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Executive Summary

Introduction

Public Research Group conducted a Community Recreational Needs Survey during the summer of 2014. The purpose of the survey was to assist in establishing priorities for future capital improvements, programs and services within the Park District of Oak Park. This information is to be used by an independent consultant team in the development of Comprehensive Master Plan for the Park District of Oak Park in late 2014. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout Oak Park. The consultant worked comprehensively with Park District staff, the elected officials and the Comprehensive Master Plan team in the development of the survey questionnaire.

The survey data was collected from three primary sources: mail, email, and telephone surveys. The goal was to obtain a total of at least 1,000 survey responses. This goal was far exceed with a total of 2,268 responses received, combining the data gathering methodologies into one data set. Statistically, a sample of 2,268 households provides a margin of error of plus or minus 2.5% at a 95% confidence level that findings are representative of the sentiments of the residents of Oak Park.

Major Survey Findings

The survey contained a series of questions that were designed to measure behavior as well as perceptions by residents of Oak Park surrounding the Park District of Oak Park, Furthermore, there were several opportunities for participants to provide specific comments from “open end” questions.

- **Overall Satisfaction with the Park District**
  89.5% respondents said they were satisfied and only 10.5% said they were not, suggesting that respondents were overall overwhelmingly satisfied with Park District.

- **Ways Respondents Learn about the Park District**
  The Park District seasonal program guide garners the highest percentage of respondents, with 82.3% of all survey respondents saying they learn about the Park District through the program guide. The Park District website was second at 52.4% while the friends and neighbors were third with 37.9%. The Illinois average for website use in this capacity is less than 30%.

- **Quality of Programs (Benchmark)**
  91.3% respondents said the programs were either excellent or good while only 0.8% said the program quality was poor. The excellent category was at 40.8% which is slightly higher than the Illinois average of 37%.

- **Participation in Park District Programs**
  The most highly participated program was community wide special events at 57.7%, followed by youth sports/leagues at 26.0% and then youth aquatics/swim lessons at 24.5%.

- **Most Important Programs**
  The top four ranked activities in terms of importance were community wide special events at 10.2%, adult fitness programs at 5.1%, youth sports/leagues at 4.8% and youth aquatic programs at 4.7%.

- **Visited a park in the last 12 months**
  93.9% of the survey respondents said they or a member of their household had visited a park during the past year which is a very high percentage of park usage as the Illinois average is less than 80%.
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- **Condition of the Parks**
  44.3% of the survey respondents said park conditions were excellent, 46.0% said they were good, 8.8% said fair, and 0.9% said poor. The findings suggest that community members who overwhelmingly visit the parks also think they are in very good shape.

- **Visitation of Park District facilities in the last 12 months**
  The highest percentage of use by the public is the Conservatory, where 63.7% of those responding said they used that facility. A total of 58.0% of those responding said they used the Rehm Outdoor Pool, with historic properties at 44.4%, neighborhood community centers at 43.6% and the Gymnastics & Recreation Center at 38.4%.

- **Condition of the Facilities**
  The physical condition ratings are generally good, but some are better than others. The Conservatory got high ratings, with 49.9% of respondents saying its physical condition was excellent and 45.3% saying it was good. The highest ratings were for the Gymnastics & Recreation Center, with 75.3% of respondents reporting its condition was excellent and 23.4% reporting it was good. This facility would be expected to gather high marks as it is a brand new facility. Other facilities were respectable but not quite as high.

- **Park District Impact on Health**
  The survey data shows that only 13.6% said that the Park District makes no difference in the health of respondents or their family members and 22.9% said it makes little difference. A total of 63.5% of respondents said the Park District helps them maintain a healthy lifestyle or has actually improved their health.

- **Level of Support for Building a New Indoor Multi-Use Facility**
  The survey data shows that 59.7% thought the Park District should build such a facility. If the survey respondent answered yes to this question, a follow up question was asked if they would be willing to support a $2 per month tax increase to pay for it. The data shows that the 59.7% that supported building the facility, only 25% said they would support a tax increase, 8.1% opposed it, 15% were unsure and 51.9% didn't answer.

- **Level of Support for Building a New Indoor Swimming Pool**
  The survey data shows that 60.3% thought the Park District should build such a facility. If the survey respondent answered yes to this question, a follow up question was asked if they would be willing to support a $4 per month tax increase to pay for it. The data shows that the 60.3% that supported building the facility, only 24% said they would support a tax increase, 9.5% opposed it, 14.4% were unsure and 52.1% didn't answer.

- **Level of Satisfaction with Website**
  The survey data shows that 91.2% were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the websites general information. Comparatively, 87.5% of those responding were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the website’s park and facility information and 86.6% with the website’s program information. Lower levels of satisfaction were attributed to the website’s online program registration, where 73.8% were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied, and lowest levels of satisfaction were attributed to its ease of navigation.

- **Use of Parks & Recreation Facilities**
  The most used facilities were outdoor swimming pools at 67.0%, playgrounds at 64.6%, gardens/natural areas at 56.9%, and walking paths at 54.6%.

- **Most Important New Parks & Facilities**
  The top four ranked new parks & facilities in terms of importance were indoor swimming pools at 58.7%, of those responding said they were needed, followed by indoor walking/running tracks at 56.0%, indoor fitness/exercise facilities at 53.8%, and art facilities at 30.7%.
Survey Conclusions

- Overall satisfaction with the Park District is high.
- Programs are the main reason for not being satisfied.
- The Park District helps maintain a healthy lifestyle.
- The program guide still heavily used followed by the website.
- Website improvements should focus on ease of navigation and on-line registration.
- Program quality and participation scored high.
- Community special events, youth sports/leagues and youth aquatics/swim lessons are used and in demand.
- Adult programming should be a focus as it is an area that the Park District does not meet the need of the community.
- Parks and facilities are heavily visited and used.
- The Community does not factor community center location in selecting programs in which to participate.
- Outdoor swimming pools, playgrounds, gardens/nature areas are important facilities to the community.
- Indoor swimming pool, indoor running/walking track and indoor fitness/exercise facilities are the most needed.
- Good level of support for a multi-use facility but a small portion of the supporters is willing to pay a tax increase to build and operate it.
- Good level of support for an indoor pool but a small portion of the supporters is willing to pay a tax increase to build and operate it.
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Methodology

Public Research Group (PRG) provides a variety of data gathering techniques and different types of analysis to help parks and recreation agencies identify the needs of their residents. PRG’s data gathering techniques include mail, telephone, email and online surveys, personal interviews, as well as meetings with staff, board members and stakeholders. Analysis of data includes quantitative and qualitative methodologies, including graphical and tabular presentations. This study utilizes mail, telephone and email surveys and reviews this data using both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques.

