

---

## 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 August 12<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

The average interview took twenty-three 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.

The *Questionnaire* reproduces the survey instrument as it was used in the interviewing process. This section also includes a response frequency distribution for each question.

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. ....	8
Age of Respondent. ....	9
Employment. ....	9
Languages. ....	10
Ethnicity. ....	10
Immigrant Status. ....	11
Children at Home. ....	11
Gender. ....	11
Commissioner District. ....	12
Service Area. ....	12
Summary and Conclusions. ....	12
 <b>Chapter Two: Attitudes and Impressions. ....</b>	 <b>14</b>
Attitudes and Impressions. ....	15
Like Most. ....	15
Like Least. ....	16
Overall Quality. ....	17
Appearance and Maintenance. ....	18
Service Ratings. ....	19
Summary and Conclusions. ....	21
 <b>Chapter Three: Recreation Centers. ....</b>	 <b>22</b>
Recreation Centers. ....	23
Use in the Past Two Years. ....	23
Rating of Recreation Center. ....	25
Inside Programs. ....	27
Outside Programs. ....	32
Additional Amenities at Recreation Center. ....	37
Recreation Centers Meet Needs of Household. ....	38
Summary and Conclusions. ....	39
 <b>Chapter Four: Getting to a Park. ....</b>	 <b>40</b>
Getting to a Park. ....	41
Modes of Transportation. ....	41
Summary and Conclusions. ....	45
 <b>Chapter Five: Facilities and Parks. ....</b>	 <b>46</b>
Facilities and Offerings. ....	47
Frequency of Use. ....	47
Meet Needs of Household. ....	50
Summary and Conclusions. ....	51

<b>Chapter Six: Barriers to Use.....</b>	<b>52</b>
Barriers to Use.....	53
Considerations.....	53
Summary and Conclusions.....	64
<b>Chapter Seven: Importance of Park Services.....</b>	<b>65</b>
Importance of Park Services.....	66
Importance of Services.....	66
Satisfaction with Programs and Activities.....	72
Summary and Conclusions.....	73
<b>Chapter Eight: Revenue Generation.....</b>	<b>74</b>
Revenue Generation.....	75
Revenue Generation.....	75
Higher End Amenities.....	78
Summary and Conclusions.....	79
<b>Chapter Nine: Mission Statements.....</b>	<b>80</b>
Mission Statements.....	81
Importance of Statements.....	81
Rating of Statements.....	84
Summary and Conclusions.....	86
<b>Chapter Ten: Taxes and Funding.....</b>	<b>87</b>
Taxes and Funding.....	88
Financial Investment in Programs.....	88
Percentage of Taxes.....	93
Tax Increase to Maintain.....	94
Tax Increase to Enhance.....	95
Value of Services for Taxes Paid.....	97
Summary and Conclusions.....	98
<b>Chapter Eleven: Communications.....</b>	<b>99</b>
Communications.....	100
Preferred Source of Information.....	100
Summary and Conclusions.....	101
Key Findings and Implications.....	102

# 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 2010 U.S. Census findings; and, second, to track any differences between subgroups and the rest of the population. There were no statistically significant differences between the findings of this survey and the census data. 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?*

Thirty-eight percent report living in Minneapolis for ten or less years, while 35% say they resided there for over twenty years:

FIVE YEARS OR LESS. ....	14%
SIX TO TEN YEARS. ....	24%
11 TO 20 YEARS. ....	26%
21 TO 30 YEARS. ....	16%
OVER 30 YEARS. ....	19%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

The median residential longevity in the city is 14.6 years.

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

- renters
- those currently not working
- 18 to 34 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

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

- renters
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds

- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants

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

- those working for a business or corporation

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

- homeowners
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

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

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Five residents
- Caucasians

## 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 \$35,000, \$35,000-\$75,000, \$75,000-\$100,000 or over \$100,000?*

The median total household income for last year is \$53,750.00:



LESS THAN \$35,000. ....	28%
\$35,000 TO \$75,000. ....	40%
\$75,000 TO \$100,000. ....	12%
OVER \$100,000.. ....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	15%

Twenty-eight percent report incomes less than \$35,000.00 and 28% post incomes over \$75,000.00.

## Age of Respondent

Respondents were asked:

*What is your age, please?*

The typical adult resident of the community is 40.8 years old:

18-24 .....	7%
25-34 .....	26%
35-44 .....	25%
45-54 .....	18%
55-64 .....	12%
65 OR OLDER.....	13%
REFUSED. ....	0%

Thirty-three percent are under 35 years old, while 25% are over 54 years old.

## 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 57% majority report they are employed by a business or corporation:

PUBLIC ENTITY. ....	9%
BUSINESS/CORPORATION.....	57%
OWN BUSINESS/SELF-EMPLOYED.....	4%
RETIRED.....	19%
NOT WORKING.....	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Nineteen percent are retired, nine percent work for a public entity, and four percent own a business or are self-employed. Another ten percent report they are not currently working.

---

## Languages

---

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

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

Eighty-one percent report “English” is their home language:

YES .....	81%
SPANISH.....	6%
SOMALI. ....	6%
HMONG. ....	3%
SCATTERED. ....	4%

Six percent each say “Spanish” or “Somali” while three percent indicated “Hmong.”

---

## Ethnicity

---

Minneapolis residents were asked for their ethnicity:

*Ethnicity?*

Using standard U.S. Census classification, 51% are “Caucasian:”

NATIVE AMERICAN.....	2%
AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....	19%
ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLANDER. ....	5%
CAUCASIAN. ....	51%
EAST AFRICAN.....	7%
HMONG. ....	3%
HISPANIC-LATINO.....	9%
SOMETHING ELSE. ....	3%
REFUSED. ....	1%

Nineteen percent are “African-American,” and nine percent are “Hispanic Latino.” Seven percent are “East African,” five percent are “Asian-Pacific Islander,” and three percent are “Hmong.” Two percent report they are “Native American.”

---

## Immigrant Status

---

Next, respondents were asked:

*Are you a first or second generation immigrant to the United States?*

Fifteen percent of the respondent are “first or second generation immigrants:”

YES .....	15%
NO .....	80%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	5%

Eighty percent are not.

---

## Children at Home

---

City residents were queried:

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

Twenty-five percent report a pre-school or school-aged child living at home:

YES .....	25%
NO .....	75%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Seventy-five percent have no infants or children living at home.

---

## Gender

---

The gender of each respondent was noted:

MALE. ....	48%
FEMALE. ....	52%

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. ....	16%
NORTHEAST. ....	16%
DOWNTOWN. ....	9%
SOUTHWEST. ....	36%
SOUTH. ....	23%

The Southwest Service Area is the largest proportion of the sample, at 36%. The smallest is the Downtown Service Area at nine percent.

