then asked:

*Have you participated in INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center?*

Fifty-nine percent report participating in INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center.

	2015	2019	2022
YES .....	45%	53%..	59%
NO .....	55%	47%..	41%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%	0%..	0%

Forty-one percent have not done so.

Participation is higher among:

- Commissioner Districts One and Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- women
- residents for six to ten years
- Black and African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- men
- East African and Somalis

Next, INSIDE program participants were asked:

*Which INSIDE programs have you participated in?*

By far, the most popular INSIDE program is youth sports, at 38%.

PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAMS .....	17%
HEALTH/FITNESS .....	19%
YOUTH SPORTS .....	38%
ADULT SPORTS .....	10%
ADULT HOBBY/ENRICHMENT .....	8%
SWIMMING .....	2%
YOUTH ENRICHMENT .....	2%
OPEN GYM .....	2%
SCATTERED .....	3%

Nineteen percent participate in “health/fitness;” seventeen percent, in “preschool programs;” and ten percent participate in “adult sports.”

“Youth sports” is posted at a higher rate by:

- self-employed residents
- households with children
- Black and African Americans

“Health and fitness” is cited more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- women
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

“Pre-school programs” is indicated more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents born after 1980
- weekly visitors to regional parks

Participants were then queried:

***How would you rate INSIDE programs – excellent, good, only fair, or poor?***

Ninety-six percent of participants rate the INSIDE programs as either “excellent” or “good.”

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT .....	35%	53%..	39%
GOOD .....	65%	45%..	57%
ONLY FAIR .....	0%	0%..	4%
POOR .....	0%	2%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED .....	0%	0%..	0%

Thirty-nine percent rate these programs as “excellent.”

Ratings are lower among:

- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

They were lower among:

- residents currently not working
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- East African and Somalis

Those providing a rating were asked a follow-up question:

***Why do you feel that way?***

Two responses, at a combined 60%, dominate the responses: “good staff,” and “educational/learn skills.”

GOOD STAFF . . . . .	37%
EDUCATIONAL/LEARN SKILLS . . . . .	23%
WELL ORGANIZED . . . . .	8%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS. . . . .	7%
BRINGS COMMUNITY TOGETHER. . . . .	6%
UP-TO-DATE FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT . . . . .	5%
ENJOYABLE/FUN. . . . .	5%
AFFORDABLE. . . . .	3%
DISORGANIZED . . . . .	2%
SCATTERED . . . . .	4%

“Educational and learn skills” is key to:

- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- Hmong

“Well organized” is cited more frequently by:

- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- non-binary residents
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

Participants were then queried:

***How would you rate the customer service you received inside a recreation center – excellent, good, only fair, or poor?***

Ninety-nine percent of participants rate the customer service as either “excellent” or “good:”

EXCELLENT . . . . .	58%
GOOD . . . . .	41%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	1%
POOR . . . . .	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Fifty-eight percent rate customer service as “excellent.”

There were no statistically significant sub-group differences.

## Outside Programs

Turning to OUTSIDE programs, Recreation Center users were asked:

*Have you participated in OUTSIDE programs at a Recreation Center?*

Fifty-six percent report participating in OUTSIDE programs.

	2015	2019	2022
YES . . . . .	53%	53% . .	56%
NO . . . . .	47%	46% . .	44%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	1% . . .	0%

Forty-four percent have not done so.

Participation is higher among:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Whites

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- renters
- residents currently not working
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- women
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans

OUTSIDE program participants were asked:

***Which OUTSIDE programs have you participated in?***

The two most popular OUTSIDE programs prove to be “youth sports,” at 48%, and “adult sports,” at 22%.

ADULT SPORTS . . . . .	22%
YOUTH SPORTS . . . . .	48%
FITNESS . . . . .	8%
EVENTS . . . . .	15%
YOUTH ENRICHMENT . . . . .	3%
SCATTERED . . . . .	4%

“Youth sports” is stated more often by:

- homeowners
- less \$25,000 annual income households

“Adult sports” is cited at a higher rate by:

- renters
- residents for five years or less

OUTSIDE program participants were then asked:

***How would you rate OUTSIDE programs – excellent, good, only fair, or poor?***

Ninety-two percent rate OUTSIDE programs as either “excellent” or “good.”

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT . . . . .	38%	47%	38%
GOOD . . . . .	56%	46%	54%
ONLY FAIR . . . . .	3%	6%	8%
POOR . . . . .	1%	0%	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%	1%	0%

Only eight percent are more negative in their judgments.

Ratings were lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- Hispanics

Users were then asked a follow-up question:

***Why do you feel that way?***

Five responses, at a combined 75%, dominate the responses: “educational/learn skills;” “enjoyable/fun;” “up-to-date facilities/equipment;” “good staff” and “brings community together.”

EDUCATIONAL/LEARN SKILLS . . . . .	22%
ENJOYABLE/FUN. . . . .	15%
UP-TO-DATE FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT . . . . .	14%
GOOD STAFF . . . . .	14%
BRINGS COMMUNITY TOGETHER. . . . .	10%
WELL ORGANIZED . . . . .	4%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS. . . . .	4%
SAFE . . . . .	3%
DISORGANIZED . . . . .	10%
SCATTERED . . . . .	4%

“Educational and learn skills” is more important to:

- residents for six to ten years
- Hmong

“Enjoyable/fun” is key to:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

“Good staff” is mentioned more frequently by:

- homeowners
- self-employed residents
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents for over thirty years
- Whites

“Up-to-date facilities/equipment” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents born after 1980
- residents for six to ten years

---

**Best Time of Day**

---

Residents were asked:

*During the school year.....*

*What would be the best time during the day for you or members of your household to participate in programs at a recreation center – early morning, mid-morning, lunchtime, early afternoon, late afternoon or evening?*

“Late afternoon” is the preference for twenty-five percent, while 21% point to “early mornings.”

EARLY MORNING .....	21%
MID-MORNING .....	15%
LUNCHTIME .....	3%
EARLY AFTERNOON.....	10%
LATE AFTERNOON .....	25%
EVENING .....	19%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

“Early morning” is cited more often by:

- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- households without children
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

“Mid-morning” is preferred most frequently by:

- homeowners
- retirees
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- households without children
- women
- Whites

“Early afternoon” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- households with children
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Late afternoon” is mentioned more often by:

- residents born after 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- residents for six to ten years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

“Evening” is selected more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents working for a public entity
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- households without children
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often

***How about over the summer....***

***What would be the best time during the day for you or members of your household to participate in programs at a recreation center – early morning, mid-morning, lunchtime, early afternoon, late afternoon, or evening?***

Twenty-four percent cite “early mornings” while 19% percent prefer “late afternoons.”