Most research studies conducted by PRG have much smaller data sets. In the case of the Park District of Oak Park (PDOP), the data set is one of the largest PRG has ever collected, only exceeded by its 2011 study for the Village of Arlington Heights, where over 2,400 surveys were collected. This PDOP study collected 2,268 surveys, including 2,068 email, 188 mail and 12 telephone.

One thousand random sample mail surveys were sent out, with 188 returns representing an 18.8% completion rate, considered above average in social science research. The email completion rate was over 72%, also considered high in social science research. Only 12 telephone surveys were completed because the 2,068 email and 188 mail survey sample was sufficient to create a representative sample.

According to the 2010 Census, the Village of Oak Park has about 23,000 occupied housing units. A random sample of 2,268 represents nearly a 10% cross-section of the community, with a 95% confidence that the sample is plus or minus 2.5% of all 23,000 households. To put your sample in perspective, nationwide presidential polls only take a sample of about 1,200 respondents to be representative of the entire voting population of the United States and Nielsen rating households only comprise about 1,200 households as well to be representative of all television viewers. Both 1,200 samples provide a statistical level of 95% that presidential polls and Nielsen ratings are within + or − 3.5% of the national average.

In this PDOP study, respondents were asked to complete a five page questionnaire with 21 questions. Within those 21 questions, there were 261 variables, most of which were statistically quantifiable and some of which were open-ended questions which could only be presented as narrative responses in tables. The survey took an average of 14 minutes to complete. A copy of the mail survey instrument is presented in the Appendix of this report. While email and telephone survey instruments had their own scripts, questions were asked in identical order and using identical wording.

The quantifiable variables are generally presented in tables and graphs in this study, using one-sample and independent-sample means testing and frequency analysis. Occasionally, correlation can be used. Qualitative data is analyzed, determining if themes within narrative responses exists and whether those themes are also reflected in the quantitative data. Most qualitative data will be presented in the Appendix of this report.

This report begins with a presentation of the demographic data, comparing it to Census estimates in order to show the strength of the sample. Questions relating to satisfaction with Park District services will be the first area of focus. Use of those services follows with questions relating to the importance or unimportance of those services immediately after. The report will conclude with questions about future priorities and the willingness of the public to pay for new services. Please note, the analysis of questions will not be presented in the same order that they were asked.
Demographic Data

According to Census estimates, the residents of the Village of Oak Park are 53.6% female and 46.4% male. It is not unusual that leisure services research survey responses tend to be more female than male. Such is the case for this study, where of the 1,620 respondents who provided their gender, approximately 82% were female and 18% male, the valid percent which does not take those who didn’t answer into consideration.

![Gender of Respondents Pie Chart]

Since females were more diligent in responding to email, mail and telephone surveys and tend to be spokespersons of their households, a question becomes does this gender difference lead to a response bias. The answer in social science research is probably not. Most questions in the survey were about household activities, participation in programs and use of facilities.

Exceptions were questions 9, 9a, 10, and 10a, which were about supporting new recreation facilities and tax increases to pay for them. During the analysis of those questions, PRG will compare gender and age responses to determine if there are gender differences in respondents' answers.

Question 18 asked the age of respondents. Census estimates were that the median age of Oak Park residents is 38.9 years. The table shows that exactly 1,500 of the 2,268 respondents chose to provide their ages and that the average age of respondents to this survey was 48.04 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Age of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>48.04 Years Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

However, since no one under 18 years of age responded to the survey, the data suggests that the average age of respondents was slightly younger compared to Census estimates, about 30 years of age (48.04 - 18 = 30.04). This can be explained by the high percentage of email surveys in the sample and that seniors tend to be the least likely to provide their ages in social science research.

Census data shows that 57.5% of households had families and 29.4% had children under 18 years of age. Sample data from the email, mail and telephone data showed that a higher percentage of respondents had children under 18 within their households, 61%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households with Children</th>
<th>61%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The findings are probably a function of the high percentage of email respondents compared to mail and telephone. In social science research, email respondents tend to be younger and have more children in the household, compared to mail and telephone respondents.

Question 16 asked respondents if they owned or rented their place of residence. Census data showed that 60.3% were estimated to own their homes and 39.7% were estimated to rent their residences. The census data also shows that 4.2% of the rental housing as vacant. So the adjusted percentage for rental residences is 35.5%.

The data from the surveys shows that, of the 1,631 respondents who answered the question about whether they owned or rented their residence, 85.9% said they owned and 14.1% said they rented. The sample was also geo-coded with parcel level zoning data powered through GIS files. The housing stock within the Village of Oak Park is approximately 42% multi-family buildings that included flats, townhomes, rentals and condo buildings according to the Village of Oak Park Village Profile. The returned sample had a breakdown of 78% of single-family homes and 22% of multi-family units. A map that illustrates the survey breakdown within the Park District is included in the Appendix.
Question 15 asked how long respondents lived in Oak Park. The following chart shows that a high percentage of respondents have been relatively recent residents. Census data was very similar.

Length of Residency in Oak Park

- More than 10 years, 56.2%
- 5 years or less, 22.1%
- 6-10 years, 21.7%

The data from the combined email, mail and telephone surveys shows that 22.1% were relative newcomers, living in the Park District for five years or less, that 21.7% said they lived in Oak Park between six and 10 years and that 56.2% lived in Oak Park for more than ten years, not taking those who didn’t answer into consideration. This finding suggests that the survey did not just focus on long time residents and senior citizens, supporting previous findings that the survey achieved a younger demographic with children in the household.

Question 19 asked respondents to describe their race. While it was assumed that some households would be of mixed race, the vast majority were of one race, mainly describing themselves as white.
The data from Question 19 shows that Black/African American respondents were somewhat under-represented in the sample, while whites were over-represented somewhat. Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, and Asian/Pacific Islander respondents were represented very close to Census estimates.