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

The median longevity of adult Minneapolis residents is 14.6 years. Thirty-eight percent lived here for less than ten years, while 35% resided here for over 20 years. The median age of adult city residents is 40.8 years old. Thirty-three percent post ages under 35 years old and 25% indicate ages of 55 years old and older. Fifty-one percent of the sample indicate they are "Caucasian," 19% are "African-American," and 9% are "Hispanic Latino." Seven percent report they are "East African," five percent are "Asian-Pacific Islander," three percent are "Hmong," and two percent report they are "Native American." Fifteen percent are either first or second generation immigrants to the United States. Fifty-seven percent are employed by a business or corporation, nine percent work for a public entity, and four percent own their business or are self-employed. Nineteen percent are retired. Ten percent are currently not working.

Fifty-one percent rent their current residences and forty-nine percent own their homes. Twenty-five percent report the presence of pre-school or school-aged children living at home. The median total household income for last year is \$53,750.00. Twenty-eight percent indicate

incomes of less than \$35,000.00, while 18% report incomes over \$75,000.00. Eighty-one percent report the main language spoken in their home is English. Six percent each speak “Spanish” and “Somali,” and three percent speak “Hmong.”

Seventeen percent live in each of the six Commissioner Districts. Thirty-six percent reside in the Southwest Service Area, 23% in the South Service Area, and 16% each in the North And Northeast Service Areas. A smaller nine 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 70% of the responses: “variety of offerings,” at 23%, “trails,” at 16%, “programs,” at 11%, “natural areas,” at 10% and “convenient locations,” at 10%:

UNSURE.....	3%
CONVENIENT LOCATIONS. ....	10%
VARIETY OF OFFERINGS.....	23%
TRAILS.....	16%
PLAYGROUNDS.....	6%
NATURAL AREAS.....	10%
CLEAN/WELL-MAINTAINED.....	5%
LAKES/BEACHES.....	4%
PROGRAMS.....	11%
PICNIC AREAS.....	2%
FRIENDLY STAFF.....	5%
SCATTERED.....	5%

“Variety of offerings” is reported most frequently by:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Hmong

“Trails” is cited most frequently by:

- homeowners
- men
- Commissioner District One residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

- Caucasians

“Programs” is stated at a higher rate by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Native Americans

“Convenient location” is key to:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Commissioner District Five residents

## Like Least

Next, respondents were queried:

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

Nine percent cite “litter,” while eight percent stress the “rising crime:”

UNSURE.....	13%
NOTHING.....	27%
LITTER.....	9%
RISING CRIME.....	8%
CROWDED.....	6%
NOT ENOUGH PARKING.....	3%
POOR REGISTRATION.....	2%
NOT ENOUGH RESTROOMS.....	2%
OUTDATED EQUIPMENT.....	3%
HIGH COST.....	2%
SHORT HOURS OF OPERATION.....	2%
BULLYING.....	3%
POOR MAINTENANCE.....	5%
NOT ENOUGH PROGRAMS.....	3%
SCATTERED.....	12%

A large 27% 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 three times higher than the norm.

“Nothing” is stated more often by:

- residents for five years or less



- 18 to 34 year olds

“Litter” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those working for a government agency

“Rising crime” is a concern among:

- residents for six to ten years
- Commissioner District Two residents

## 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?*

A nearly-unanimous 91% rate the System as either “excellent” or “good:”

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

Twenty-seven percent rate the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System as “excellent.” Only eight percent are more critical in their evaluations.

Ratings are higher among:

- Commissioner District Five residents

They are lower among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- Commissioner District One residents

## 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?*

Eighty-one percent rate the System favorably:

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

Thirty percent rate the System as “excellent.” Eighteen percent are more critical in their evaluations, an increase of 12% over the four year period.

Ratings increase among:

- residents for five years or less
- renters
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds

They decrease among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

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

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

Two responses dominate: one positive, “trash and graffiti” and one negative, “full trash cans and litter:

FULL TRASH CANS/LITTER.....	16%
CLEAN/WELL-MAINTAINED.....	53%
DRUGS/ALCOHOL TRASH. ....	3%
NICE PLAYGROUNDS. ....	4%
WELL MAINTAINED GRASS/TREES.....	11%
WELL MAINTAINED TRAILS.....	6%
PLAYGROUNDS NEED UPDATING.....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	5%

“Clean/Well maintained” is stated most frequently by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Three residents
- African Americans

“Full trash cans/litter” is cited more often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

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

- women
- Native Americans

## 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 very high 79% rate snow removal on trails favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	34%
GOOD. ....	45%
ONLY FAIR.....	8%
POOR. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	13%

Ratings are higher among:

- those working for a business or corporation

They are lower among:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- Hispanic-Latinos

***Snow removal on sidewalks?***

An even higher 81% rate snow removal on sidewalks favorably.

EXCELLENT.....	41%
GOOD. ....	40%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR .....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	4%

Ratings are higher among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Six residents
- African Americans

They are lower among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Caucasians

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

By an almost ten to one ratio, residents overwhelmingly rate maintenance of trees in parks positively:

EXCELLENT.....	35%
GOOD. ....	53%
ONLY FAIR.....	9%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Ratings are higher among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those working for a business or corporation

They are lower among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- homeowners
- Commissioner District One residents

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

Similarly, a very high 88% rate maintenance of trees on boulevards favorably:

EXCELLENT.....	33%
GOOD. ....	53%
ONLY FAIR.....	11%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Ratings are higher among:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation

They are lower among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- homeowners
- Hispanic-Latinos

---

## **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 offerings,” “trails,” and “programs.” These three responses together account for fifty percent of the aspects cited. The most disliked aspects include “litter” and the “rising crime,” at nine and eight percent, respectively. While MPRB has a comparatively large group of “boosters,” 27%, who dislike “nothing” about the System – it is a drop of seventeen percent since 2015. Both the overall impression of the System and the overall impression of the appearance and maintenance of the System are strongly positive: ninety-one percent favorable in the former case and 81% percent in the latter case. However, the 12% increase in “only fair” on the appearance and maintenance is something to watch in the future. The four specific services tested enjoy very strong ratings, positive to negative ratios of better than five to one.

# **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?*

Thirty-one percent of the sample used a Recreation Center during the past two years:

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

Users are more apt to be:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- women
- households with children

Non-users are more likely to be:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- men

Center users were asked several follow-up questions. First, the site was established:

***Which Recreation Center do you use most often?***

“Bryant Square,” “Luxton,” and “Northeast” are cited by five percent each:

BOTTINEAU.....	3%
BRYANT SQUARE. ....	5%
ELIOT. ....	4%
FAIRVIEW. ....	3%
FULLER.....	2%
HARRISON.....	2%
KEEWAYDIN.....	3%
LOGAN. ....	3%
LONGFELLOW. ....	4%
LUXTON.....	5%
LYNNHURST.....	3%
MATTHEWS.....	3%
MORRIS. ....	3%
NORTH COMMONS. ....	3%
NORTHEAST. ....	5%
PEARL.....	3%
PHILLIPS.....	4%
POWDERHORN.....	5%
WEBBER.....	3%
WHITTIER. ....	3%
DON'T REMEMBER NAME.....	10%
SCATTERED. ....	24%

Next, Center users were asked:

***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 4-5 times per month:

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

Forty-two percent use a Recreation Center at least weekly. Twenty-eight percent use a Center at least monthly, though less than on a weekly basis. And, 23% visit a Recreation Center more sporadically.