EARLY MORNING . . . . .	24%
MID-MORNING . . . . .	16%
LUNCHTIME. . . . .	4%
EARLY AFTERNOON. . . . .	10%
LATE AFTERNOON . . . . .	19%
EVENING . . . . .	18%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	9%

“Early morning” is cited more often by:

- homeowners
- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- households without children
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

“Mid-morning” is preferred most frequently by:

- homeowners
- households with children
- women
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks

- Whites

“Early afternoon” is posted at a higher rate by:

- self-employed residents
- households with children
- men

“Late afternoon” is mentioned more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- men
- residents for six to ten years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly and monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

“Evening” is selected more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents working for a public entity
- residents born after 1980
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- households without children
- non-binary residents
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks or regional parks often

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Recreation Centers receive very high grades from their visitors. Twenty-eight percent of the sample report using a Center during the past two years for recreational purposes. Fifty-three percent of recent users come to a Center at least weekly; thirty-four percent visit at least monthly but not as often as weekly; and, 13% percent less often. An extremely high 94% rate the quality of Recreation Centers highly – either “excellent” or “good.” Only six percent are more critical in their evaluations.

Fifty-nine percent, an increase of 14% since 2015, report participating in INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center, such as basketball, music lessons, tumbling, pottery, yoga, and pre-school. Youth sports are by far the most popular offering drawing 38% of program participants. Health and fitness, at 19%; preschool programs, at seventeen percent; and adult hobby and enrichment

programs at eight percent, account for most of the rest of indicated activities. A near unanimous 96% rate the INSIDE programs as either “excellent” or “good.”

Fifty-six percent cite participating in OUTSIDE programs at a Recreation Center, such as baseball, soccer, tennis lessons, geocaching, archery and neighborhood festivals. Youth sports, at 48%, and adult sports, at 22%, are the main draws. Events, at fifteen percent and fitness at eight percent together account for much of the remaining participation. An impressive 92% rate the OUTSIDE programs as “excellent” or “good,” while eight percent are more critical in their evaluations.

When considering the best time for their household to participate in programs at a recreation center, no clear consensus emerges. “Late afternoons” and “early mornings” are preferred between 19% and 25% of the sample for both during the school year and over the summer.

# **Chapter Four: Getting to a Park**

# Getting to a Park

The survey focused on the modes of transportation used by residents to get to a Minneapolis Park.

## Modes of Transportation

Respondents were asked:

*For each of the following ways to get to a Minneapolis Park, please tell me if you or members of your household use it.*

### *Automobile?*

Seventy-four percent report using an automobile to get to a Minneapolis park.

	2019	2022
YES .....	58%..	74%
NO .....	42%..	26%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%...	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- residents working for a public entity
- residents working for a business or corporation
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- Hispanics

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for five years or less
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

***Bicycle?***

Fifty-four percent report using a bicycle to get to a Minneapolis park.

	2019	2022
YES .....	51%..	54%
NO .....	49%..	46%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%..	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hispanics

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- households without children
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks or regional parks often
- Black and African Americans
- East African and Somalis

***Rideshare, such as Uber or Lyft.***

Four percent report using a rideshare service to get to a Minneapolis park.

	2019	2022
YES .....	2%..	4%
NO .....	98%..	96%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%..	0%

“Yes” is cited at a higher rate by:

- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents who don’t visit regional parks often

***School District bus?***

Four percent report using a school district bus to get to a Minneapolis park.

	2019	2022
YES .....	4%..	4%
NO .....	96%..	96%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%..	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- self-employed residents
- residents born after 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- Hispanics

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- households without children
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans
- Whites

***Public transportation, such as Metro Transit or a Light Rail Line?***

Seven percent report using public transportation to get to a Minneapolis park.

YES	14%	7%
NO	86%	93%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.	0%	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- renters
- residents born after 1980
- women
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- Recreation Center users

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- homeowners
- men
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

***Metro Mobility?***

Three percent report using Metro Mobility to get to a Minneapolis park.

YES	2%	3%
NO	97%	97%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.	1%	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- homeowners
- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- Whites

“No” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- renters
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- residents for five years or less
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

***Walk?***

Fifty-six percent report walking to a Minneapolis park.

	2019	2022
YES .....	74%..	56%
NO .....	26%..	44%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%..	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1965
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- men
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Black and African Americans

***Scooter or bike share?***

Twenty-three percent report using a scooter or bike share service.

YES .....	23%
NO .....	77%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks

“No” is stated most frequently by:

- retirees
- residents born before 1964
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- East African and Somalis

For those indicating they only used an automobile to get to a Minneapolis Park, a follow-up question was asked:

***What is the primary reason you only use an automobile to get to a Minneapolis Park?***

Three reasons account for 79% of responses: "rising crime," "convenient" and "distance."

AGE/HEALTH . . . . .	7%
DISTANCE . . . . .	16%
EASIER WITH CHILDREN. . . . .	9%
RISING CRIME . . . . .	36%
CONVENIENT. . . . .	27%
BRING EQUIPMENT . . . . .	5%

"Rising crime" is stated more often by:

- residents born before 1946
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

"Convenient" is posted more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents for five years or less
- Hispanics

"Distance" is indicated most frequently by:

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to regional parks

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Three modes of transportation are the primary methods of getting to a Minneapolis park: "automobile," at 74%; "walk," at 56%; and finally, "bicycle," at fifty-four percent. Public transportation options are used by much smaller segments of residents.

# **Chapter Five: Facilities and Offerings**

# Facilities and Offerings

Residents were initially asked about the frequency of their use, if at all, of two different types of parks. Finally, they were asked about the adequacy of existing park and recreation facilities.

## Frequency of Use

*How often do you visit a neighborhood park – daily, two to three times a week, weekly, two to three times a month, monthly, less often, or never?*

The typical Minneapolis resident visits a neighborhood park about three times a month.

	2019	2022
DAILY . . . . .	12% . . .	7%
2 TO 3 TIMES A WEEK . . . . .	26% . .	16%
WEEKLY . . . . .	16% . .	14%
2 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH . . . . .	12% . .	15%
MONTHLY . . . . .	9% . .	10%
LESS OFTEN . . . . .	17% . .	26%
NEVER . . . . .	7% . .	13%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0% . . .	0%

But 39% of residents rarely visit a neighborhood park.

“Daily” is indicated more often by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- renters
- residents born after 1980
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Two to three times a week” is indicated more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- self-employed residents
- residents born after 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to regional parks

“Two to three times a month” is stated more frequently by:

- residents born after 1980
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- East African and Somalis

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- self-employed residents
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- monthly visitors to regional parks

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- households without children
- residents for over twenty three years
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often
- Black and African Americans

“Never” is stated more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- households without children
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often

***How often do you visit a regional park – daily, two to three times a week, weekly, two to three times a month, monthly, less often, or never?***

The typical Minneapolis resident visits a regional park a few times a year.