In social science research, random sampling attempts to eliminate biases toward one group or another. PRG finds that respondents are self-selecting, volunteering to complete surveys or not. In this study for the Park District of Oak Park, the sample is so large that it would be difficult to argue it is not representative of the entire community. The demographic data more or less bears that hypothesis out.
Satisfaction

Question 1 asked respondents to characterize their overall levels of satisfaction with the Park District of Oak Park. Respondents were provided the choices of saying they were satisfied or not satisfied. Some respondents chose not to answer the question.

A total of 94 respondents failed to answer the question. Of the 2,174 that answered it, 89.5% said they were satisfied and 10.5% said they were not, suggesting that respondents were overwhelmingly satisfied.

Question 1a provided those not satisfied with the opportunity to explain the reasons why. Respondents were provided the choices of saying customer service, facilities, parks, programs, or fees were the reasons. Respondents were offered the opportunity to select more than one choice or provide an answer of their own.

Reasons for Not Being Satisfied

- Customer Service: 9.3%
- Parks: 18.8%
- Fees: 20.2%
- Facilities: 22.8%
- Programs: 28.9%
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A total of 229 had said they were not satisfied with the Park District in Question 1. Since respondents were permitted to select more than one reason for not being satisfied, there were 356 reasons selected.

The data shows that programs were the leading reason for dissatisfaction, with 28.9% of the 10.5% dissatisfied respondents selecting programs. Facilities were second at 22.8%, fees third at 20.2%, and parks fourth at 18.8%. A distant fifth was customer service at 9.3%, suggesting that programs, parks and facilities were the leading reasons for any dissatisfaction that existed.

There were a relatively few open-ended responses that are presented in a table in the Appendix of this report. PRG presents them in their unedited versions so as not to put words in the mouths of respondents. A few of the responses were choices that could have been selected from those provided in the question. Others were reasons of their own.

Question 8 asks respondents to what extent does the Park District of Oak Park make a difference in their or other members of their household’s health. The following chart presents how the data arrived.

![Pie chart showing differences in health]

The data shows that only 13.6% of those answering the question said that the Park District makes no difference in the health of respondents or their family members and 22.9% said it makes little difference. A total of 63.5% of respondents said the PDOP helps them maintain a healthy lifestyle or has actually improved their health.

The findings suggest at least one reason why the Park District of Oak Park has such a high level of overall satisfaction, as well as explaining part of the importance of parks and recreation in general.

Other satisfaction questions in this study are embedded in the questionnaire as follow-up inquiries to questions about park, facility and program usage. Those satisfaction questions will be considered during this report as they occur. However, it is sufficient to say that, considering the high number of responses to the combined email, mail and telephone surveys, there was a relatively high level of satisfaction indicated and a fairly low number of reasons not to be satisfied. A goal of this study is to identify other causal factors and determine what can be done to improve satisfaction beyond its currently high level.
Media and Communication

Question 2 asked the ways in which respondents learn about the Park District of Oak Park. Respondents were provided a list of choices and an opportunity to provide their own method. Different percentages of respondents answered the different choice. The percentages reflected in the following graph are those that answered the question divided by the total respondents for the survey.

The percentages show that the Park District seasonal program guide garners the highest percentage of respondents, with 82.3% of all survey respondents saying they learn about the PDOP through the program guide. It should not be totally surprising that a high percentage of our database comprised mainly of email respondents would say they lean about the Park District from its website. Other means of communication garner far fewer followers.

Question 12 asked combined email, mail and telephone respondents if they had visited the Park District’s website in the past year. This question corroborates one of the media choices in Question 2.
The chart shows that 521 (23.0%) of respondents didn’t answer the question. Of those who did, 1,433 (82.0%) said they visited the website during the past year. That number is higher than the 1,189 who said they learned about the Park District of Oak Park from the website in Question 2, suggesting that the difference is the number of people that already were aware of the Park District and used the website for registration or additional information.

Question 12 asked respondents who visited the website to rate their satisfaction level with its general information, online program registration, park and facility information, program and event information, and user friendliness and ease of navigation. Respondents were provided the opportunity to say they were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, or not sure how they felt. PRG considers those respondents that didn’t answer the question to be among the unsure, making valid percent responses the most relevant.
The graph shows that 91.2% were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the website's general information. Comparatively, 87.5% of those responding were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the website's park and facility information and 86.6% with the website's program information. Lower levels of satisfaction were attributed to the website's online program registration, where 73.8% were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied, and lowest levels of satisfaction were attributed to its ease of navigation.
Program Questions

A number of survey questions addressed program participation and whether Park District of Oak Park programs met the recreational needs of Oak Park residents.

Question 3 was a warm-up question asking whether respondents or members of their households had participated in any programs offered by the PDOP during the past year.

The response totals show that 68.2% of respondents said they or a member of their household had participated in Park District programs during the past 12 months and 31.6% said they had not. Four respondents were not sure, and 183 didn’t answer the question. The data suggests participation among respondents was high, an indication of the importance of parks and recreation to the community.

Question 3a asked respondents to provide a rating of the overall quality of the programs in which they or members of their households had participated. Respondents were provided the choice of saying the overall quality was excellent, good, fair, or poor. It is assumed that anyone who didn’t respond either didn’t participate in a program or had no opinion.

The following chart shows the percentages of respondents who had an opinion.
What is striking about the data is that only 0.8% of those answering the question said program quality was poor and needed many improvements. A total of 91.3% said programs were either excellent or good.

Question 4 focused specifically on group fitness classes, asking respondents if they or members of their households had participated in group fitness classes during the past 12 months.

Of the 2,048 respondents answering the question, 299 (14.6%) said they had and 1,748 (85.4%) said they had not. Question 4a was written to identify what prevented respondents from participating in group fitness classes. Respondents were provided a list of possible reasons and to choose all that applied. They were also provided the opportunity to express their own reasons. The following graph shows the percentages or those choosing one of the reasons divided by the total number of the 1,748 respondents who said they didn’t participate in group fitness classes.

