

REPORT: PALM BEACH **COUNTY PARKS AND** **RECREATION NEEDS** **ASSESSMENT SURVEY**

Palm Beach County, FL

Prepared by

MANAGEMENT LEARNING LABORATORIES

October 2015



About MLL

Management Learning Laboratories (MLL) is an independent research organization that is only involved with recreation and leisure attitude and interest studies. MLL has been in operation since 1989 and has served numerous communities across the USA. MLL uses research methods that have developed by MLL specifically for the study of leisure and recreation. The key personnel are listed here

- Ananda Mitra, Ph.D., President and Project Director
 - Education
 - Bachelor of Technology from Indian Institute of Technology
 - Master of Arts from Wake Forest University
 - Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 - Professional Experience
 - Head of the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois
 - Founder of the Survey Research Center of Wake Forest University
 - Project director for numerous needs assessment projects for parks and recreation agencies
 - Survey research consultant for:
 - ✓ Americorps
 - ✓ Franklin County Prevention Institute of Ohio,
 - ✓ Department of Plant Biology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 - ✓ Department of Architecture at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 - ✓ Department of Psychology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 - ✓ Department of Chemistry at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 - ✓ US Air Force Military Airlift Command
 - ✓ Web-based data collection projects funded by the National Institute of Health
 - Scholarship
 - Author of the two books on research methods for parks and recreation professionals
 - Published articles in numerous academic and trade journals
 - Presented on needs assessments at numerous state and national recreation conferences
 - Conducted workshops on needs assessments for parks and recreation professionals across the United States

Studies are directed by Dr. Ananda Mitra, and Dr. Joseph Bannon, Sr. serves as the senior advisor to the projects.

Selected Past Studies

<i>.Biddeford, ME</i>	Rick Towle	(207) 590-5996
<i>.Chatham, MA</i>	Dan Tobin	(508) 945-5107
<i>.Brookline, MA</i>	Bob Lynch	(617) 730-2069
<i>.Burlington County, NJ</i>	Jeff Kirchner	(609) 265-5858
<i>.Westfield, NJ</i>	Bruce Kauffman	(908) 789-4080
<i>.Monmouth County, NJ</i>	Andrew Spears	(732) 842-4000
<i>.Great Neck, NY</i>	Neil Marrin	(516) 487-7665
<i>.Chesterfield County, VA</i>	Stuart Connock	(561) 871-5088
<i>.Franklin County, VA</i>	Donnie Underwood	(540) 483-9293
<i>.Richmond, VA</i>	Ray Sutton	(804)-780-5749
<i>.Fauquier County, VA</i>	Larry Miller	(540) 347-6848
<i>.Franklin County, NC</i>	David Munden	(919)-496-6624
<i>.Black Mountain, NC</i>	Chip Craig	(828)-669-1072
<i>.Winston-Salem, NC</i>	Tim Grant	
<i>.Stanly County, NC</i>	Toby Thorpe	(704)-984-9564
<i>.Charleston County, SC</i>	Jeff Schryver	(843)-762-2172
<i>.Columbia, SC</i>	Allison Baker	(803)-733-8331
<i>.Anderson, SC</i>	Willis Lee	
<i>.Horry County, SC</i>	Glenn Cartrette	(843)-248-1864
<i>.Florence County, SC</i>	Joe Eason	(803)-667-0920
<i>.Spartanburg County, SC</i>	Jeff Caton	(864)-593-3737
<i>.Savannah, GA</i>	Alice Martin	(912) 351-3837
<i>.Boynton Beach, FL</i>	Wally Majors	(561) 742-6255
<i>.Port St. Lucie, FL</i>	Chuck Proulx	(561) 871-5088
<i>.Hudson, OH</i>	Phil Mikita	(800)-689-7477
<i>.Clark County, OH</i>	Tim Smith	(937) 324-7347
<i>.Marshall, MI</i>	Ann Adams	(616)-781-5183
<i>.Battle Creek, MI (1997)</i>	Marda Hinkley	(616) 966-3431
<i>.Battle Creek, MI (2008)</i>	Ted Dearing	(616) 966-3431
<i>.Grand Rapids, MI</i>	Nancy MacCartney	(616) 456-3696
<i>.McHenry, IL</i>	Pete Merkel	(815) 363-2160
<i>.Will County, IL</i>	Michael A. Pasteris	(815) 727-8700
<i>.Joliet, IL</i>	Ronald Dodd	
<i>.Lake Zurich, IL</i>	Eric Christensen	(847) 540-5068
<i>.Lan-Oak, IL</i>	John Wilson	(708) 474-5020
<i>.Homewood-Flossmoor, IL</i>	Greg Meyer	(708) 957-0300
<i>.Crystal Lake, IL</i>	Kirk Reimer	(815) 459-0680
<i>.Addison, IL</i>	Bill Tookey	(630) 833-0100
<i>.Des Plaines, IL</i>	Dave Markworth	(847)-391-5700
<i>.Downers Grove, IL</i>	Dan Cermak	(630)-963-1304
<i>.Schaumburg, IL</i>	Jerry Handlon	(847)-985-2115
<i>.Bloomington, IL</i>	Keith Rich	(309) 823-4260
<i>.Macon County, IL</i>	Paul Hagan	
<i>.Johnson County, KS</i>	Randy Knight	(913) 707-0200
<i>.Merriam, KS</i>	Susan Hayden	(913) 722-7750
<i>.Kansas City, MO</i>	Steve Abbott	(816) 513-7622
<i>.Norman, OK</i>	Jud Foster	(405)-226-0015
<i>.Broken Arrow, OK</i>	Scott Esmond	(918)-259-7000
<i>.San Antonio, TX</i>	Ronald Darner	(210) 655-9601
<i>.Sioux Falls, SD</i>	Larry Weires	(605)-367-7060
<i>.Missoula, MT</i>	Donna Gaukler	(406) 523-2754
<i>.Billings, MT</i>	Mark Jarvis	(406)-657-8367
<i>.Reno, NV</i>	Nancy MacCartney	(775) 334-2260