	2019	2022
DAILY . . . . .	1% . . .	2%
2 TO 3 TIMES A WEEK . . . . .	4% . . .	6%
WEEKLY . . . . .	3% . . .	7%
2 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH . . . . .	12% . .	13%
MONTHLY . . . . .	19% . .	11%
LESS OFTEN . . . . .	41% . .	50%
NEVER . . . . .	21% . .	12%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0% . . .	0%

Fifteen percent report visiting at least on a weekly basis.

“Two to three times a week” is indicated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- self-employed residents
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- non-binary residents
- residents for five years or less
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Whites

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- Whites

“Two to three times a month” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for six to ten years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly or monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Whites

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for six to ten years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans

“Never” is reported more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- men
- residents for five years or less
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- East African and Somalis

## **Meet Needs of Household**

All respondents were asked:

*In general, do you feel existing parks and recreation facilities offered by the Park Board meet the needs of your household?*

Eighty-nine percent believe existing park and recreation facilities offered by the Park Board meet the needs of their households.

	2015	2019	2022
YES .....	95%	97%	89%
NO .....	2%	3%	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%	1%	8%

Only three percent disagree.

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1965
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for eleven to twenty years

- Recreation Center users
- weekly and monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

The very few residents indicating their needs are not being met were asked:

*What do you feel is missing?*

UNSURE . . . . .	15%
MORE DOG PARKS . . . . .	8%
YOUTH ACTIVITIES . . . . .	31%
NOT HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE. . . . .	15%
YOUTH SPORTS. . . . .	8%
SENIOR PROGRAMS . . . . .	8%
NOT ENOUGH FREE OFFERINGS . . . . .	8%
NEW PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT . . . . .	8%

There are no statistically significant differences.

---

**Summary and  
Conclusions**

---

All Minneapolis respondents were asked about their use of neighborhood and regional parks in the city. Avid users of neighborhood parks – more than once per week – was 23%. Thirteen percent indicate they have never visited a neighborhood park. Regional park visitors are more infrequent in their use, 13% state they use this type of park at least weekly. However, this is almost double the amount of high frequency users from 2019. Twelve percent report they have never visited a regional park. A very high 89% feel existing park and recreation facilities meet the needs of their households; only three percent disagree. And, among this small subgroup of three percent, not one recommendation garners more than one-quarter of a percent.

# **Chapter Six: Barriers to Use**

# Barriers to Use

Minneapolis residents were next asked about limiting factors which decrease their household’s use of facilities and programming in the Minneapolis Park System. The factors range from lack of transportation and inconvenient times and hours.

## Considerations

Respondents were instructed:

*To what extent does each of the following considerations limit your household’s use of Minneapolis public parks and trails and participation in Minneapolis recreation activities and programs - would you say it limits you a lot, somewhat, or not at all?*

They were then read a list of fourteen potentially limiting factors:

*Lack of transportation?*

Four percent view “lack of transportation” as limiting them “a lot.” This factor ranks 10<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	5%	6%	4%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	15%	13%	8%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	81%	81%	88%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

An additional 8% see the lack of transportation as “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents currently not working

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- self-employed residents
- residents currently not working
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households

- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Hmong

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- residents working for a public entity
- residents working for a business or corporation
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Whites

***Cost of programs and equipment?***

Ten percent regard the “cost of programs and equipment” as a serious limit on their use of Park System facilities and programming. This factor ranks 3<sup>rd</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	4%	6%	10%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	16%	20%	34%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	79%	73%	56%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%	1%	0%

Thirty-four percent view it as “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents currently not working
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- East African and Somalis

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents working for a business or corporation
- households with children
- non-binary residents
- residents for six to ten years
- monthly visitors to regional parks

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- homeowners
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- households without children
- men
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

***Facilities are not suited to my needs?***

Five percent are limited “a lot” by facilities not being suited to their needs. This factor ranks fifth out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	6%	6%	5%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	15%	18%	24%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	79%	76%	71%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Twenty-four percent are “somewhat” limited by this factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- residents for over thirty years

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks

***Language barriers?***

Three percent see language barriers as a serious limiting factor. This factor ranks 9<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	2%	8%	3%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	10%	10%	12%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	87%	82%	85%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Twelve percent find language barriers “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is cited most frequently by:

- East African and Somalis

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for five years or less
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- East African and Somalis

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- homeowners
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Black and African Americans
- Whites

***Lack of information about facilities and programs?***

Eighteen percent say a lack of information significantly limits their use of Park System facilities and programming. This obstacle ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	6%	12%	18%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	20%	30%	30%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	74%	58%	51%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Another 30% see the lack of information as “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Five and Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- households without children
- men
- residents for over twenty years
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- residents for five years or less
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- self-employed residents
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- residents for six to ten years
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- Whites

***Cultural beliefs and restrictions?***

Only two percent report cultural beliefs and restrictions are serious obstacles to greater use of facilities and programming. This factor ranks 8<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2022</b>
A LOT . . . . .	3%	3%	2%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	9%	9%	14%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	87%	88%	82%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	2%

An additional fourteen percent see this factor as “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is indicated more often by:

- East African and Somalis

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- East African and Somalis

“Not at all” is selected most often by:

- Whites

***Concern about personal safety?***

Twenty-six percent think concerns about personal safety significantly limit their use of Park System facilities and programming. This factor ranks 1<sup>st</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	7%	14%	26%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	15%	26%	30%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	78%	59%	43%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Another 30% regard public safety as a secondary limiting factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- homeowners
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for five years or less
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Whites

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District One and Three residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- residents for six to ten years

***Lack of companion – no one to do things with?***

Twelve percent think the lack of a companion limits their recreation activities “a lot.” This factor ranks 4<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	4%	7%	12%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	17%	20%	21%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	79%	74%	67%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

An additional 21% think having no one to do things with is a secondary factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- households without children
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- households without children
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- self-employed residents
- residents born before 1946
- households with children
- residents for six to ten years
- residents for over thirty years
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- East African and Somalis

***Don't feel welcome by other park users?***

One percent report feeling unwelcome by other park users significantly impact their use of Park System facilities and programming. This concern ranks 11<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	3%	5%	1%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	10%	13%	8%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	87%	81%	91%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	0%	0%	0%

An additional eight percent regard it as “somewhat” of a limit.

“A lot” is cited more often by:

- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents currently not working
- residents for over twenty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents for six to twenty years

***Don't feel welcome by park staff?***

Only one percent are significantly and negatively impacted by feeling unwelcome by park staff. This factor ranks tied for 13<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	4%	1%	1%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	6%	8%	5%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	89%	91%	93%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . . 0% . . 0% . . . 0%

Another five percent see it as a secondary limiting factor.