Reasons for Not Participating in Group Fitness Classes

- Quality of instructors: 2.5%
- Quality of fitness space: 4.2%
- Types of classes offered: 8.9%
- Lack of flexible registration options: 9.6%
- Cost: 11.8%
- Lack of childcare: 15.0%
- Lack of time: 27.2%
- Not interested: 27.3%
- Use a different provider: 30.0%
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Intuitively, a hypothesis would be the biggest reason people don’t participate in group fitness classes would be that they were not interested to do so. Counter-intuitively, the data shows that the biggest reason is that respondents said they don’t participate in group fitness classes (30.0%) because they participate somewhere else. Not being interested was selected by 27.3% of respondents followed closely by 27.2% of respondents who said they didn’t have the time. Other reasons generally paled by comparison, with lack of childcare and cost being the most significant second tier reasons.

The open-ended responses are in a table in the Appendix of this report, presented in unedited form. Most of the responses in the table repeat those choices provided in the question, such as stating the service provider from whom respondents participate in group fitness.

Question 5 also provided a table where respondents were asked to state if they used each of the programs in the table and, if they did, had the Park District met their needs. The graph showing who participated in what program types is on the following page. Percentages are calculated as the number of people who said they participated in a program divided by the number of people responding to each program choice.
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The graph shows that, by far, the most highly participated program was community wide special events, where 57.7% of the 1,605 people answering that question said they participated. The lowest participation was for adult gymnastics, where only .6% of the 1,474 responding to the question said they participated.

As far as meeting their needs which was the second part of Question 5, not everyone who said they participated answered that question. Of those who did, the following graph shows their responses.

Does the PDOP Meet Your Needs

- Adult Gymnastics: 20.8%
- Adult Art: 39.7%
- Youth Gardening: 45.5%
- After School Care: 47.7%
- Adult Martial Arts: 53.3%
- Youth Environmental: 53.8%
- Adult Dance: 57.6%
- Adult Environmental: 59.0%
- Youth Dance: 61.8%
- Senior Programs/Events: 62.3%
- Adult Ice Hockey: 63.1%
- Adult Ice Skating: 65.6%
- Other Adult Special Interest: 66.4%
- Youth Martial Arts: 66.4%
- Adult Aquatic/Swim Lessons: 68.2%
- Youth Art: 68.2%
- Youth Aquatics/Swim Lessons: 69.3%
- Adult Fitness: 69.5%
- Teen Programs/Events: 70.4%
- Youth Fitness: 70.9%
- Youth Ice Hockey: 71.6%
- Adult Sports/Leagues: 73.7%
- Preschool/Early Childhood: 74.3%
- Other Youth Special Interest: 75.4%
- Adult Gardening: 79.4%
- Youth Ice Skating: 82.7%
- Youth Sports/Leagues: 82.8%
- Youth Summer Camps: 84.5%
- Youth Gymnastics: 85.9%
- Family Special Events: 91.1%
- Community Wide Special Events: 96.4%
The data shows the highest participation programs are also those which respondents thought met their needs. Community-wide special events were attended by 835 of those 1,605 people responding to the question, which represented 57.7% of the public, with 96.4% of them believing these programs met their needs. Family special events, youth gymnastics, youth summer camps, and youth sports leagues were also highly utilized and popular in so far as respondents thought they met their needs.

Question 5a asked respondents to list the four programs that were the most important to their household. All of the programs in Question 5 were eligible, with respondents also permitted to select “none.”

**Most Important to Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Gymnastics</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Gardening</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Fitness</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Environmental</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Environmental</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Martial Arts</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Youth Special Interest</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Dance</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Art</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Ice Skating</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Gardening</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs/Events</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Care</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Ice Hockey</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Dance</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Programs/Events</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adult Special Interest</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Martial Arts</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ice Skating</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sports/Leagues</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Special Events</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Aquatic/Swim Lessons</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool/Early Childhood</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Gymnastics</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Summer Camps</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Aquatics/Swim Lessons</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports/Leagues</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Fitness</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Wide Special Events</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While none was the most frequently selected choice, it only represented a small portion of the total sample of 2,268 households. The top seven ranked activities in terms of importance were community wide special events, adult fitness programs, youth sports programs, youth aquatic programs, youth summer camps, youth gymnastics programs, and preschool/early childhood programs. All others were distant finishers.

Respondents were permitted the opportunity in Question 5b to list their needs that are not being met. Their comments are presented in unedited form so as not to change them. The table of those needs is in the Appendix of this report.

Within that table are hundreds of suggestions, but most of them are comments that will be reiterated at the end of the survey when they have the opportunity to make them again. Comments range from discussions about dog parks to discussions about swimming lessons. There are a few new program ideas, but most respondents did not address the question of suggesting new programs that would meet their needs.
Park and Facility Usage

Question 6 asked respondents if they had visited any of the Park District of Oak Park parks during the past year. Respondents were permitted to answer yes or no, and PRG also recorded the number of people who did not answer the question for whatever reason.

Of those 1,799 respondents who answered the question, 93.9% said they or a member of their household had visited a park during the past year. This is a very high percentage of park usage, higher than other communities PRG has polled in the past 10 years, suggesting parks are very important to the residents of Oak Park.

Question 6a asked how respondents rated the physical condition of all of the parks in Oak Park that they had visited. Respondents were provided the choices of saying the conditions were excellent, good, fair, or poor. Those not responding are also shown in the following chart.
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Of those 1,679 respondents who answered the question, 44.3% said park conditions were excellent, 46.0% said they were good, 8.8% said fair, and .9% said poor. The findings suggest that community members who overwhelming visit the parks also think they are in very good shape.

Specific facilities were listed in Question 7. Survey respondents were provided a list of five facilities in which they were asked if they used them and how they would rate their physical condition.

The graph shows the highest percentage of usage by the public is the Conservatory, where 63.7% of those responding said they used the facility. A total of 58.0% of those responding said they used the Rehm Outdoor Pool, with historic properties, the Gymnastics & Recreation Center and neighborhood community centers garnering 44.4%, 38.4% and 43.6% respectively.
The graph above shows the physical condition ratings.

The physical condition ratings are generally good, but some are better than others. The Conservatory got high ratings, with 49.9% of respondents saying its physical condition was excellent and 45.3% saying it was good. The highest ratings were for the Gymnastics & Recreation Center, with 75.3% of respondents reporting its condition was excellent and 23.4% reporting it was good. This facility would be expected to gather high marks as it is a brand new facility. Other facilities were respectable but not quite as high.