*.Sunnyvale, CA
.Tacoma, WA(2005, 2009)
.Waukesha, WI
.Lakewood, CO*

**Robert Walker
Lois Stark
Mona Bauer
George Fivgas**

(408) 730-7516
(253) 305-1099
(262) 524-3732
(303) 987-7806

Recognition of MLL by Professional Recreation Organizations

- “Youth data collection for citizen surveys” Annual Conference of the **Virginia Parks and Recreation Association**, Hot Springs, VA, September 2012
- “Multi-mode data collection for citizen surveys” Annual Conference of the **Florida Parks and Recreation Association**, Orlando, FL, September 2012
- “Multi-mode data collection for citizen surveys” Annual Conference of the **Indiana Parks and Recreation Association**, Michigan City, IN, January 2012
 - “Data Collection using the Web.” Annual Conference of the **Florida Parks and Recreation Association**, Orlando, FL, September 2011.
 - “Collecting citizen input.” Annual Conference of the **Texas Parks and Recreation Association**, McAllen, TX, March 2011.
 - “Collecting citizen input.” Annual Conference of the **Michigan Parks and Recreation Association**, Acme, MI, February 2011.
 - “Collecting citizen input.” Annual Conference of the **Indiana Parks and Recreation Association**, Indianapolis, IN, January 2011.
 - “Data Collection using the Web.” Annual Conference of the **National Recreation and Parks Association**, Minneapolis, MN, October 2010.
 - “Collecting data from college students using Web based data collection instruments.” Best practices session at the **AACE Conference Global Learning Asia Pacific**, Penang, Malaysia, May 2010.
 - “New Technologies of Data Collection.” Annual Conference of the **Ohio Parks and Recreation Association**, Athens, OH, January 2010.
 - “New Technologies of Data Collection.” Annual Conference of the **Kentucky Parks and Recreation Association**, Louisville, KY, November 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **North and South Carolina Parks and Recreation Association**, Winston-Salem, NC, November 2009.
 - “Technologies to collect survey data.” **Cairo Second International Conference on Public Opinion Poll**, Cairo, Egypt, November 2009.
 - “New Technologies of Data Collection.” Annual Conference of the **Tennessee Parks and Recreation Association**, Kingsport, TN, September 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Tennessee Parks and Recreation Association**, Kingsport, TN, September 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Virginia Parks and Recreation Association**, Roanoke, VA, September 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Arizona Parks and Recreation Association**, Phoenix, AZ, August 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Maryland Parks and Recreation Association**, Ocean City, MD, April 2009.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Georgia Parks and Recreation Association**, Athens, GA, November 2008.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Oklahoma Parks and Recreation Association**, Tulsa, OK, November 2008.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Missouri Parks and Recreation Association**, Lake of the Ozarks, MO, March 2008.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Arkansas Parks and Recreation Association**, Eureka Springs, AR, March 2008.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Ohio Parks and Recreation Association**, Dayton, OH, February 2008.
 - “Needs Assessment: Taking the Pulse of Communities.” Annual Conference of the **Michigan Parks and Recreation Association**, Acme, MI, January 2008.
 - “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Indiana Parks and Recreation Association**, Indianapolis, IN, January 2008.
 - “Collecting youth data.” Annual Meeting of the **National Recreation and Park Association**, Indianapolis, IN, September 2007.