“Daily” is indicated more often by:

- residents for six to ten years
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Native Americans
- East Africans

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

- those working for a government agency
- 45 to 54 year olds
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- renters
- Hmong

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

- residents for more than thirty years
- Commissioner District Three residents

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Native Americans

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

---

## **Rating of Recreation Center**

---

Recreation Center users were

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

Eighty-nine percent rate the quality of the Recreation Center as either “excellent” or “good:”

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

Eleven percent rate it lower.

Ratings increase among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Native Americans

They decrease among:

- residents for six to ten years
- 45 to 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Hispanic-Latinos

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

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

Three responses, at a combined 62%, dominate the responses: “variety of programs,” “friendly staff,” and “clean/well maintained:”

CLEAN/WELL MAINTAINED. ....	16%
FRIENDLY PEOPLE. ....	5%
UNFRIENDLY STAFF.....	4%
FRIENDLY STAFF.....	20%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	26%
VARIETY OF AMENITIES. ....	6%
SAFE .....	4%
FUN .....	3%
WELL ORGANIZED. ....	3%
LACK OF VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	3%
GOOD DIVERSITY. ....	2%
OLD FACILITY. ....	2%
SCATTTERED. ....	6%

“Variety of programs” is cited more often by:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Caucasians

“Friendly staff” is mentioned more frequently by:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

## 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-three percent report participating in INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center:

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

Forty-seven percent have not done so.

Participation is higher among:

- homeowners
- households with children
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

It is lower among:

- renters
- East Africans

Next, INSIDE program participants were asked:

***For each of the following age ranges, please tell me  
if a member of your household has participated in  
INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center?***

***6 to 12 years old?***

Sixty-one percent report a 6 to 12 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	61%
NO .....	39%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children

It decreases among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

***13 to 17 years old?***

Twenty-eight percent report a 13 to 17 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	28%
NO .....	72%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- 35 to 44 year olds

It decreases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Caucasians

***18 to 24 years old?***

Ten percent report an 18 to 24 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	10%
NO .....	90%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- 18 to 34 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents

It decreases among:

- 35 to 44 year olds
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

### *25 to 35 years old?*

Twenty-eight report a 25 to 35 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	28%
NO .....	72%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- those currently not working
- Commissioner District Two residents

### *36 to 55 years old?*

Twenty-two percent report a 36 to 55 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	22%
NO .....	78%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- homeowners
- 45 to 54 year olds

It decreases among:

- residents for six to ten years
- renters
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- 18 to 34 year olds

***Over 55 years old?***

Finally, 11% report an over 55 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	11%
NO .....	88%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Participation increases among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

It decreases among:

- residents for six to ten years
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- women

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

By far, the most popular INSIDE program is basketball, at 35%:

FITNESS. ....	19%
BASKETBALL. ....	35%
FESTIVAL/EVENTS. ....	4%
YOUTH SPORTS. ....	2%
KIDS CLUB.....	6%
EDUCATIONAL.....	5%
ARTS/HOBBIES.....	17%
PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	5%
SOCIAL CLUBS.....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	5%

Nineteen percent participate in “fitness,” seventeen percent, in “arts/hobby” activities, and six percent participate in “kids clubs.”

“Basketball” is posted at a higher rate by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- African Americans

“Arts and hobby” is cited more frequently by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households

“Fitness” is indicated more often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

Participants were then queried:

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

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

	2015	2019
EXCELLENT.....	35%...	53%
GOOD. ....	65%...	45%
ONLY FAIR.....	0%....	0%
POOR .....	0%....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%....	0%

Fifty-three percent rate these programs as “excellent.”

Ratings are lower among:

- residents for six to ten years
- Commissioner District Two residents

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

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

Three responses, at a combined 50%, dominate the responses: “fun,” “friendly staff,” and “place to socialize.”

UNSURE.....	2%
FRIENDLY STAFF.....	17%
AFFORDABLE.....	5%
CLEAN/WELL-MAINTAINED.....	5%
FUN .....	22%
EDUCATIONAL.....	7%
WELL ORGANIZED. ....	7%
PLACE TO SOCIALIZE.....	11%

VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	5%
NICE FACILITY.....	4%
UNFRIENDLY STAFF.....	3%
EXERCISE. ....	3%
CROWDED.....	3%
SCATTERED. ....	6%

“Fun” is key to:

- renters
- Commissioner District Four residents
- African Americans

“Friendly staff” is cited more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- households with children

“Place to socialize” is mentioned at a higher rate by:

- Asian-Pacific Islanders

## Outside Programs

Turning to OUTSIDE programs, Recreation Center users were asked:

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

Fifty-three percent participated in OUTSIDE programs:

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

Forty-six percent had not.

Participation is higher among:

- Native Americans

It is lower among:

- under \$35,000 annual income households



- retirees

OUTSIDE program participants were asked:

***For each of the following age ranges, please tell me  
if a member of your household has participated in  
INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center?***

***6 to 12 years old?***

Sixty-four percent report a 6 to 12 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	64%
NO .....	36%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- those working for a government agency
- 35 to 44 year olds
- women
- households with children
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Hmong

It decreases among:

- over 54 year olds
- men
- Native Americans
- Caucasians

***13 to 17 years old?***

Thirty-three percent report a 13 to 17 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	33%
NO .....	67%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Participation increases among:

- 45 to 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Hmong
- Hispanic-Latinos

It decreases among:

- 18 to 34 year olds
- Caucasians

***18 to 24 years old?***

Eight percent report an 18 to 24 year old member of their household participating:

YES	8%
NO	92%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Participation increases among:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Commissioner District One residents

It decreases among:

- 35 to 44 year olds

***25 to 35 years old?***

Eighteen percent report a 25 to 35 year old member of their household participating:

YES	18%
NO	82%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Participation increases among:

- residents for six to ten years
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Native Americans

***36 to 55 years old?***

Twenty-one percent report a 36 to 55 year old member of their household participating:

YES	21%
NO	79%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	0%

Participation increases among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- over 54 year olds
- men
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- Caucasians

It decreases among:

- 18 to 34 year olds
- women

### ***Over 55 years old?***

Six percent report an over 55 year old member of their household participating:

YES .....	6%
NO .....	94%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

Participation increases among:

- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- men
- Caucasians

It decreases among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- women

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

The two most popular OUTSIDE programs prove to be “soccer,” at 26%, and “baseball/softball,” at 18%:

SOCCKER. ....	26%
BASEBALL/SOFTBALL. ....	18%
EDUCATIONAL.....	2%
CHILDREN’S SPORTS. ....	4%
TENNIS.....	7%
COMMUNITY/FAMILY EVENTS. ....	7%
NATURE PROGRAMS. ....	4%
LAKES/BOATING. ....	8%
POOL .....	7%
FOOTBALL.....	5%
BASKETBALL. ....	8%

SCATTERED. .... 4%

“Soccer” is stated more often by:

- 45 to 54 year olds
- households with children
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Baseball/Softball” is cited at a higher rate by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District One residents
- Native Americans

OUTSIDE program participants were then asked:

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

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

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

Only six percent are more negative in their judgments.