Question 13 provided another list of facilities typically found in parks but also including historic properties, outdoor swimming pools, nature and environmental centers. Respondents were asked if they used these types of facilities and, if yes, does the Park District meet their needs by providing them. The graphs on the following two pages includes both statistics.
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Parks and Facility Usage & Need

- **Outdoor Ice Rinks**
  - Meets Needs: 79.0%
  - Use Facility: 13.1%

- **Outdoor Gardens/Natural Areas**
  - Meets Needs: 93.1%
  - Use Facility: 56.9%

- **Outdoor Basketball Courts**
  - Meets Needs: 54.5%
  - Use Facility: 9.9%

- **Outdoor Baseball/Softball**
  - Meets Needs: 79.1%
  - Use Facility: 26.2%

- **Off-Leash Dog Areas**
  - Meets Needs: 46.9%
  - Use Facility: 14.3%

- **Nature/Environmental Centers**
  - Meets Needs: 91.1%
  - Use Facility: 36.8%

- **Martial Arts Facilities**
  - Meets Needs: 60.5%
  - Use Facility: 5.4%

- **Indoor Ice Rinks**
  - Meets Needs: 92.2%
  - Use Facility: 32.2%

- **Historic Properties**
  - Meets Needs: 96.3%
  - Use Facility: 41.8%

- **Gymnastics Facilities**
  - Meets Needs: 93.8%
  - Use Facility: 26.3%

- **Dance Facilities**
  - Meets Needs: 61.4%
  - Use Facility: 5.4%
Park and Facility Usage & Need (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Meets Needs</th>
<th>Use Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Pedestrian Paths</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pads/Spray Areas</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sled Hills</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis Courts</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Soccer/Multipurpose Fields</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Parks</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The graphs show the highest and lowest percentages of respondents who said they used the facilities on the list in Question 13. The most used facilities were outdoor swimming pools at 67.0%, playgrounds at 64.6%, gardens/natural areas at 56.9%, and walking paths at 54.6%. The lowest used facilities were outdoor volleyball courts at 5.3%, martial arts and dance facilities both at 5.4%, and outdoor skate parks at 6.5%.

The lowest percentage of respondents, 46.9%, said that off-leash dog areas met their needs, affirming some of the open-ended comments in Question 5b and which this report will show in other comments at the end of the study.

Question 13a asked respondents to list the four facilities that were the most important to their household. The following graph shows the percentages.

Most Important Facilities
The graph shows the number of respondents who selected each of the facilities in Question 13 as one of their top four in importance. While none was the most frequently selected response, representing 59.2% of the total sample of 2,268 households, outdoor swimming pools, playgrounds, outdoor gardens/natural areas, walking paths, sled hills, historic properties, and splash pads/spray areas were the top seven choices by respondents.

Question 14 asked if respondents or any member of their households saw the need for new facilities that it listed in the table. Respondents were then asked in Question 14a, which four recreation facilities would be the most important. The two graphs showing the responses are presented below and on the next page.

### Facilities Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Tennis Courts</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Roller Hockey Rinks</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton Courts</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee Golf Courses</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for Seniors</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for Teens</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Fitness Equipment Areas</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Gymnasiums</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Facilities</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Fitness/Exercise Facilities</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Running/Walking Tracks</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows the top four need facilities to be indoor swimming pools, where 58.7% of those responding said they were needed, followed by indoor walking/running tracks at 56.0%, indoor fitness/exercise facilities at 53.8%, and art facilities at 30.7%. Question 14a attempted to corroborate those responses.
The graph above shows that the top four needed facilities when respondents are asked to rank them are indoor swimming pools, indoor running/walking tracks, indoor fitness/exercise facilities, and indoor gymnasiums. Indoor gymnasiums just edged out art facilities. Art facilities were among the four most frequently selected. It would be fair to say then that five types of facilities are what the public would want to see built first.
Building New Facilities

Question 9 asked if respondents believed the Park District of Oak Park should build and operate a multi-use facility housing indoor basketball and volleyball courts and a walking track. The following graph shows their responses.

The chart shows that 59.7% of those answering the question said they thought the Park District should build such a facility, considering that 45.6% said yes taking into consideration those respondents not answering the question. Valid percent is the percent of respondents, not taking into consideration those who didn’t answer the question. Percent takes them into consideration.

Either way, the findings suggest that more people favor the idea of a building and operating a multi-purpose facility than oppose it. Considering the responses to Question 14, an indoor walking/running track and a fitness center would be popular amenities.

Question 9a asked respondents if they would support a tax increase of $2 per month per $100,000 assessed home value to build a multi-purpose facility. The question also explains that the average home in Oak Park, valued at $323,200, would pay less than $7 per month. Respondents were provided the choice of saying they would support a tax increase for that purpose, that they would not or they were unsure. For this question, those not answering the question would be considered unsure. The following table shows the percentages for each answer.
2014 Survey Findings

The table shows that 25% of all respondents said they would support a tax increase, 8.1% opposed it, 15% were unsure and 51.9% didn’t answer. Counting those who didn’t answer as unsure, 76.9% in total were unsure.

Question 10 asked if respondents believed the Park District of Oak Park should build and operate an indoor pool.

Should the PDOP Build & Operate an Indoor Pool

- No, 39.7%
- Yes, 60.3%

Not considering those who didn’t respond, 60.3% of all respondents supported the notion of building and operating an indoor pool and 39.7% oppose it. Counting those who didn’t answer as undecided, 46% of respondents supported the idea, 30.3% opposed it, and 23.7% were undecided.

In terms of their willingness to increase property taxes to fund the construction of an indoor pool, the pattern of responses was similar to that of the multi-purpose facility.

Support a $4 Tax Increase

- Yes, 24.0%
- No, 9.5%
- Unsure, 66.5%

Considering those respondents that didn’t answer to be undecided, 24% of all survey respondents supported a tax increase to pay to build an indoor pool, 9.5% opposed it, 14.4% said they were unsure and 52.1% didn’t answer, for a total 66.5% unsure.
The findings from Question 9, 9a, 10, and 10a suggest that the public supports the idea of construction of an indoor multi-purpose facility and an indoor pool but are largely undecided about whether they want to pay for it through a property tax increase. The data suggests that more information needs to be provided in order for supporters to be willing to pay for these facilities, but that it is far better to start from a position of the public supporting the concepts instead of opposing them.