“A lot” is mentioned more often by:

- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner Districts One and Three residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents for six to ten years

***Park staff doesn't look like me?***

Only one percent indicated “park staff doesn't look like me” as a serious limiting factor. This concern ranks 12<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	1% . . .	1%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	4% . . .	7%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	96% . .	92%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0% . . .	0%

An additional 7% report this as “somewhat” limiting.

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- residents currently not working
- residents born after 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- residents for five years or less
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don't visit regional parks often

- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- East African and Somalis

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- Whites

***Facilities are not physically accessible to me?***

Two percent see “physical inaccessibility” as a serious limiting factor. This concern ranks tied for 13<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	7%	3%	2%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	13%	7%	4%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	79%	89%	94%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

An additional 4% report this as “somewhat” limiting.

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- residents for five years or less
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

***Inconvenient hours of operation?***

Three percent see inconvenient hours of operation as a significant limiting factor. It ranks 7<sup>th</sup> on the list of 14 concerns.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	9%	11%	3%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	24%	14%	19%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	67%	73%	78%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%	0%	0%

Another 19% view inconvenient hours as a contributing factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- non-binary residents
- Hmong

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- self-employed residents
- women
- residents for six to ten years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- men
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks and regional parks often

***Inconvenient times of programs or activities?***

Five percent think inconvenient times of programs or activities limit their participation “a lot.” This factor ranks 6<sup>th</sup> out of 14.

	2015	2019	2022
A LOT . . . . .	8%	13%	5%
SOMEWHAT . . . . .	24%	14%	21%
NOT AT ALL . . . . .	68%	73%	74%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%	0%	0%

Twenty-one percent see scheduling as “somewhat” limiting their participation.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Hmong

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- renters
- residents working for a business or corporation
- women
- residents for six to ten years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- households without children
- men
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood and regional parks often

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

The two key limiting factors on the use of Park System facilities and programming are: “lack of information” and “personal safety.” These factors can be addressed by MPRB. As communication with residents has evolved into more electronic methods, MPRB is faced with the same challenges as public entities are facing. Electronic methods require the consumer of information to be proactive and seek information. In reality, residents only use electronic methods to seek specific information when needed. The concern of personal safety could be a spillover concern about crime in Minneapolis as a whole. MPRB should be sharing crime statistics in the park system with residents to help assuage these concerns.

One tier of limiting factors is also directly within the control of programming decisions: “inconvenient hours of operation” and “inconvenient program times.” Further data-gathering will be needed to match programs and operating hours with activities to offer. Of course, it makes no sense to offer expanded hours and programming to insufficient numbers to justify costs. But, identifying potential demand clusters by activity and location could provide a sound starting point.

Another tier of limiting factors is composed of “lack of companion,” “cost of programs and equipment,” “lack of transportation,” “language barriers,” and “facilities are not suited to my need.” Some of these barriers can be directly approached by MPRB through programs offering residents opportunities to meet and socialize, and perhaps even share equipment and transportation.

# **Chapter Seven: Importance of Park Services**

# Importance of Park Services

Minneapolis residents were asked to rate the importance of current programs and activities provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. In only three of the programs or activities tested did the ratings of “very important” and “somewhat important” fall below 80%. As a result, since it shows greater variation, importance rankings will be based only on “very important” ratings.

## Importance of Services

Respondents were instructed:

*I would like to read you a list of current programs and activities provided by the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board. For each one, please tell me how important you think that service is to the community -- very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important. If you have no opinion about a particular service, just say so....*

A list of eleven programs or activities was then read:

*Youth sports programs?*

Seventy-four percent rate youth sports programs as “very important.” This program ranks first on the list of 11.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	73%	76%	74%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	24%	17%	23%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	2%	5%	3%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	1%	1%	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%	0%

Overall, 97% consider this offering to be at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- homeowners
- households with children

*Youth technology programs?*

Forty-eight percent rate youth technology programs as “very important.” This program ranks 7<sup>th</sup> on the list of 11.

VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	48%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	31%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	13%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	2%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%

Overall, 79% consider this offering to be at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hmong

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- renters
- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

*Youth non-sports programs?*

Fifty-three percent regard youth non-sports programs to be “very important.” This program rank 4<sup>th</sup> on the list of 11.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	66%	70%..	53%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	29%	24%..	37%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	4%	4%..	9%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	1%	1%..	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	0%..	1%

Ninety percent rate this offering at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1965
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Hispanics

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner Districts Two and Six residents
- residents in the North and Southeast Service Area
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans

***Adult sports programs?***

Forty-two percent rate adult sports programs as “very important.” This program ranks 9<sup>th</sup> out of 11.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	38%	37%..	42%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	43%	41%..	47%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	14%	15%..	12%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	4%	6%..	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	1%..	0%

Eighty-nine percent rate adult sport programs as at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Three residents

- residents in the South Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood and regional parks often
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

***Adult non-sports programs?***

Twenty-seven percent regard adult non-sports programs as “very important.” This program ranks 11<sup>th</sup> out of 11 on the list.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	36%	33%..	27%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	40%	45%..	54%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	17%	15%..	18%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	6%	6%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	1%..	1%

Eighty-one percent rate adult non-sports programs as either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often

***Programs that appeal to adults over 65?***

Forty-two percent rate senior programs as “very important.” This program ranks 10<sup>th</sup> out of 11 on the list.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	52%	40%..	42%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	33%	38%..	43%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	8%	14%..	8%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	6%	5%..	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	3%..	6%

A total of 85% rate senior programs at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Programs for people with disabilities?***

Forty-nine percent think programs for people with disabilities is “very important.” This service ranks sixth out of 11 on the list.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	51%	50%..	49%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	38%	37%..	41%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	8%	9%..	6%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	2%	2%..	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	2%..	4%

A total of 90% regard programs for people with disabilities to be at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Multi/inter-generational programming?***

Forty-four percent regard multi/inter-generational programming as “very important.” This type of programming ranks 8<sup>th</sup> out of 11 on the list.

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	33%	47%..	44%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	46%	37%..	36%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	18%	11%..	15%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	2%	2%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	3%..	4%

Overall, 80% see multi/inter-generational programming as either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- Hispanics

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans
- Whites

***Community events?***

Sixty-five percent see community events as “very important.” These offerings ranks second on the list of 11.

	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	71%..	65%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	20%..	27%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	8%..	7%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	1%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%..	0%

Ninety-two percent regard community events as either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- Black and African Americans
- Whites

***After-school programs?***

Sixty-four percent rate after-school programs as “very important.” These activities rank third on the list of 11.

VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	68%..	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	26%..	29%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	4%..	4%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	1%..	1%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%..	1%

Ninety-three percent, though, think these activities are at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- households with children

- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- Whites

*Nature-based programs?*

Fifty-two percent rate after nature-based programs as “very important.” These programs rank 5th on the list of 11.

VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	52%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	39%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	8%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	1%

Ninety-one percent, though, think these activities are at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Hmong

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often
- East African and Somalis

---

**Importance of Police Protection**

---

Residents were then asked:

*How important is it to provide police protection in the parks – is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?*

Fifty-six percent rate the provision of police protection in the parks as “very important.”

	2015	2019	2022
VERY IMPORTANT . . . . .	72%	51%..	56%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT . . . . .	22%	28%..	39%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT . . . . .	5%	11%..	4%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT . . . . .	1%	9%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	0%	1%..	1%

Ninety-five percent consider the provision of police protection in the parks to be either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is reported more frequently by:

- retirees
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- Hispanics

---

## Satisfaction with Programs and Activities

---

Residents were asked their overall satisfaction with current programs and activities:

*Overall, are you very satisfied with current programs and activities offered by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?*

An extraordinary 90% report satisfaction.

	2019	2022
VERY SATISFIED . . . . .	60%..	34%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED. . . . .	35%..	56%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED . . . . .	2%..	2%
VERY DISSATISFIED . . . . .	0%..	0%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	3%..	8%

Satisfaction is higher among:

- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- self-employed residents
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly and monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks

It is lower among:

- renters
- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often
- Hmong

The very small number of residents expressing dissatisfaction were asked:

*Why do you feel that way?*

NOT ENOUGH FOR YOUTH. . . . .	18%
NOT HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE . . . . .	27%
MORE NATURE PROGRAMS . . . . .	18%
MORE FOR SENIORS . . . . .	18%
FEES TOO HIGH . . . . .	18%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

By far, the most important programming provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is youth sports programs, considered “very important” by 74% of the sample. A second programming tier includes community events, at 65%; after-school programs, at 64%; and youth non-sports programs, at 53%. The key audiences are programs for youth and their families.

Public safety services are also ranked highly. Providing police protection in the parks is viewed as “very important” by 56%, and nature-based programs is similarly rated by 52%.

A very high 90% are satisfied with current programs and activities offered by MPRB; only two percent express dissatisfaction. And, among this small subgroup of two percent, no one recommendation garners more than one-third of a percent.

# **Chapter Eight: Revenue Generation**

# Revenue Generation

Minneapolis residents were asked about ways to generate additional revenue for the Park and Recreation System in light of growing budget challenges. These options range from fee increases to naming rights. In every case, a majority favors that approach.

---

## Revenue Generation

---

Respondents were instructed:

*In times of limited resources, the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board are looking to be efficient with these resources. Some people have suggested the Park System set fees for the use of several currently free services, increase fees for services already paid for by participants, or offer other revenue-generating services. For each of the following proposals, please tell me if you would strongly support it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose it. If you have no opinion, just say so....*

A list of five potential revenue sources was then read:

*Increase all adult recreation fees so the cost of programs and services is fully paid for by the fees charged?*

By a 67%-28% majority, residents favor increasing adult recreation fees to cover the total cost of those programs or services.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT . . . . .	25%	28%	36%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	49%	36%	31%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	18%	18%	17%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	5%	14%	11%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	2%	4%	5%

Intense support outnumber intense opposition by more than three-to-one.

Support increases among:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- weekly visitors to regional parks

- Hispanics
- Hmong

It decreases among:

- residents for five years or less
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- East African and Somalis

***Impose fees for youth recreation programs and services based upon their ability to pay?***

By a 58%-40% majority, interviewees favor imposing fees for youth recreation programs and services based upon the ability to pay.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT . . . . .	39%	31%	25%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	38%	37%	33%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	16%	16%	16%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	6%	15%	24%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%	1%	1%

Intense support and opposition are equal.

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- residents in the Downtown Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

Opposition increases among:

- Commissioner Districts Three and Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- residents for six to ten years
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Adding additional concession stands, vendors and rental opportunities?***

By an 81%-17% majority, residents support adding additional concession stands, vendors and rental opportunities.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT .....	39%	44%	46%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	49%	39%	35%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE .....	10%	9%	12%
STRONGLY OPPOSE.....	1%	6%	5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED .....	1%	1%	2%

Support increases among:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Hmong

It decreases among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often

***Increase corporate sponsorship opportunities to help offset the cost of programs and/or facilities, for example Minnesota Zoo's World of Birds Show, sponsored by Wings Financial?***

While 83% support increasing corporate sponsorship opportunities to help offset the cost of programs and/or facilities, 11% oppose it.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT .....	41%	51%	45%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	46%	33%	38%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE .....	10%	11%	9%
STRONGLY OPPOSE.....	3%	2%	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED .....	1%	4%	6%

Support increases among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- Hispanics

It decreases among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

***Allow organizations or individuals to purchase naming rights for Park Board properties, for example the McCormick Tribune Ice Rink in Chicago's Millennium Park?***

By an 78%-12% majority, residents support allowing organizations of individuals to purchase naming rights for Park Board properties.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT . . . . .	30%	44%	39%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	52%	31%	39%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	13%	12%	9%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	3%	6%	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	2%	8%	10%

Support increases among:

- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- households without children
- Recreation Center users
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities

It decreases among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents born before 1946
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Each of the revenue generators tested in this survey drew majorities in its favor, with small percentages in opposition. The top three proposals show at least 78% majorities in favor and opposition below 20%. Changes in fees for youth recreation programs and services drew a majority of 58%, but opposition rose to the forty percent.

# **Chapter Nine: Volunteer Opportunities**

# Volunteer Opportunities

Minneapolis residents were asked a series of questions about volunteer opportunities.

## Increase the Number of Volunteer Opportunities

*Volunteers are an important part of the Minneapolis Park system including youth athletic coaches and caring for natural areas.*

*Do you think the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board should increase the number of volunteer opportunities? Do you feel strongly that way?*

Only sixteen support the Board increasing the number of volunteer opportunities, while a majority, 57% oppose.

STRONGLY SUPPORT	.6%
SUPPORT	10%
OPPOSE	46%
STRONGLY OPPOSE	11%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	27%

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- East African and Somalis

It is lower among:

- Commissioner Districts Five and Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents born before 1946
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- households without children

- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

Those in support of the Board increasing the number of volunteer opportunities were asked two follow-up questions.

***What kind of additional volunteer opportunities would you like to see offered?***

Only two opportunities were suggested by more than ten percent: “park maintenance” at 20% and “enrichment instructors” at 11%.