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

Users were then asked a follow-up question:

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

Four responses, at a combined 52%, dominate the responses: “friendly staff,” “fun,” “place to socialize” and “clean/well maintained”:

KEEP CHILDREN BUSY.....	6%
FRIENDLY STAFF.....	18%
AFFORDABLE.....	5%
CLEAN/WELL-MAINTAINED.....	10%
FUN .....	13%
EDUCATIONAL.....	7%
SAFE .....	4%

WELL ORGANIZED. ....	7%
PLACE TO SOCIALIZE.....	11%
VARIETY OF PROGRAMS.....	4%
NICE FACILITY.....	3%
UNFRIENDLY STAFF.....	3%
EXERCISE. ....	3%
TEACHES TEAMWORK.....	3%
SCATTERED. ....	5%

“Friendly staff” is more important to:

- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Fun” is key to:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

“Place to socialize” is mentioned more frequently by:

- Commissioner District Five residents
- East Africans

“Clean/Well maintained” is posted at a higher rate by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- over 54 year olds

## Additional Amenities at Recreation Center

OUTSIDE programming users were asked about additions or enhancements:

*What additional/other amenities or facilities would you like to see the Park Board offer its residents at a Recreation Center?*

Forty-five percent report there is “nothing” they would like to see as additions or enhancements:

UNSURE.....	19%
NOTHING.....	45%
MORE VARIETY OF PROGRAMS. ....	5%

MORE COMMUNITY/FAMILY EVENTS.....	5%
MORE WATER FOUNTAINS.....	5%
BETTER POOLS.....	3%
MORE FITNESS.....	4%
MORE SEATING. ....	2%
MORE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.....	2%
SCATTERED. ....	10%

Five percent each would like to see more “variety of programs” “more community and family events,” and “water fountains.”

“Nothing” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Hmong

## Recreation Centers Meet Needs of Household

All respondents were asked:

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

Eighty-one percent feel existing recreation centers meet the needs of their households:

	2015	2019
YES .....	90%...	81%
NO .....	8%...	12%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%....	6%

Twelve percent disagree.

“Yes” is mentioned most frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those currently not working
- 35 to 44 year olds
- women
- Native Americans
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

“No” is cited more frequently by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation

- men
- Commissioner District Three residents
- East Africans

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Recreation Centers receive very high grades from their visitors. Thirty-one percent of the sample report using a Center during the past two years for recreational purposes, a four percent increase since 2015. Sixty-one percent of recent users come to a Center at least weekly; twenty-eight percent visit at least monthly but not as often as weekly; and, 12% percent less often. A high 89% rate the quality of Recreation Centers highly – either “excellent” or “good.” Eleven percent are more critical in their evaluations.

Fifty-three percent, an increase of 8% since 2015, participated in INSIDE programs at a Recreation Center, such as basketball, music lessons, tumbling, pottery, yoga, and pre-school. Basketball was by far the most popular offering drawing 35% of program participants. Fitness, at 19%, arts or hobby classes, at seventeen percent, kids club, at six percent, and educational or preschool programs, each at five percent, account for most of the rest of indicated activities. A near unanimous 98% rate the INSIDE programs as either “excellent” or “good.”

Fifty-three percent participated in OUTSIDE programs at a Recreation Center, such as baseball, soccer, tennis lessons, boating, and community or family events. Soccer, at 26%, and baseball/softball, at 18%, are the main draws. Basketball and boating, at eight percent each, tennis or community/family events, each at seven percent together account for much of the remaining participation. An impressive 93% rate the OUTSIDE programs as “excellent” or “good,” while six percent are more critical in their evaluations.

A 64% majority has no suggestions for additional or other amenities to be offered at a Recreation Center. Only more variety in programs and more community/family events, suggested by five percent, are a modest request. In fact, 81% of the sample feel existing recreation centers offered by the Park Board meet the needs of their household members.

# **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.*

Fifty-eight percent report using an automobile to get to a Minneapolis park:

YES .....	58%
NO .....	42%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 54 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District One residents

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for six to ten years
- residents for more than thirty years
- those currently not working
- over 54 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans

#### *Bicycle.*

Fifty-one percent report using a bicycle to get to a Minneapolis park:

YES .....	51%
NO .....	49%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District Three residents

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- those currently not working
- over 54 year olds
- Hispanic-Latinos

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

Two percent report using a rideshare to get to a Minneapolis park:

YES .....	2%
NO .....	98%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- Commissioner District Four residents

***School District bus.***

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

YES .....	4%
NO .....	96%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- households with children
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hmong

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- homeowners
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- Caucasians

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

Fourteen percent report using public transportation to get to a Minneapolis park:

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

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Three residents
- East Africans

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a government agency

***Metro Mobility.***

Two percent report using Metro Mobility to get to a Minneapolis park:

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

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

***Walk.***

Seventy-four percent report walking to a Minneapolis park:

YES .....	74%
NO .....	26%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 1%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents for six to ten years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- households with children
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans

“No” is mentioned most frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

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 80% of responses: “location is far,” “need car” and “age/health”:

UNSURE.....	1%
LOCATION IS FAR.....	37%
TAKE CHILDREN.....	4%
AGE/HEALTH.....	17%
HEAVY EQUIPMENT/GEAR.....	2%
NOT SAFE TO WALK.....	6%
NEED CAR.....	26%
BIKE THEFT.....	2%
FASTEST.....	4%
SCATTERED.....	2%

“Location is far” is stated more often by:

- residents for six to ten years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Two residents
- East Africans

“Need car” is posted more often by:

- residents for five years or less
- those currently not working

- men
- Native Americans

“Age/Health” is indicated most frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Caucasians

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Three modes of transportation are the primary methods of getting to a Minneapolis park: “walking,” at 74%; “automobile,” at 58%; and finally, “bicycle,” at fifty-one percent. Public transportation options are used by much smaller segments of residents.

# **Chapter Five: Facilities and Parks**

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 parks 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 at least once a week:

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

But 24% of residents rarely visit a neighborhood park.