The research methodology developed by MLL has been presented at NRPA six times and at the annual conferences of several state recreation associations including several times in Florida

- “Community Hear: Listen to Citizens.” Annual Conference of the **Tennessee Recreation and Parks Association**, Paris, TN, November 2006.
- “Webbing Your Way to the Citizen.” Annual Conference of the **Tennessee Recreation and Parks Association**, Paris, TN, November 2006.
- “Collecting Citizen Input.” Annual Conference of the **Oklahoma Recreation and Parks Association**, Tulsa, OK, October 2006.
- “Web-based data collection.” Annual Conference of the **National Recreation and Parks Association**, Seattle, WA, October 2006.
- “Community input: Process and outcomes.” Annual Conference of the **Arizona Parks and Recreation Association**, Phoenix, AZ, August 2006.
- “Collecting citizen input.” Invited Workshop convened by the **Georgia Parks and Recreation Association**, Covington, GA, August 2006.
- “Community input: Process and outcomes.” Annual Conference of the **Florida Parks and Recreation Association**, Tampa, FL, September 2005.
- “Utilizing community input.” (A. Mitra, and B. Kauffmann) Annual Conference of the **New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association**, Atlantic City, NJ, March 2005.
- “Collecting citizen input.” Invited Workshop jointly convened by the **Illinois Association of Park Districts and the Illinois Parks and Recreation Association**, Carol Stream, IL, March 2005.
- “Collecting community input: Staying in touch with who we serve.” Invited Workshop at the Pre-Conference and CBM Institute of the 2003 Annual Conference of the **South Carolina Recreation and Parks Association**, September 2003.
- Keynote address at the 2002 Annual Conference of the **New Mexico Recreation and Parks Association**, September 2002.
- “Citizen Data Collection: Process and Outcome.” Invited Workshop at the 2002 Annual Conference of the **New Mexico Recreation and Parks Association**, September 2002.
- “Citizen Data Collection: Process and Outcome.” Invited Workshop at the 2002 Annual Conference of the **New Jersey Recreation and Parks Association**, March 2002.
- “Needs Assessments.” Invited Workshop at the 2001 Annual Conference of the **Massachusetts Recreation and Parks Association**, November 2001.
- “Community input: Process and Outcome.” Invited Workshop at the 2001 Training Institute of the **New Jersey Recreation and Park Association**, October 2001.
- “Gathering Citizen Input in Parks, Recreation and Leisure Services.” Invited Workshop at the 2001 Annual Conference of the **North Eastern Training Institute of the National Recreation and Parks Association**, June 2001.
- “Needs Assessments in Park, Recreation and Leisure Services.” Invited Workshop at the 2001 Annual Conference of the **Pennsylvania Parks and Recreation Society**, Seven Springs, PA, March 2001.
- “Needs Assessments: Taking the Pulse of Communities.” Invited Workshop at the 2000 Annual Conference of the **Virginia Parks and Recreation Society**, Hot Springs, VA, December 2000.
- “Needs assessment: Taking the pulse of communities.” (with J. Bannon, Sr., P. Rea, N. MacCartney and M. Pope). **National Recreation and Parks Association** national conference, Nashville, TN, October 1999.
- “Needs assessment in recreation planning.” (with M. Baker). Joint Conference of the North and **South Carolina Parks and Recreation Societies**, Myrtle Beach, SC, October 1998.
- “Role of citizen input in recreation planning.” **National Recreation and Parks Association Southern Regional Conference**, Asheville, NC, April 1998.
- “Attitude and Interest Surveys.” State-wide teleconference presentation for **North Carolina Recreation Resource Services** of the North Carolina State University. Wake Forest University Medical School Teleconference Center, Winston-Salem, January 1998.
- “Needs Assessment and Citizen Input.” Workshop at the annual convention of the **Connecticut Parks and Recreation Association**, November 1997.
- “Needs Assessment.” (J. Bannon, A. Mitra, M. Pope) **National Recreation and Parks Association Conference**, Kansas-City, MO, October 1996.