UNSURE . . . . .	13%
LANGUAGE TRANSLATORS . . . . .	3%
GREETERS/INFORMATION DESK . . . . .	9%
FLYERS/SIGN DELIVERY . . . . .	3%
COACHES . . . . .	8%
PARK MAINTENANCE . . . . .	20%
ENRICHMENT INSTRUCTORS . . . . .	11%
EVENTS STAFF . . . . .	4%
PLAYGROUND ASSISTANTS . . . . .	5%
SECURITY . . . . .	6%
LANDSCAPING/GARDENING . . . . .	5%
YOUTH MENTORS . . . . .	5%
TUTORS . . . . .	6%
SCATTERED . . . . .	2%

“Park maintenance” is cited at a higher rate by:

- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Enrichment instructors” is mentioned by:

- residents currently not working
- Recreation Center users

***Would you be willing to volunteer for the Minneapolis Park system? How many hours per week would you be willing to volunteer?***

Overall, only about eight percent would be willing to volunteer for the Minneapolis Park system.

NO .....	33%
YES/ONE TO TWO HOURS.....	35%
YES/THREE TO FOUR HOURS.....	10%
YES/FIVE HOURS OR MORE .....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	20%

“No” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District Three residents
- renters
- residents currently not working
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- East African and Somalis

“Yes/one to two Hours” is cited most frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Only sixteen percent of the sample support the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board increasing the number of volunteer opportunities. A majority, 57%, oppose such action. Among the sixteen percent, only two items: “park maintenance” and “enrichment instructors” post over 1% of the overall sample. Only eight percent indicate they would be willing to volunteer hours with the Minneapolis Park system.

# **Chapter Ten: Taxes and Funding**

# Taxes and Funding

Respondents were asked a series of questions about taxing and funding issues. Support for more financial investment in programs was ascertained. Knowledge about the current share of property taxes going to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System was examined. Support for a property tax increase to either maintain or enhance was ascertained. Finally, the value of services provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System was judged in terms of the property taxes paid for their offerings.

## Percentage of Taxes

Respondents were initially asked:

*About what percent of the property taxes you pay goes to the operation of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System?*

The typical – or median - response is four percent.

:

	2015	2019	2022
LESS THAN ONE PERCENT . . . . .	3%	3%	5%
1 TO 2 PERCENT . . . . .	12%	12%	16%
3 TO 4 PERCENT . . . . .	21%	22%	22%
5 TO 7 PERCENT . . . . .	22%	17%	19%
8 TO 10 PERCENT . . . . .	13%	8%	7%
MORE THAN 10 PERCENT . . . . .	8%	2%	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	21%	36%	25%

While 25% are unable to answer this question, 62% underestimate the actual amount of eight percent. Before proceeding further, respondents were informed of the actual percentage.

“One to two percent” is stated more often by:

- Commissioner District Two residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

“Three to four percent” is cited more frequently by:

- homeowners
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks

“Five to seven percent” is mentioned more often by:

- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- over \$50,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Eight to ten percent” is selected more frequently by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents who don’t visit neighborhood parks often

“Over ten percent” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- homeowners
- residents for over thirty years
- East African and Somalis

---

## Value of Services for Taxes Paid

---

Respondents were asked:

*When you consider the property taxes you pay and the quality of the infrastructure, programs and services provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation system, how would you rate that value -- is it an excellent value, a good value, an only fair value, or a poor value?*

Sixty-nine percent view their received value as “excellent” or “good.”

	2015	2019	2022
EXCELLENT. . . . .	19%	18%	8%
GOOD . . . . .	67%	60%	61%
ONLY FAIR. . . . .	10%	9%	16%
POOR . . . . .	0%	1%	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	3%	12%	15%

Sixteen regard it as “only fair.”

Ratings increase among:

- Commissioner District Four residents
- homeowners
- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

They decrease among:

- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

## **Tax Increase to Maintain**

Minneapolis residents were asked:

*Would you support or oppose a property tax increase to maintain Minneapolis Park and Recreation System infrastructure, programs and services at their present levels? Do you feel strongly that way?*

By an 82%-5% majority, respondents support a property tax increase to maintain the System.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT . . . . .	19%	23%	17%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	57%	46%	65%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	8%	6%	2%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	3%	2%	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	12%	22%	14%

Intense support is almost six times higher than intense opposition.

Support is higher among:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly and monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

It is lower among:

- retirees
- residents for over thirty years
- Black and African Americans

The small subsample of opponents was asked a follow-up question:

***What programs and services would you be willing to see cut?***

Thirty-six percent advise cuts to “administration.”

UNSURE . . . . .	12%
NONE . . . . .	8%
ADULT EDUCATION. . . . .	12%
COMMUNITY EVENTS. . . . .	4%
ACROSS THE BOARD . . . . .	16%
ADMINISTRATION . . . . .	36%
ADULT SPORTS. . . . .	12%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

## **Tax Increase to Enhance**

Next, residents were asked about a property tax increase to enhance System services:

***Would you support or oppose a property tax increase to enhance Minneapolis Park and Recreation System programs and services? Do you feel strongly that way?***

By a 17%-54% verdict, residents oppose this type of property tax increase.

	2015	2019	2022
STRONGLY SUPPORT . . . . .	8%	12%	8%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT. . . . .	16%	29%	9%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	51%	22%	43%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	9%	10%	11%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. . . . .	17%	27%	29%

Support increases among:

- residents working for a public entity
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users

- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- East African and Somalis

It decreases among:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- homeowners
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives
- Whites

Supporters were asked a follow-up query:

***What Minneapolis Park and Recreation System programs and services would you like to see enhanced?***

Only two programs, “youth programs” and “nature-based programs” received greater than single digit support.

UNSURE . . . . .	27%
YOUTH PROGRAMS . . . . .	17%
ADULT SPORTS . . . . .	3%
FREE EVENTS . . . . .	8%
MORE POLICE PATROLS . . . . .	3%
SOCIAL SERVICES . . . . .	3%
NATURE BASED PROGRAMS . . . . .	14%
MORE FOR DISABLED . . . . .	5%
SWIMMING LESSONS . . . . .	4%
SENIOR PROGRAMS . . . . .	3%
INDOOR WINTER PROGRAMS . . . . .	3%
YOUTH SPORTS . . . . .	3%
LOWER FEES . . . . .	4%
SCATTERED . . . . .	3%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

---

## Parkways

---

Residents were asked a couple of questions about parkways in the City of Minneapolis.

***Do you live on or regularly use parkways in the City of Minneapolis?***

Forty-one percent report they live on or regularly use parkways.