“Daily” is indicated more often by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 45 to 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

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

- residents for six to ten years
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- women
- households with children
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- renters

- those working for a government agency
- those currently not working
- 18 to 34 year olds
- households with children
- Hispanic-Latinos

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

- renters
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Hmong

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for five years or less
- men
- Native Americans

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Caucasians

“Never” is stated more often by:

- residents for more than twenty years
- homeowners
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

***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:

DAILY.....	1%
2 TO 3 TIMES A WEEK.....	4%
WEEKLY.....	3%
2 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH. ....	12%
MONTHLY.....	19%



LESS OFTEN. ....	41%
NEVER. ....	21%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

Eight percent report visiting at least on a weekly basis.

“Daily” is indicated more often by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Three residents

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

- residents for six to ten years
- men
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Weekly” is cited more often by:

- women
- households with children
- Native Americans

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

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- Hmong

“Monthly” is posted at a higher rate by:

- 35 to 44 year olds

“Less often” is mentioned more frequently by:

- renters

“Never” is reported more often by:

- residents for more than twenty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- those currently not working
- over 54 year olds

- Commissioner District Three residents
- East Africans

## **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?***

A almost unanimous 97% believe existing parks and recreation facilities offered by the Park Board meet the needs of their households:

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

Only three percent disagree.

“Yes” is posted at a higher rate by:

- women

“No” is indicated more frequently by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- 18 to 34 year olds
- men
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District One residents

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

***What do you feel is missing:***

POOL .....	23%
SENIOR PROGRAMS. ....	15%
MODERN PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT. ....	15%
PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	23%
MORE STAFF.....	15%
MORE DOG PARKS. ....	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 38%. Only seven percent indicated they have never visited a neighborhood park. Regional park visitors are more infrequent in their use, only 8% state they use this type of park at least weekly. Twenty-one percent report they have never visited a regional park. A very high 97% feel existing parks and recreation facilities meet the needs of their households; only three percent disagree. And, among this small subgroup of three percent, no 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 ranged 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?*

Six percent view "lack of transportation" as limiting them "a lot." This factor ranks 8<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

	2015	2019
A LOT. ....	5%....	6%
SOMEWHAT .....	15%...	13%
NOT AT ALL. ....	81%...	81%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%....	0%

An additional 13% see the lack of transportation as "somewhat" limiting.

"A lot" is stated more frequently by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Native Americans
- East Africans

"Somewhat" is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for six to ten years
- renters

- those currently not working
- Commissioner District Three residents

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Caucasians

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

Six percent regard the “cost of programs and equipment” as a serious limit on their use of Park System facilities and programming. This factor ranks 5<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

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

Twenty percent view it as “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- 18 to 34 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- East Africans

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households
- those working for a government agency
- households with children
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Hmong
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Commissioner District Five residents
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Caucasians

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

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

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

Eighteen percent are “somewhat” limited by this factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Caucasians

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- retirees
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Commissioner District Five residents

***Language barriers?***

Eight percent are serious limited by language barriers. This factor ranks 9<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

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

Ten percent find language barriers “somewhat” limiting.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for five years or less
- renters
- those currently not working
- households with children
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Four residents
- East Africans

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for five years or less
- renters
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Commissioner District Five residents
- East Africans
- Hmong
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents

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

Twelve percent say a lack of information significantly limits their use of Park System facilities and programming. This obstacle ranks 1<sup>st</sup> out of 14:

	2015	2019
A LOT. ....	6%...	12%
SOMEWHAT .....	20%...	30%



NOT AT ALL. ....	74%... 58%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%.... 0%

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

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- East Africans

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- residents for five years or less
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- homeowners
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Native Americans
- Caucasians

### ***Cultural beliefs and restrictions?***

Only three percent report cultural beliefs and restrictions are serious obstacles to greater use of facilities and programming. This factor ranks 11<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2019</b>
A LOT. ....	3%....	3%
SOMEWHAT .....	9%....	9%
NOT AT ALL. ....	87%...	88%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%....	0%

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

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- renters
- men
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants

- Commissioner District One residents
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- renters
- those currently not working
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Caucasians

### *Concern about public safety?*

Fourteen percent think concerns about public safety significantly limit their use of Park System facilities and programming. This factor ranks second out of 14:

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

Another 26% regard public safety as a secondary limiting factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Two residents
- East Africans

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- Commissioner District Six residents

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

Seven percent think the lack of a companion limits their recreation activities “a lot.” This factor ranks third out of 14:

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

An additional 20% think having no one to do things with is a secondary factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District One residents

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children

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

Five percent report feeling unwelcome by other park users significantly impact their use of Park System facilities and programming. This concern ranks 9<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

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

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

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- renters
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- East Africans

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- retirees
- over 54 year olds

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- 35 to 44 year olds

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

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

	2015	2019
A LOT. ....	4%....	1%
SOMEWHAT .....	6%....	8%
NOT AT ALL. ....	89%...	91%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%....	0%

Another eight percent see it as a secondary limiting factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for six to ten years
- 18 to 34 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- homeowners
- over 54 year olds
- women
- households with children
- Caucasians

***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 14<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

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

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

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Two residents

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- renters
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District One residents
- East Africans

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- homeowners
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- Caucasians

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

Three percent see “physical inaccessibility” as a serious limiting factor. This concern ranks 12<sup>th</sup> out of 14:

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2019</b>
A LOT. ....	7%....	3%
SOMEWHAT .....	13%....	7%
NOT AT ALL. ....	79%...	89%

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

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

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- 45 to 54 year olds
- East Africans

### ***Inconvenient hours of operation?***

Eleven percent see inconvenient hours of operation as a significant limiting factor. It ranks sixth on the list of 14 concerns:

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

Another 14% view inconvenient hours as a contributing factor.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for six to twenty years
- 45 to 54 year olds
- women
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- 35 to 44 year olds

- Commissioner District Six residents
- Native Americans

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- over 54 year olds
- men
- Caucasians
- East Africans

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

Thirteen percent think inconvenient times of programs or activities limit their participation “a lot.” This factor ranks third out of 14:

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

Fourteen percent see scheduling as “somewhat” limiting their participation.

“A lot” is stated more frequently by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- renters
- 45 to 54 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District One residents
- Hmong

“Somewhat” is posted at a higher rate by:

- Hmong

“Not at all” is cited most often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Caucasians
- East Africans

---

## **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 over 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.

The next tier of limiting factors are 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 ten programs or activities was then read:

#### *Youth sports programs?*

Seventy-six percent rate youth sports programs as “very important.” This program/activity ranks first on the list of 10:

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

Overall, 93% consider this offering to be at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- renters
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Four residents

### ***Youth non-sports programs?***

Seventy percent regard youth non-sports programs to be “very important.” These programs rank third on the list of 10:

	2015	2019
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	66%...	70%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	29%...	24%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	4%....	4%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%....	1%
DON’T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%....	0%

Ninety-four percent rate this offering as “important.”