MLL Scholarship

- Mitra, A. (2011). *Collecting Citizen Input*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Mitra, A. with others (2008). Differences in rate of response to Web based surveys among college students. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 7(2), 265-281.
- Mitra, A. (2006). Collecting citizen input. *Oregon Parks and Recreation Journal*.
- Mitra, A. (2006). Collecting citizen input. *Utah Leisure Insights*, 26(1), 16-17, 19.
- Mitra, A. (2005). Weaving a new web. *Parks and Recreation*, June 2005
- Mitra, A. (2002). Deciding what programs to offer. *Management Strategy*, 26(2), 1, 4.
- Mitra, A. (2001). Thinking of recreation needs assessments. *Parks and Recreation*, 36, 5, 16-18.
- Mitra, A. (1999). The importance of comprehensive needs assessment for parks and recreation agencies. *Management Strategy*, 23(1), 1-7.
- Mitra, A. and Lankford, S. (1999). *Research Methods in Park, Recreation and Leisure Services*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Mitra, A. (1998). Construction and utilization of community surveys. In (Ed. Joseph J. Bannon), *Leisure resources: Its comprehensive planning*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Mitra, A. (1998). Needs Assessment Plans. *Management Strategy*, 22(3), 4.
- Mitra, A. (1994). Use of Focus Groups in the Design of Questionnaires for Needs Assessment. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 17(2), 133-140.
- Johnson, T., Mitra, A., Newman, R. and Horm, J. (1993). Problems of Definition in Sampling Special Populations: The Case of Homeless Persons. *Evaluation Practice*, 14(2), 119-126.

Ananda Mitra of MLL is the author of two books on recreation needs assessments

MLL is the publisher of the only available collection of statistically tested bank of recreation needs assessment question items called the "[MLL QuestionBank](#)" available through sellers like Amazon.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

READING/INTERPRETING THE REPORT 2

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY..... 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY 6

GENDER.....6

AGE.....6

INCOME7

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION.....7

RECREATION INTERESTS.....8

VISITS TO PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES11

REASONS FOR NON-USE12

INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION15

FUNDING FOR RENOVATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION17

FUNDING FOR OPERATIONS18

PERSONAL OPINIONS.....19

AREAS OF IMPORTANCE24

READING/INTERPRETING THE REPORT

This report is the final outcome of the Needs Assessment Study (henceforth referred to as “study”) that was commissioned by Palm Beach County (henceforth referred to as “PBC”) in 2014. In reading/interpreting this report, it is important to note that the results are presented in several ways. First, there is a narrative description of the findings, which then are supported by tables of data. **Key findings and summaries are underlined in the body of the report.** Recommendations are made across the entire body of the report and are always supported by data. *All recommendations are presented in italics in the body of the report.*

The tables and numbers in the report should be considered carefully. Since there were several questions that addressed similar issues, these items were distributed in different parts of the questionnaire. When combined, these pieces of information together make up the entire report and results. *In many cases, the importance attached to a particular piece of numeric data must be interpreted along with other similar questions in the instrument.* Moreover, before drawing specific conclusions, it is important to recognize that a universal yardstick cannot be used to interpret the results. For example, the results from one section of the questionnaire may suggest that a particular facility, considered by 40% of the respondents to be needed in Palm Beach County, is in fact a significant necessity because most of the other facilities listed in that section received far less endorsement. On the other hand, a particular activity that is considered necessary by 40% of the respondents may be very insignificant in a particular section if there were other activities that received far more support. It is the ranking, as presented in the tables that is most important. Consequently, it is impossible to try to find one percentage as the cut-off point for all the questions. Each question needs to be considered separately and as a part of the section to which it belongs.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The study was designed to elicit interest, behavior, demographic, and attitude information from the citizens served by the PBC concerning recreation and leisure. It is important to note that the study was intended to obtain information from the entire community and not any specific user group. The objective of the study was to obtain the relevant information that will help the PBC do its job more effectively by enabling it to be more responsive to the recreation needs of the residents of Palm Beach County. Additionally, the information can also be used to better organize the internal workings of the PBC to stay in tune with the current and future needs of the community. This also implies that the PBC will benefit by learning about the residents' awareness of the recreation activities within Palm Beach County. This report offers the findings from two parallel studies – 1) a general population study and 2) user study with different methods of sampling and data collection. The first study had a low response rate resulting in relatively high sampling and non-response error. The first group of respondents have been called “General Population” and the second group has been called “Park Users” in the rest of this document.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Numerous people were invited to meet with the research staff resulting in several focus group meetings and some personal interviews that helped to identify issues relating to parks and recreation in Palm Beach County. The meetings were moderated by MLL staff. Overall, the meetings were well attended.