YES	41%
NO	59%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

“Yes” is reported more often by:

- residents working for a public entity
- residents working for a business or corporation
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- Whites

“No” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- retirees
- residents born before 1946
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***There are approximately 55 miles of parkways in the Minneapolis Park system. Maintenance and construction of parkways are supported by the City of Minneapolis property taxes.***

***Would you support or oppose a property tax increase to improve the condition of parkways? Do you feel strongly that way?***

Fifty-six percent support a property tax increase to improve the condition of parkways. Only twenty-five percent oppose, while a high 19% express uncertainty.

STRONGLY SUPPORT	10%
SUPPORT	46%
OPPOSE	19%
STRONGLY OPPOSE	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	19%

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- Recreation Center users
- weekly visitors to neighborhood parks and regional parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents in the South Service Area
- residents currently not working
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often

## **Stormwater Fees**

Residents were asked about stormwater fees:

*Monthly utility bills include a stormwater fee for each household.*

*About what percent of the stormwater fees collected in Minneapolis goes to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to improve and monitor water quality in Minneapolis lakes and creeks?*

The typical resident estimated about four percent of stormwater fees collected going to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, more than double the actual percentage.

LESS THAN ONE PERCENT . . . . .	10%
ONE TO TWO PERCENT . . . . .	27%
THREE TO FOUR PERCENT . . . . .	25%
FIVE TO SEVEN PERCENT . . . . .	13%
EIGHT TO TEN PERCENT . . . . .	3%
MORE THAN TEN PERCENT . . . . .	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	22%

“Less than one percent” is cited more often by:

- Commissioner Districts Three and Six residents
- residents in the Northeast and Downtown Service Area
- homeowners
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood parks often
- Whites

“One to two percent” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- self-employed residents
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Three to four percent” is indicated most frequently by:

- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks

“Five to seven percent” is stated at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents working for a public entity
- \$50,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

*For your information, the actual percentage is about 1.6 percent of the total stormwater fees collected or 1.6 cents out of every dollar. The average household pays about \$14.00 a month in stormwater fees.*

*How much would you be willing to increase stormwater fees per household per month for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to improve and monitor water quality in Minneapolis lakes and creeks?*

Only sixteen percent stated they would not be willing increase their stormwater fees to improve and monitor water quality. The typically resident would be willing to pay an additional dollar a month for this purpose.

NOTHING . . . . .	16%
50 CENTS . . . . .	24%
\$1.00 . . . . .	32%
\$1.50 . . . . .	13%
\$2.00 . . . . .	3%
MORE THAN \$2.00 . . . . .	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	10%

“Nothing” is reported more by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- residents currently not working
- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents who don't visit neighborhood and regional parks often
- East African and Somalis

“50 cents” is selected most frequently by:

- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- monthly visitors to regional parks

“\$1.00” is cited more often by:

- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents for over thirty years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“\$1.50” is mentioned more often by:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to regional parks

***Stormwater carries pollutants and trash to lakes and creeks from streets and other sources across the city. It is the top source of pollution for Minneapolis lakes and creeks.***

***Knowing this would you still oppose an increase to stormwater fees in Minneapolis?***

Of the sixteen percent indicating they would not support an increase to their stormwater fees, 41% indicated they would still oppose the increase after the statement was read.

YES	.....	41%
NO	.....	53%
UNSURE	.....	6%

“Yes” is posted more often by:

- women
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“No” is cited most frequently by:

- men

## **Endowment Program**

Residents were asked about four potential endowments which could be created to benefit the Minneapolis Park and Recreation system.

*In times of limited resources, the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board are looking to be efficient with these resources. Some people have suggested the Park System lead the establishment of an endowment program supported by donations. The funds would be used to support aspects of the system above and beyond what property taxes can fund. This funding source would provide an opportunity for residents and non-residents to give back to the parks and provide a permanent source of funding. For each of the following proposals, please tell me if you would strongly support it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose it. If you have no opinion, just say so....*

*Creating an endowment to support protection and maintenance of natural areas, such as the Eloise Wildflower Garden, invasive species removal, and habitat enhancement?*

Seventy-two percent support this endowment, while only 21% oppose its creation. Strong support outpaces strong opposition by a better than five to one ration.

STRONG SUPPORT .....	33%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT .....	39%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE .....	15%
STRONGLY OPPOSE .....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED .....	7%

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- self-employed residents
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- women
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- Black and African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Creating an endowment to support creating and implement climate resilience initiatives, such as wetland and flood storage creation, creek and stream capacity enhancement, flood proofing roads and trails, mitigating urban heat islands and solar energy projects?***

Seventy-one percent support this endowment, while only 24% oppose its creation. Strong support outpaces strong opposition by a better than four to one.

STRONG SUPPORT . . . . .	34%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	37%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	16%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	5%

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Black and African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents for five years or less
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Creating an endowment to support improvements to regional park facilities, such as regional trails, restrooms, playgrounds and beachers?***

Sixty-eight percent support this endowment, while 27% oppose its creation. Strong support outpaces strong opposition by a better than three to one ratio.

STRONG SUPPORT . . . . .	35%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	33%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	17%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	6%

Support is higher among:

- residents working for a public entity
- self-employed residents
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Black and African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

***Creating an endowment to support rehabilitation of historic assets such as Lake Harriet Bandshell, Minnehaha Falls walls and stairs, and the Chalet at Wirth Park?***

Seventy-four percent support this endowment, while only 23% oppose its creation. Strong support outpaces strong opposition by a better than four to one.

STRONG SUPPORT . . . . .	39%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT . . . . .	35%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE . . . . .	14%
STRONGLY OPPOSE . . . . .	9%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	3%

Support is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- residents working for a public entity
- retirees
- households with children

- residents for six to ten years
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don't visit regional parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Black and African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents for six to ten years
- residents who don't use Recreation Centers
- weekly visitors to regional parks
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

*How likely would you be to contribute to an endowment for a purpose you support – very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?*

Two-thirds of respondents indicate they would be likely to contribute to an endowment for a purpose they support.

VERY LIKELY . . . . .	31%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY . . . . .	35%
NOT TOO LIKELY . . . . .	21%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY . . . . .	7%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	7%

“Very likely” was stated more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- American Indian and Alaskan Natives

“Somewhat likely” was cited at a higher rate by:

- residents in the Southeast Service Area
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

“Not too likely” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Commissioner Districts Two and Five residents
- residents in the North Service Area
- retirees
- residents currently not working
- households without children
- residents who don’t use Recreation Centers
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often
- Asian and Pacific Islanders

“Not at all likely” was reported more often by:

- renters
- residents born after 1980
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for five years or less
- East African and Somalis

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Strong support, 82%, still exists for a property tax increase to maintain infrastructure, programs and services at their current level. At the same time support for a property tax increase to enhance services and programs, decreased from 41% in 2019 to 17% this year. The value of services received for property tax dollars is also very highly rated.