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

### ***Adult sports programs?***

Thirty-seven percent rate adult sports programs as “very important.” This offering ranks 9<sup>th</sup> out of 10:

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

Seventy-eight percent rate adult sport programs as at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds
- households with children

- Commissioner District One residents

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents

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

Thirty-three percent regard adult non-sports programs as “very important.” This program/activity ranks 10<sup>th</sup> out of 10 on the list:

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

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

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- over 54 year olds
- African Americans

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

Forty percent rate senior programs as “very important.” These programs rank eighth out of 10 on the list:

	2015	2019
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	52%...	40%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	33%...	38%

NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	8%... 14%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	6%... 5%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%... 3%

A total of 78% rate senior programs at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Caucasians

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Hmong
- Hispanic-Latinos

### ***Providing police protection in the parks?***

Fifty-one percent rate the provision of police protection in the parks as “very important.” This service ranks fifth out of 10:

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

Seventy-nine 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
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District One residents
- Commissioner District Five residents
- Hispanic-Latinos

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- under \$35,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Three residents

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

Fifty percent think programs for people with disabilities is “very important.” This service ranks sixth out of 10 on the list:

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

A total of 87% regard parkway street light maintenance to be at least “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Caucasians

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Hmong

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

Forty-seven percent regard multi/inter-generational programming as “very important.” This type of programming ranks 7<sup>th</sup> out of 10 on the list:

	2015	2019
VERY IMPORTANT. ....	33%...	47%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	46%...	37%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	18%...	11%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	2%...	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%...	3%

Overall, 84% see multi/inter-generational programming as either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for five years or less
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Native Americans

### ***Community events?***

Seventy-one percent see community events as “very important.” This service ranks second on the list of 10:

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

Ninety-one percent regard tree trimming as either “very important” or “somewhat important.”

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- East Africans

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- African Americans

### ***After school programs?***

Sixty-eight percent rate after school programs as “very important.” These activities rank fourth on the list of 10:

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

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

“Important” is cited more frequently by:

- those working for a business or corporation
- women
- Commissioner District One residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

“Not important” is mentioned more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- men
- Caucasians

**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 95% report satisfaction:

VERY SATISFIED.....	60%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED.....	35%
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.....	2%
VERY DISSATISFIED.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	3%

In fact, a majority, 60%, report being “very satisfied.”

Satisfaction is higher among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- African Americans

It is lower among:

- Commissioner District Two residents

The very small number of residents expressing dissatisfaction were asked:



*Why do you feel that way?*

NOT ENOUGH VARIETY.....	11%
NOT ENOUGH FOR DISABLED. ....	11%
NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION. ....	11%
DUPLICATE SPORTS WITH SCHOOLS.....	11%
NOT ENOUGH SENIOR PROGRAMS.....	11%
NOT ENOUGH COMMUNITY/FAMILY EVENTS. ....	11%
NOT ENOUGH FOR YOUNG CHILDREN. ....	33%

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 76% of the sample. In a second programming tier come community events, at 71%, youth non-sports programs, at 70%, and after-school programs, at 68%. The key audiences, then, 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 51%, and programs for people with disabilities is similarly rated by 50%.

A very high 95% 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 six 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 64%-32% majority, residents favor increasing adult recreation fees to cover the total cost of those programs or services:

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

Intense support outnumber intense opposition by two-to-one.

Support increases among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Three residents

It decreases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Commissioner District Four residents

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

By a 68%-31% majority, interviewees favor imposing fees for youth recreation programs and services based upon the ability to pay:

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

Intense support dominates intense opposition by over two-to-one.

Opposition increases among:

- 18 to 34 year olds

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

By an 83%-15% majority, residents support adding additional concession stands, vendors and rental opportunities:

	2015	2019
STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	39%..	44%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	49%..	39%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	10%...	9%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	1%...	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%...	1%

Support increases among:

- residents for six to ten years
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Hispanic-Latinos

It decreases among:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

***Partner with private organizations to support programming, for example Oregon's Kidz Love Soccer program which provides non-competitive youth soccer classes and soccer camp?***

An 79%-16% majority supports partnering with private organizations to support programming:

	2015	2019
STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	34%..	42%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	54%..	37%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	8%..	12%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	3%...	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%...	4%

Support increases among:

- Hmong

It decreases among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- Commissioner District Three residents

***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 84% support increasing corporate sponsorship opportunities to help offset the cost of programs and/or facilities, 13% oppose it:

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

Support increases among:

- Hmong

It decreases among:

- Commissioner District Five residents

***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 75%-18% majority, residents support allowing organizations of individuals to purchase naming rights for Park Board properties:

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

Support increases among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- East Africans

It decreases among:

- retirees
- Commissioner District One residents
- Caucasians

---

## Higher End Amenities

---

Residents were then queried about potential use of higher end amenities:

***Some people have suggested the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board should offer higher end amenities, such as artificial turf athletic fields, an upscale golf course or a large water park. These types of amenities would require higher fees to use.***

***Would you be willing to pay a higher fee to use these types of amenities? Do you feel strongly that way?***

By a 53% to 38% majority, residents indicate they would be willing to pay a higher fee to use these types of amenities:

STRONGLY YES.....	21%
YES .....	32%
NO .....	23%
STRONGLY NO.....	15%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	8%

“Yes” is cited more often by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a government agency
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District One residents
- Native Americans
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

“No” is mentioned more frequently by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Caucasians

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

Each of the revenue generators tested in this survey drew large majorities in its favor, with small percentages in opposition. The top four proposals show at least 75% majorities in favor and opposition below 20%. Changes in fees drew majorities of over 60%, with opposition rising to the low 30% range.

A majority of residents expressed interest in paying a higher fee to use higher end amenities if they were developed by the MPRB.

# **Chapter Nine: Mission Statements**



# Mission Statements

Minneapolis residents were read a series of mission statements of Minneapolis Park and Recreation System. First, the importance for the MPRB to focus on the statement was ascertained; then residents were asked to rate MPRB on achieving the statement.

## Importance of Statements

First, respondents were instructed:

*For each of the following statements, please tell me if you think it is very important for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to focus on, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important.*

*Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance nature resources.*

Ninety-two percent indicate this statement is important to focus on:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	28%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	6%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	1%

In fact, 64% report it is very important to focus on.

Importance is higher among:

- Commissioner District One residents
- Caucasians

It is lower among:

- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders
- Hmong

***Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance parkland.***

Ninety-four percent indicate this statement is important to focus on:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	67%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	27%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	5%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

In fact, 67% report it is very important to focus on.

Importance is higher among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Caucasians

It is lower among:

- those working for a government agency
- those currently not working
- 45 to 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Four residents
- Native Americans

***Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance recreational opportunities.***

Ninety-two percent indicate this statement is important to focus on:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	60%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	32%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	7%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

In fact, 60% report it is very important to focus on.