Finally, Question 11 asked combined email, mail and telephone respondents if they believe the Park District of Oak Park should make acquiring green space a priority over building new facilities.

![Pie chart showing survey findings on acquiring additional greenspace](chart.png)

The responses to this question were close, but respondents were slightly more in favor of building new facilities than acquiring additional green space. Less people didn't answer the question and, therefore, less were undecided, with 24.7% in that category. A plurality of 39.3% said that the PDOP should not make acquiring additional green space a priority, compared to 36% who said it should.

Removing the undecided respondents from consideration, 47.8% said that the PDOP should make acquiring land a priority over building new facilities and 52.2% said it should not, suggesting there is a slim majority in favor of building new facilities. This finding has been consistent throughout the data, with strong support for new indoor facilities.
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Ideas and Comments

Question 20 asked respondents for the one idea they felt would be beneficial for the Park District of Oak Park to implement in the next five years. As can be imagined, some people offered an idea, others no ideas, and still others offered many ideas. Their unedited responses are in the Appendix in a very long table, with over 1,000 people offering their thoughts.

Many of their ideas supported the concept of a new indoor multi-purpose facility or swimming pool. Others were programming ideas expressed earlier in Question 5b. Overall, though, the ideas were generally positive and consistent with questions throughout the survey. Reviewing the comments shows how important parks and recreation services are to the residents of Oak Park and how they encourage the Park District to improve them whenever they can. Many are simply offers of thanks for the good work the Park District does.

Question 21 asked respondents to share any additional comments they might have. Their comments are presented in a very large table in the Appendix of this report.

Many of their comments were reminiscent of respondents’ previous fond memories of them or their children using Park District services. Others were restatements of issues they had discussed earlier; including ideas expressed in Question 20. For the most part, comments were positive.
Additional Analysis

Question 1

The following two charts compare the data for overall satisfaction with the Park District of Oak Park from 2010 to 2014. While the 2014 survey did not give an option for the respondent to reply they didn’t know, the level of satisfaction with the Park District is much higher for the 2014 survey.

Overall Satisfaction with PDOP- 2010 Survey Results

- Satisfied, 62%
- Don’t Know, 30%
- Not Satisfied, 8%

Overall Satisfaction with PDOP- 2014 Survey Results

- Satisfied, 89.5%
- Not Satisfied, 10.5%
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Question 3

The following two charts compare program participation data from 2010 to 2014. The charts show that participation in Park District programs increased dramatically since the 2010 survey.

Participated in PDOP Programs- 2010 Survey Results

- Yes, 38.0%
- No, 62.0%

Participated in PDOP Programs- 2014 Survey Results

- Yes, 68.2%
- No, 31.6%
- Not Sure, 0.2%

Participation in programs comparing households with kids compared to all households shown graphically:

Program Use by Children in Household

- All households: 63.0%
- Kids in household: 82.0%
Participation in programs by different ethnic groups compared graphically:

**Program Use by Ethnic Group**

- Black: 61.0%
- American Indian: 64.0%
- White: 71.0%
- Hispanic: 78.0%
- Asian: 78.0%

Program participation comparing those who rent to those who own their homes shown graphically:

**Program Use by Home Ownership**

- Rent: 50.0%
- Own: 71.0%
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Question 4 & 4A

Comparing households with and without children in Question 4, the following table shows the percentage or households with children who said they had a household member in any group fitness class offered by the Park District of Oak Park.

Group Fitness Use by Children in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows 13% of households with children have a household member who participates in group fitness classes and 16% of those household without children participate.

Considering Question 4, the question asked respondents to select from a list of what prevents them from using group fitness. The graph on the following page compares the different responses by households with and without children. There are relatively small differences between households with and without children regarding the reasons that households with and without children don’t participate in group fitness classes, except for lack of childcare, which is in an intuitive response.

For households with children, the second greatest difference is the response to the time classes are offered. Taking them from a different provider is the third greatest difference, with not being interested close behind.
Not Using Group Fitness by Children in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of classes offered</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of fitness space</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of childcare</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use different provider</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lack of flexible          | Without children | With children |
| registration options      |                  |              |
|                          | 6.0%             | 10.0%        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of instructors</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time offered</th>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>With children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question 6 & 6A

The following charts compare the number of respondents who said they have visited a Park District of Oak Park park within the past 12 months, and then how they would rate the physical condition of those parks from 2010 to 2014.

Visited any PDOP Parks in the Past Year - 2010 Survey Results

- Yes, 85.0%
- No, 15.0%

Visited any PDOP Parks in the Past Year - 2014 Survey Results

- Yes, 93.9%
- No, 6.1%

Physical Condition of the Parks - 2010 Survey Results

- Excellent, 31.0%
- Good, 54.0%
- Fair, 14.0%
- Poor, 1.0%

Physical Condition of the Parks - 2014 Survey Results

- Excellent, 44.3%
- Good, 46.0%
- Fair, 8.8%
- Poor, 0.9%
Question 8

The following charts compare the difference respondents said the Park District makes to their households health between 2010 and 2014.

What Difference did the PDOP Make in Your Households Health- 2010 Survey Results

- Helps maintain a healthy lifestyle: 48.0%
- Actually improved my health: 14.0%
- Makes little difference: 16.0%
- Makes no difference: 7.0%
- Don’t know: 15.0%

What Difference did the PDOP Make in Your Households Health- 2014 Survey Results

- Helps maintain a healthy lifestyle: 53.6%
- Actually improved my health: 9.9%
- Makes little difference: 22.9%
- Makes no difference: 13.6%
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Question 9

This question asks respondents whether the PDOP should build a new multi-use facility that would house indoor basketball and volleyball courts and a walking track. The following graph compares the responses by households that had children and those without children after eliminating all the undecided respondents and those that didn’t answer both questions.

Support Multi-use Facility by Children in Household

- Without children: 56.0%
- With children: 64.0%

The graph shows a marginal higher level of support by households with children at 64% compared to households without children at 56%.

The following graph compares support for a multi-use facility by those who rent and those who own after eliminating all the undecided respondents and those that didn’t answer both questions.