There is majority support, 56%, for a property tax increase to improve the condition of parkways in the City of Minneapolis. Seventy-four support at least a 50 cent a month increase to their stormwater fees to improve and monitor water quality in Minneapolis lakes and creeks.

Each of the potential endowment programs tested in this survey drew majorities in its favor, with small percentages in opposition. All four proposals show at least 68% majorities in favor and opposition below 27%. Two-thirds of residents indicate they would be likely to contribute to an endowment program for a purpose they support.

# **Chapter Eleven: Communications**

# Communications

Respondents were asked their preferred source of information.

## Preferred Source of Information

Interviewees were asked:

*How would you most prefer to receive information about Minneapolis Parks and its activities -- e-mail or government delivery subscription, Minneapolis Parks website, park publications and newsletters, videos, local neighborhood newspaper coverage, social media, radio, visiting or using a park facility?*

Three sources are preferred by 73% of the sample – “park publications and newsletters” at 40%; “e-mail/government delivery subscription” at 18%; and “MPRB website” at fifteen percent.

	2019	2022
E-MAIL/GOVERNMENT DELIVERY SUBSCRIPTION . . . . .	6%..	18%
MPRB WEBSITE. . . . .	14%..	15%
PUBLICATIONS/NEWSLETTERS. . . . .	35%..	40%
VIDEOS. . . . .	0%..	0%
LOCAL NEWSPAPERS . . . . .	6%..	10%
SOCIAL MEDIA . . . . .	14%..	11%
RADIO. . . . .	1%..	0%
VISITING/USING A PARK FACILITY . . . . .	12%..	4%
NONE . . . . .	10%..	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED . . . . .	1%..	0%

“MPRB website” is stated more often by:

- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- weekly visitors to neighborhood and regional parks
- Whites
- Hispanics

“E-mail/government delivery subscription” is cited more frequently by:

- residents in the South Service Area
- homeowners
- residents working for a public entity

- residents born between 1965 and 1980
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Recreation Center users
- monthly visitors to regional parks
- Whites

“Publications and newsletters” is mentioned more often by:

- Commissioner District One residents
- residents in the Northeast Service Area
- self-employed residents
- residents born between 1946 and 1964
- less \$25,000 annual income households
- residents for six to ten years
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- Whites

“Social media” is stated most frequently by:

- renters
- residents working for a business or corporation
- residents born after 1980
- \$25,000 to \$50,000 annual income households
- monthly visitors to neighborhood parks
- residents who don’t visit regional parks often
- residents who drive to MPRB parks and facilities
- Asian and Pacific Islanders
- Black and African Americans

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Preferred information sources reveal a multi-modal communications network. These networks combine publications and newsletters, social media, the MPRB website, and email. These four methods mentioned by 84% as their preferred communications channel, allows MPRB to focus on them to reach the broad general public with key messages.

# **Chapter Twelve: Key Findings and Implications**

## Key Findings and Implications

- The general ratings of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System remain consistently strong. In fact, they rank among the highest ratings for a park system across the Twin Cities metro area over the past three years. Key strengths continue to include variety of offerings and programs, the variety of locations and the extensive and well-maintained trail system. The only weaknesses, expressed by modest numbers, are maintenance and rising crime. An impressive 24% of residents are “boosters” and see nothing they dislike about the System. In line with most local governments, the survey does show a slippage in the intensity of positive ratings – a switch from “excellent” to “good” – has occurred due to the pandemic.
- In spite of the pandemic, recreation centers have a stable constituency; twenty-eight percent indicate using a recreation center during the past two years. The facilities are rated highly by all visitors; users divide into two overlapping groups: participants in inside programs and participants in outside programs. Virtually unanimity prevails in the very positive evaluations of both program types.
- Neighborhood parks continue to be used by a large segment of the population. However, there has been a 17% decline of respondents indicating they visit them on at least a weekly basis. At the same time, use of regional parks on a weekly basis almost doubled from 8% to 15%.
- The three primary modes of transportation to a Minneapolis park are walking, driving an automobile, and bicycling. There has been a large shift – walking declined by 18% while at the same time driving an automobile increased by 16%. Twenty-two percent of respondents indicate they only use an automobile to get to a Minneapolis Park – with over one-third indicating it is due to concerns about rising crime.
- The two major considerations limiting greater use of Minneapolis Park and Recreation facilities and programming are lack of information and personal safety – two barriers which can be directly impacted by the MPRB. Concern about personal safety increased as a limiting factor by sixteen percent over the past three years. There are other barriers, although not as compelling as the two previously cited, which could also be impacted by Park and Recreation staff: hours of operation and times of programs or activities and costs for programs and equipment.
- Three current programs or services are rated “very important” by at least 64% of the sample: youth sports programs, community events, and after-school programs. While all services tested were deemed at least somewhat important by at least 79%; these key offerings should be protected in decision-makers’ budget setting.

- Solid majorities of respondents are supportive of five revenue-generators for the Park System; in each case, at least 58% favor the approach. Three proposals are favored by over 78%: adding additional concession stands, increasing corporate sponsorship opportunities, and allowing organizations or individuals to purchase naming rights for Park Board properties.
- There is limited support for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board increasing the number of volunteer opportunities. In fact, a majority of residents oppose such action. Less than ten percent indicate they would be willing to volunteer hours with the Minneapolis Park system.
- There remains a divergence between perception and reality about the percent of property taxes going to the operation of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System; the median estimate is 4.0%, while the actual percentage is 8.0%. In fact, 62% of the sample underestimate the designated percentage; while 25% are uncertain.
- A very high 82%-5% majority supports a property tax increase to maintain the System's infrastructure, programs and services at their current level. Support increased by thirteen percent from 2019. Support for a property tax increase to maintain infrastructure, programs and services continues to receive majority support across all demographic groups. In a large shift from 2019, only seventeen percent support a property tax increase to enhance the System in these three areas. This reflects a 24% decrease in support from the previous study. Since residents received their property tax statements in the middle of November, property tax hostility has increased at the same time as financial insecurity across the State of Minnesota has increased.
- There is very high support for all four potential endowment programs tested. All four proposals show at least two-thirds support among residents. A majority of residents indicate they would be likely to contribute to an endowment program for a purpose they support. There is always a disconnect between intention and actual behavior, but using standard marketing analysis – over twenty percent of residents would be likely to contribute to an endowment for a purpose they support.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation System is viewed exceptionally strong and remains the “jewel in the crown” by Minneapolis residents. Additionally, the System has established a large reservoir of good will across the community, which will serve elected officials and administration well as they try to balance the needs of residents with current fiscal realities. The challenge for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is to regain the intense favorable ratings of the past – moving residents from “good” back to “excellent.” This challenge is shared by local governing bodies across the State of Minnesota as communities to emerge out of the effects of the pandemic.