Importance is higher among:

- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- Hispanic-Latinos

It is lower among:

- renters
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- over 54 year olds
- Native Americans

***Provide places and recreation opportunities for all people.***

Ninety-three percent indicate this statement is important to focus on:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	63%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	30%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	7%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

In fact, 63% report it is very important to focus on.

Importance is higher among:

- residents for six to ten years

It is lower among:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- men
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Three residents
- East Africans

***Provide places and recreation opportunities to engage in activities promoting health, well-being, community and the environment.***

Ninety-one percent indicate this statement is important to focus on:

VERY IMPORTANT. ....	64%
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT. ....	27%
NOT TOO IMPORTANT. ....	6%
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	2%

In fact, 64% report it is very important to focus on.

Importance is higher among:

- homeowners
- Commissioner District Six residents

It is lower among:

- renters
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Hmong

## Rating of Statements

Next, residents were instructed:

*Now, going through the same statements again, please tell me if you rate the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board as excellent, good, only fair or poor in achieving the statement.*

*Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance nature resources.*

Eighty-three percent rate MPRB favorably in achieving this statement.

EXCELLENT. ....	27%
GOOD.....	56%
ONLY FAIR. ....	14%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

Ratings increase among:

- those working for a business or corporation

They decrease among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a government agency

*Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance parkland.*

Eighty-three percent rate MPRB favorably in achieving this statement.

EXCELLENT. ....	33%
GOOD.....	50%

ONLY FAIR. ....	13%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Ratings increase among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- East Africans

They decrease among:

- homeowners
- those working for a government agency
- retirees
- Hmong

***Permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve and enhance recreational opportunities.***

Seventy-six percent rate MPRB favorably in achieving this statement.

EXCELLENT. ....	31%
GOOD.....	45%
ONLY FAIR. ....	15%
POOR .....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

Ratings increase among:

- over \$75,000 annual income households

They decrease among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years

***Provide places and recreation opportunities for all people.***

Eighty-three percent rate MPRB favorably in achieving this statement.

EXCELLENT. ....	38%
GOOD.....	45%
ONLY FAIR. ....	14%
POOR .....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

Ratings increase among:

- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District Five residents

They decrease among:

- Commissioner District Two residents

***Provide places and recreation opportunities to engage in activities promoting health, well-being, community and the environment.***

Seventy-nine percent rate MPRB favorably in achieving this statement.

EXCELLENT. ....	32%
GOOD. ....	47%
ONLY FAIR. ....	15%
POOR ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	5%

Ratings increase among:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- African Americans

They decrease among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- under \$35,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

All five statements tested were rated as important by residents to focus on by at least 90%. In fact, “very important” was stated by at least 60% for each statement. Importantly, residents also highly rated MPRB in achieving all five statements. At least 75% rated MPRB favorably in achieving the statement, less than 20% rated them unfavorably.

# **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.

### **Financial Investment in Programs**

Residents were instructed:

*For each of the following, please tell me if you would strongly support more financial investment from the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board in it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose more financial investment from the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board.*

*Programs for children under 5 years old?*

By 90% to 6%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	63%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	27%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	5%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	3%

Supporters tend to be:

- residents for six to ten years
- renters
- those working for a business or corporation
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- East Africans
- Hispanic-Latinos

Opponents are more apt to be:



- homeowners
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents

### ***Programs for elementary school children?***

By 97% to 3%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	75%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	22%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	1%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

Supporters tend to be:

- 35 to 44 year olds
- East Africans

Opponents are more apt to be:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Hmong

### ***Programs for middle school children?***

By 97% to 3%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	73%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	24%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	2%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	0%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

### ***Programs for high school children?***

By 92% to 6%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	64%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	28%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	5%

STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	2%

Supporters tend to be:

- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- Commissioner District One residents

Opponents are more apt to be:

- those currently not working
- Commissioner District Two residents

*Programs for young adults, 18 to 24 years old?*

By 77% to 19%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	34%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	43%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	15%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	4%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Supporters tend to be:

- renters
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds

Opponents are more apt to be:

- homeowners
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Caucasians

*Programs for adults over the age of 55?*

By 78% to 19%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	36%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	42%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	13%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	2%

Supporters tend to be:

- over \$75,000 annual income households

Opponents are more apt to be:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- those currently not working
- 45 to 54 year olds
- over 54 year olds
- Hmong

***Health care programs?***

By 74% to 19%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	45%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	29%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	9%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	7%

Supporters tend to be:

- residents for five years or less
- residents for more than thirty years
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Commissioner District Five residents
- East Africans

Opponents are more apt to be:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Commissioner District Four residents

***Child care programs?***

By 83% to 14%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	53%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	30%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	6%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	3%

Supporters tend to be:

- renters
- 18 to 34 year olds
- East Africans

Opponents are more apt to be:

- homeowners
- Caucasians

### ***Technology programs?***

By 76% to 20%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	47%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	29%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	12%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	8%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	5%

Supporters tend to be:

- residents for six to ten years
- renters
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents

Opponents are more apt to be:

- homeowners
- those working for a government agency
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Caucasians

### ***Job training programs?***

By 77% to 19%, residents support more financial investment in these programs:

STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	53%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	24%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	9%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	10%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED. ....	4%

Supporters tend to be:

- Commissioner District Six residents
- East Africans

Opponents are more apt to be:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- Commissioner District Two residents

## 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
LESS THAN ONE PERCENT.....	3%...	3%
1 TO 2 PERCENT.....	12%..	12%
3 TO 4 PERCENT.....	21%..	22%
5 TO 7 PERCENT.....	22%..	17%
8 TO 10 PERCENT.....	13%...	8%
MORE THAN 10 PERCENT.....	8%...	2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	21%..	36%

While 36% are unable to answer this question, 37% underestimated the actual amount of seven percent. Before proceeding further, respondents were informed of the actual percentage.

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

- 18 to 34 year olds

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

- residents for more than thirty years
- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- 35 to 44 year olds
- Hispanic-Latinos

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

- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households

- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Caucasians

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

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- homeowners
- Caucasians

“Over ten percent” is cited more often by:

- those currently not working

## **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 a 69%-8% majority, respondents support a property tax increase to maintain the System:

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

Intense support is over ten times higher than intense opposition.

Support is higher among:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a government agency
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children
- Commissioner District Five residents
- Native Americans
- African Americans
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

It is lower among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- renters
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Two residents
- Caucasians

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

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

Twenty-two percent advise “budget better,” without specifying where wasteful spending might be:

UNSURE.....	33%
NOTHING/BUDGET BETTER.....	22%
TRAIL MAINTENANCE.....	5%
ADULT SPORTS. ....	5%
ADULT HOBBY.....	5%
YOUTH SPORTS OFFERED BY SCHOOLS.....	19%
ADULT EDUCATIONAL. ....	10%

Thirty-three percent are “unsure.”