Support Multi-use Facility by Home Ownership

- Own: 58.0%
- Rent: 68.0%

The graph shows renters tend to support the construction of a multi-use facility at somewhat higher levels than those households that own their own homes.
Question 9A

Question 9a asks respondents if they would support a $2 per month tax increase to build a multi-use facility. Comparing respondents' answers by whether they owned or rented their residences, the following graph makes that comparison after eliminating all the undecided respondents and those that didn’t answer both questions.

Support Tax Increase by Home Ownership

The graph shows there is practically no difference between home owners and renters.
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Question 10

Question 10 asks respondents to state whether they believed the PDOP should build an indoor pool. After eliminating all of those respondents who didn’t answer either of the questions, the following graph compares the responses of those households that had children against the ones that did not have children or didn’t answer the questions.

Build Indoor Pool by Children in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without children</th>
<th>55.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows that 65% of those households with children said an swimming pool should be built compared to 55% of those without children, a relatively significant difference.

The following graph compares respondents who said they rented their dwelling units compared to those who said they owned them after eliminating those respondents who didn’t answer the questions or were not sure.

Build Indoor Pool by Home Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own</th>
<th>59.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data suggests that there is a difference of 6% between owners and renters supporting the construction and operation of an indoor swimming pool, with 59% of homeowners in favor and 65% of renters.
Question 10A

Question 10a asked respondents whether they would support a tax increase of $4 per month per $100,000 of assessed home value to build an indoor pool. The following graph compares homeowners to renters after those who didn’t answer both questions were eliminated or simply didn’t know.

Support Tax Increase for Indoor Pool by Home Ownership

The graph shows that homeowners were slightly more in favor of paying increased property taxes than renters, with 74% of them supporting the tax increase compared to 68% of renters.

Question 14A

Question 14a asked respondents to rank which four parks & recreation facilities that the Park District of Oak Park does not have were most important to their household from a list in question 14. The following graphs compares demographic age breakdowns and if kids were in the household or not.

Under 5 Age Group
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### 5-9 Age Group

- **Indoor gymnasium**: 34.1%
- **Indoor fitness**: 45.4%
- **Indoor track**: 46.7%
- **Indoor swimming**: 58.6%

### 10-14 Age Group

- **Indoor gymnasium**: 34.7%
- **Indoor fitness**: 40.4%
- **Indoor track**: 47.0%
- **Indoor swimming**: 55.5%
### 45-54 Age Group

- Indoor gymnasium: 27.8%
- Indoor fitness: 43.0%
- Indoor track: 45.5%
- Indoor swimming: 49.1%

### 55-64 Age Group

- Senior facilities: 19.5%
- Indoor fitness: 37.0%
- Indoor swimming: 38.7%
- Indoor track: 40.4%
65 & Older Age Group

- Senior facilities: 28.4%
- Indoor fitness: 30.3%
- Indoor swimming: 32.7%
- Indoor track: 34.1%
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Conclusions

This study had a number of goals which PRG believes were achieved. One goal was to measure the levels of satisfaction for the Park District of Oak Park in general and for specific services, including the use of parks and facilities. Another goal was to measure program and facility usage, rank their importance and determine if use met their needs. Still another goal was to measure the media with which the public learns about the Park District and feelings about the website specifically. And another goal was to determine if the public favors the construction of new indoor facilities and would be willing to pay for them.

The findings from this study identified the most popular programs, the use of facilities and that the public was in favor of constructing new indoor facilities as long as they included a walking/running track, fitness center and indoor pool. Those that had an opinion were in favor of paying for these new facilities, but a majority of people were undecided.

Finally, PRG found that, unlike many other Park Districts in Illinois, Oak Park residents rely heavily on the website as a means of communication. Typically, residents rely more on the printed seasonal brochures, but Oak Park is unique in its high volume of website users. That finding suggests that the Park District of Oak Park should continue to focus on its electronic communication as well as social media in the future.
Appendix
Legend
- Multi-Family - 439
- Single Family - 1,644
- Park District Boundary
Park District of Oak Park Questionnaire

The Park District of Oak Park would like your input to help determine park and recreation priorities for our community. Your “household” refers to you and those residing in your home. This survey will take up to 15 minutes to complete. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. All responses to this survey are anonymous and confidential. Please note that the Park District of Oak Park is a separate, autonomous agency, independent from the governance of the Village of Oak Park.

1. How would you characterize your overall satisfaction with the Park District of Oak Park?
   ___ Satisfied (Skip to #2)   ___ Not Satisfied (Answer #1a)

1a. If you answered “Not Satisfied”, please tell us which area(s) you are not satisfied with?
(Choose all that apply)
   ___ Customer Service   ___ Programs
   ___ Facilities         ___ Fees
   ___ Parks             ___ Other (Please specify)

2. Select the ways in which you learn about the Park District of Oak Park. (Choose all that apply)
   ___ Park District seasonal program guide   ___ School fliers/newsletters
   ___ Park District website                   ___ Promotions at Park District events
   ___ Newspaper                              ___ Conversations with Park District staff
   ___ Social media e.g. Facebook & Twitter   ___ Park District e-newsletter
   ___ Materials at Park District facilities   ___ Friends & neighbors
   ___ Affiliate Organizations (FOPCON, Youth Sports Organizations, etc.)
   ___ Other (Please specify)

3. Have you or members of your household participated in any programs offered by the Park District of Oak Park during the past 12 months?
   ___ Yes (Answer #3a)   ___ No (Skip to #4)

3a. How would you rate the overall quality of the programs you and members of your household participated in?
   ___ Excellent   ___ Fair (needs some improvements)
   ___ Good        ___ Poor (needs many improvements)

4. Have you or other members of your household participated in any group fitness classes offered by the Park District of Oak Park during the past 12 months?
   ___ Yes (Skip to #5)   ___ No (Answer #4a)