All of the background information gathered in these meetings was used to produce the first draft of the instrument, which contained questions and items specific to the community. These early drafts were then reviewed by the consulting team, as well as by the members of the PBC. After a thorough review, a final draft of the questionnaire was approved by the PBC.

One section of the questionnaire was designed to elicit respondent interest in various recreation categories such as “arts and crafts,” “performing arts,” “sports and athletics,” etc. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of interest in each of the categories. Examples of activities within each category were listed so respondents would know what each category meant. Respondents were also asked to indicate if they had participated in any of the recreation activities within the past 12 months.

Another section, labeled, “Attendance,” dealt with the level of use of parks, and attendance at the recreation programs by the respondents. Different types of recreation uses were listed and the respondents were asked to indicate how frequently they had engaged in each use in the past twelve months.

Next, there was a section designed to elicit reasons for not using or attending recreation facilities and programs. A list of possible barriers was provided and respondents were asked to indicate if each applied to them and the members of their family. The choices included items such as “lack of information,” “lack of cleanliness,” etc.

Respondents were also asked about the best ways of keeping informed about public recreation opportunities. They were provided with a list that included items such as cable television, seasonal brochures and word of mouth, and respondents were asked to evaluate them as either “effective” or “ineffective” or “not sure.”

Another section listed items that were indicated as needs in various meetings. These included both programmatic and facility additions. The respondents were asked to indicate the level of importance of each item.

Respondents were also provided a section that solicited opinions about funding recreation in Palm Beach County. Several funding options like “user fees”, “bonds” and “property taxes” were offered and the respondents were asked to indicate their support for each method on a four-point scale that ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” with a fifth “don’t know” option.

One other section of the questionnaire dealt with personal opinions of the respondents. There was a series of statements for which they could indicate their level of agreement on a four-point scale that ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” with a fifth “don’t know” option. There were several general areas of personal opinion.

The items dealt with issues such as:

- Respondents’ personal knowledge and feelings about the PBC and its offerings,
- Specific improvements that the PBC could make in its services,
- General recreation issues related to the PBC,
- Opinions about the effectiveness of marketing and publicity efforts of the PBC, and
- General questions about the quality of life in Palm Beach County.

The last section of the questionnaire included general demographic questions concerning gender, age, marital status, household composition, length of residence in Palm Beach County, and where generally the respondent lives in the community.

For the PBC study the data collection was conducted in two phases. The first phase of the data collection involved the selection of a random sample of names and addresses in the County. The sample was sent a questionnaire that respondents could complete either on paper or using a Web based instrument. The response rate to this data collection effort fell below 10%. Therefore, a second phase of data collection was conducted where an existing list of users were sent the questionnaire electronically and were invited to complete the questionnaire using a Web based instrument. The response to this user data collection was far more favorable resulting in two data sets – the general population and the user data sets.

Both the data sets were analyzed using standard statistical software to develop the recommendations presented here. Furthermore, it should be noted that the data presented in this report are based only on the responses obtained in the questionnaire-based studies and the descriptive and narrative information collected in the focus group meetings were used to embellish the quantitative data. There are no presumptions about the actual performance of the PBC; only the perceptions of the community are reported. It is quite possible that many of the perceptions do not match the actual activities of the PBC. However, the purpose of this report is to present the perception, accurate or inaccurate, to demonstrate how the community feels about the PBC. It is quite possible that some of the recommendations refer to activities and programs already offered by PBC but the data suggests the importance of what is offered or additional needs for what is already offered.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

A set of questions was designed to elicit demographic information such as age, marital status, gender, etc. These questions can provide information about a community's makeup and therefore its possible recreation needs. It is useful to note that the percentages reported and tabulated sometimes add up to 101% or 99% due to the effects of rounding off decimals.

Gender

The sample of respondents from the General Population was made up of 45% male and 55% female respondents. The gender distribution for the Park Users was 41% male and 59% female.

Age

The questionnaire provided different age categories and the age category percentages of the respondents are reported below. This places the median age in the 55-64 age groups which matches with the Census information.