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 services? Do you feel strongly that way?***

By a 41%-32% verdict, residents support this type of property tax increase:

	2015	2019
STRONGLY SUPPORT.....	8%..	12%
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT.....	16%..	29%
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE. ....	51%..	22%
STRONGLY OPPOSE. ....	9%..	10%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... 17%.. 27%

Curiously, intense opposition and intense support are almost equal, indicating that opponents are not adamantly opposed about this tax increase.

Support increases among:

- homeowners
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children
- Caucasians

It decreases among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Five residents
- African Americans
- Hispanic-Latinos

Supporters were asked a follow-up query:

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

Only one program, “family programs,” received greater than single digit support:

UNSURE . . . . .	8%
CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL. . . . .	5%
CHILDREN SPORTS. . . . .	7%
FAMILY PROGRAMS. . . . .	12%
CHILDCARE. . . . .	3%
ALL CHILDREN PROGRAMS. . . . .	6%
COMMUNITY/FAMILY EVENTS. . . . .	3%
ADULT SPORTS. . . . .	5%
SENIOR PROGRAMS. . . . .	6%
CHILDREN LESSONS. . . . .	2%
PARK/TRAIL MAINTENANCE. . . . .	7%
MORE INDOOR FACILITIES. . . . .	3%
MORE OUTDOOR FACILITIES. . . . .	2%
AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS. . . . .	2%
POOL . . . . .	7%



HEALTH/FITNESS AREAS. ....	4%
LONGER HOURS. ....	2%
BETTER SECURITY.....	2%
MODERN PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT.....	3%
JOB TRAINING. ....	3%
SCATTERED. ....	8%

There are no statistically significant sub-group differences.

## 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?*

A comparatively high 78% view their received value as “excellent” or “good.”

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

Only 10% regard it as “only fair.”

Ratings increase among:

- homeowners
- \$35,000 to \$75,000 annual income households
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- 35 to 44 year olds
- African Americans
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

They decrease among:

- residents for twenty-one to thirty years
- homeowners
- retirees
- over 54 year olds

- Commissioner District Two residents

---

## **Summary and Conclusions**

---

There is strong support for greater financial investment for all ten programs tested. At least 74% of residents supported each one, while 20% or less opposed the additional investment. Strong support, 69%, still exists for a property tax increase to maintain services and programs at their current level. Growing support was seen for a property tax increase to enhance services and programs, moving from 24% in 2015 to 41% this year. The value of services received for property tax dollars is also very highly rated.

# **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?*

Four sources are preferred by 75% of the sample – “park publications and newsletters” at 35%; “social media” or “MPRB website,” each at 14%, and “visiting or using a park facility” at twelve percent:

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

“MPRB Website” is stated more often by:

- residents for five years or less
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds
- Commissioner District Three residents
- Commissioner District Five residents
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

“Visiting/using a park facility” is cited more frequently by:

- residents for five years or less
- renters
- 35 to 44 year olds
- households with children

- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Commissioner District Two residents
- East Africans

“Publications and newsletters” is mentioned more often by:

- residents for more than thirty years
- retirees
- over 54 year olds
- Commissioner District Six residents
- Caucasians

“Social media” is stated most frequently by:

- residents for eleven to twenty years
- renters
- over \$75,000 annual income households
- those working for a business or corporation
- 18 to 34 year olds
- 1st or 2nd generation immigrants
- Asian-Pacific Islanders

---

## Summary and Conclusions

---

Preferred information sources reveal a multi-modal communications network. These networks combine publications and newsletters, social media, the MPRB website, and posted material at park facilities. These four methods mentioned by 75% as their preferred communications channel, allows MPRB to focus on them to reach the broad general public with key messages.

## 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 systems across the Twin Cities metro area over the past three years. Key strengths include variety and scope of offerings, the convenient location of city parks, natural areas and the extensive and well-maintained trail system. The only weaknesses, expressed by modest numbers, are too much litter and rising crime. While still impressive the comparatively high 27% of residents who are “boosters” and see nothing they dislike about the System, is down 17% from 2015.
- Recreation Centers have a smaller constituency; users during the recent past increased to 31%. The facilities are rated highly by all visitors; users divide into two overlapping groups: participants in inside programs and participants in outdoors programs. Virtually unanimity prevails in the very positive evaluations of both program types.
- Neighborhood parks are used by a large segment of the population, with over half of respondents indicating they visit them on at least a weekly basis. Regional parks possess a smaller constituency at 39% of the sample households visiting on at least a monthly basis.
- The three primary modes of transportation to a Minneapolis park are walking, driving an automobile, and bicycling. Only 17% of respondents indicate they only used an automobile to get to a Minneapolis Park.
- 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. Both of these considerations increased as a limiting factor by more than ten percent over the past four 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 language barriers.
- Four current programs or services are rated “very important” by at least 68% of the sample: youth sports programs, community events, youth non-sports programs, and after school programs. While all services tested were deemed at least somewhat important by at least 78%; these are key offerings should be protected in decision-makers’ budget setting.
- Solid majorities of respondents are supportive of six revenue-generators for the Park System; in each case, at least 64% favor the approach. Four proposals are favored by over 75%: adding additional concession stands, partnering with private organizations to support programming, increase corporate sponsorship opportunities, and allow organizations or individuals to purchase naming rights for Park Board properties.

- A narrow majority of 53% indicated a willingness to pay higher fees to use higher end amenities if they were developed by MPRB. These types of development should be balanced against the potential impact on current programs and services deemed important for the MPRB to continue to offer.
- Over 90% of respondents think the five Mission statements tested are important for the MPRB to focus on. In fact, over 60%, feel all five are “very important.” It is even more important that over 75% of residents rate the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board very highly in achieving each of the five mission statements tested.
- There is broad support for additional financial investments in each of the ten programs tested. Four services: programs for elementary school, middle school, high school and preschool children, received support of at least 90%. Not one program tested found opposition higher than 20%.
- 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 7.0%. In fact, 37% of the sample underestimate the designated percentage; while 36% are uncertain.
- A still solid 69%-8% majority supports a property tax increase to maintain the System’s infrastructure, programs and services at their current level, although support is down by seven percent from 2015. In a shift from 2015, a 41%-32% plurality supports a property tax increase to enhance the System in these three areas. Support for a property tax increase to maintain service and programs receives majority support across all demographic groups. Support for a property tax increase to enhance services and programs receives majority support among over \$75,000 annual income households, 35-44 year olds, and households with children. Opposition majorities are found among retirees and residents over the age of 55. It is critical to keep in mind that “upgrades” and “replacements” also are considered maintenance activities; and trails, natural areas, playgrounds and youth programs are particularly important to residents.

Once again, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation System is viewed exceptionally strong and is still seen as 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 the fiscal realities. Decision-makers should remember the already-established reservoir and the willingness of most residents to listen to a property tax increase to preserve, modernize, and protect the Park System and its programs for the future.