4a. What prevents you from participating in Park District of Oak Park group fitness classes? (Choose all that apply)
   ___ Time classes offered   ___ Lack of childcare   ___ Quality of fitness space
   ___ Quality of instructors   ___ Cost               ___ Types of classes offered
   ___ Lack of flexible registration options such as monthly pass/punch pass
   ___ I take group fitness classes from a different provider
   ___ Not interested in group fitness classes
   ___ Other (Please specify)
5. Indicate if YOU or ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD uses the following program offerings. If YES, does the Park District meet your needs by circling YES or NO below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>USE this program?</th>
<th>If YES, Does the Park District meet your needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Preschool &amp; Early Childhood Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Youth Aquatics &amp; Swim Lesson Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Youth Art Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Youth Dance Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Youth Fitness Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Youth Gymnastics Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Youth Ice Hockey Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Youth Ice Skating Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Youth Martial Arts Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Youth Environmental Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Youth Gardening Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Youth Sports Programs &amp; Leagues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Youth Summer Camps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N After School Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Other Youth Special Interest Programs (Cooking, Crafts, Technology, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Teen Programs &amp; Events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Adult Aquatic &amp; Swim Lesson Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Adult Art Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Adult Dance Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Adult Gymnastics Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Adult Ice Hockey Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Adult Ice Skating Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Adult Fitness Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Adult Martial Arts Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Adult Environmental Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Adult Gardening Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Adult Sports Programs &amp; Leagues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB Other Adult Special Interest Programs (Cooking, Crafts, Technology, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Senior Programs &amp; Events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Family Special Events (such as Egg Hunt, Santa Trolley, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Community Wide Special Events (such as Frank Lloyd Wright Races, Concerts in the Parks, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5a. Which FOUR programs that you use from the list above are most important to your household? (Please write in the letters corresponding to your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices below; or select NONE if recreation programs are not important to your household.)

____ 1st  ____ 2nd  ____ 3rd  ____ 4th  ____ NONE

5b. If you indicated above that your needs are not being met in any areas above, what specific programs are you looking for?

Please answer the questions on the reverse side of this page.
6. Have you or members of your household visited any Park District of Oak Park parks during the past year?

___ Yes (Answer #6a)  ___ No (Skip to #7)

6a. Overall how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the parks in Oak Park that you have visited?

___ Excellent  ___ Good  ___ Fair (needs some improvements)  ___ Poor (needs many improvements)

7. Indicate if YOU or ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD has visited the recreation facilities listed below in the past 12 months by circling YES or NO next to the facility. If yes, rate the overall physical condition by circling the number to the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>USE this Facility?</th>
<th>If YES, how would you rate the physical condition?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics &amp; Recreation Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Properties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Community Centers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehm Outdoor Pool</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. To what extent does the Park District of Oak Park make a difference in the health of you or other members of your household? (Please check one)

___ The Park District makes no difference.
___ The Park District makes little difference.
___ The Park District helps to maintain a healthy lifestyle.
___ The Park District has actually improved my health or the health of someone in my household.

9. Do you believe the Park District of Oak Park should build and operate a multi-use facility that houses indoor basketball courts, volleyball courts and walking track?

___ Yes (Answer #9a)  ___ No (Skip to #10)

9a. Would you support a tax increase of $2 per month per $100,000 of assessed home value to build a multi-use facility? (The average home in Oak Park, valued at $323,200, would pay less than $7/month)

___ Yes  ___ No  ___ Unsure

10. Do you believe the Park District of Oak Park should build and operate an indoor pool?

___ Yes (Answer #10a)  ___ No (Skip to #11)

10a. Would you support a tax increase of $4 per month per $100,000 of assessed home value to build an indoor pool? (The average home in Oak Park, valued at $323,200, would pay less than $13/month)

___ Yes  ___ No  ___ Unsure

11. Do you believe the Park District of Oak Park should make acquiring additional green space a priority over building new facilities?

___ Yes  ___ No
12. Have you visited the Park District’s website in the past year?

___ Yes (Answer #12a) ___ No (Skip to #13)

12a. Rate your household’s satisfaction with the Park District of Oak Park’s website by circling the corresponding number to the right of each description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online program registration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; facility information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; event information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User friendliness/ Ease of navigation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Indicate if YOU or ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD uses the existing parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling YES or NO next to the park/ facility. If YES, does the Park District meet your needs by circling YES or NO below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>USE this type of park/ facility?</th>
<th>If YES, Does the Park District meet your needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Dance Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Gymnastics Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Historic Properties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Indoor Ice Rinks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Martial Arts Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Nature/ Environmental Centers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Off-Leash Dog Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Outdoor Baseball/ Softball Fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Outdoor Basketball Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Outdoor Gardens/ Natural Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Outdoor Ice Rinks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Outdoor Skate Parks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Outdoor Soccer/ Multipurpose Fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Outdoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Outdoor Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Outdoor Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Outdoor Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Playgrounds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Sled Hills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Splash Pads/ Spray Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Walking Paths</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13a. Which FOUR existing parks & recreation facilities that you use from the list above are most important to your household? (Please write in the letters corresponding to your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices below, or select NONE if parks & facilities are not important to your household.)

___ 1st ___ 2nd ___ 3rd ___ 4th ___ NONE

Please answer the questions on the reverse side of this page.
14. Indicate if YOU or ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD has a need for the following parks and recreation facilities that the Park District of Oak Park does not currently have listed below by circling YES or NO next to the park/facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Park/ Facility</th>
<th>Do you need this type of park/ facility?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Arts Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Badminton Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Facilities for Teens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Facilities for Seniors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Frisbee Golf Courses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Indoor Fitness &amp; Exercise Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Indoor Gyms (Basketball, Volleyball, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Indoor Running/Walking Tracks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Indoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Indoor Synthetic Turf Sports Fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Outdoor Fitness Equipment/Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Outdoor Roller Hockey Rinks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Platform Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14a. Which FOUR parks & recreation facilities from the list above that the Park District of Oak Park does not currently have are most important to your household? (Please write in the letters corresponding to your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices below, or select NONE if parks & facilities are not important to your household.)

___ 1st ___ 2nd ___ 3rd ___ 4th ___ NONE

15. How long have you lived in Oak Park? ___ Years

16. Do you own or rent your residence? (Select one)

___ Own                     ___ Rent

17. Your gender?

___ Male                     ___ Female

18. What are the genders and ages of those in your household? (M or F/ Age)

___/___ ___/___ ___/___ ___/___ ___/___

19. How would you describe your race? (Please check all that apply)

___ Asian/Pacific Islander ___ Black/African American

___ White/Caucasian          ___ Hispanic/Latino/Spanish

___ American Indian         ___ Other:

20. What is the one idea that you feel would be beneficial for the Park District to implement in the next 5 years?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

21. Please share any additional comments.

__________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and effort. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed stamped envelope by Wednesday, July 2nd.