Age Category	Percent in General Population	Percent in Park Users
18-24	1%	2%
25-34	8%	7%
35-44	9%	18%
45-54	16%	21%
55-64	24%	23%
65-69	16%	12%
70-74	6%	10%
Over 75	15%	6%

Income

The household income distribution varied from under \$50,000 to over \$150,000 per year, with the median income being in the \$50,000 to \$75,000 range. The specific income categories reported by the respondents were as follows:

Income Category	Percent in General Population	Percent in Park Users
Under \$50,000	33%	18%
\$50-75,000	23%	19%
\$75-100,000	19%	17%
\$100-125,000	14%	17%
\$125-150,000	3%	9%
Over \$150,000	10%	20%

Household composition

The General Population respondents indicated that 72% were married whereas the percentage among users was 60%. Nearly 92% of the General Population respondents claimed to be white, with the rest being evenly distributed between African-Americans (4%) and Hispanic (4%); in the case of the Park Users 89% claimed to be white and the majority of the rest being Hispanic. Nearly all of the respondents among the General Population and the Park Users claimed to have a high-school diploma or a higher educational degree. The average number of years of residence in the County for the General Population was 21 years and 27 years for the users. The General Population respondents also reported that 43% were retired as compared to the 33% of the Park Users. Finally, on the average the both set of respondents indicated that there were two adults in the household and 65% of the users reported having at least one child under 18 years old in the household.

Recreation Interests

The first section of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the level of interest they have for each of eight different categories of recreational activities. Examples of specific activities pertaining to each general category were provided. The scale included the options, “No Interest,” “Some Interest” and “Great Interest.” The rankings of the categories were based on the percentage of population indicating “Great Interest.”

Outdoor recreation appeared at the top of the ranking for the General Population while it was the third most popular amongst the Park Users. About 86% of the Park Users and 80% of the General Population showed an interest in outdoor recreational activities, with more than 55% of the General Population showing “Great Interest”. This is particularly significant as more than 70% of the General Population and about 64% of the Park Users indicated a need for bike paths, while close to three-fifth of the Park Users as well as the General Population chose canoeing kayaking as an important need, in another section of the questionnaire. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should consider offering more facilities for outdoor recreational activities.*

Special events appeared next in ranking for the General Population and as the topmost choice for the Park Users in terms of “Great Interest”. About 86% of the General Population reported an overall interest in concerts, environmental and historical events, while 94% of the Park Users expressed an interest in them. The emphasis on special events is also supported by the fact that there is a higher agreement between the Park Users and the General Population with respect to choosing environmental programs as an important need for the community. Given such a strong interest level, *the Parks and Recreation Department should ensure that it provides opportunities and spaces for their residents to participate in special events.*

Activities related to performing arts followed next. More than four-fifth of the General Population and about 90% of the Park Users indicated an overall interest in theater, concerts, ballet, music and museum. Although there seems to be a lesser agreement amongst the General Population and the Park Users while considering amphitheatres as an important need, more than half the population in both sets seem to view it as a major requirement. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide their residents opportunities for participating or attending theater and concerts.*

Close to three-fourth of the Park Users showed an interest in active recreation like sports and athletics while 65% of the General Population indicated an interest in them. More than half the population of both groups declared that they had visited athletic fields, with 13% of the General Population and a quarter of the Park Users mentioning a visit frequency of more than 12 times. Given that there is a segment of the population who are heavy users of athletic fields, *the Parks and Recreation Department should consider providing more options for its residents to enjoy sports and athletics.*

Water sports were largely popular. Nearly 60% of the General Population and more than 50% of the Park Users were highly interested in lap swim, swim lessons, family swim and diving. However, there seems to be a lesser agreement amongst the Park Users and the General Population when considering the importance of water exercise, swimming opportunities and swim lessons in other parts of the study. The need for swimming opportunities is almost split halfway for both kinds of residents. More than half the General Population has also mentioned that they have never visited pools and water parks. Given a strong interest from the General Population to participate in such activities, it seems there is a lack of information regarding the presence of such opportunities. A lesser interest from the Park Users as compared to the General Population but a higher rate of visits by the Park Users to pools also indicates a need to provide more information. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide and promote pools and water-parks for their resident.*

Fitness-related activities appeared next in the ranking. Nearly 65% of the general residents reported having an interest in boot camps, yoga, cross fit, cross country and aerobics. The emphasis on fitness is

also reflected elsewhere in the study where three quarters of the General Population and nearly 65% of the Park Users indicated a need for outdoor fitness trails, and a large number of respondents including the Park Users supported the importance of yoga and indoor gymnasiums. About 75% of the General Population indicated that they have used walking paths and trails over the past year, while one-third of the Park Users have mentioned using them more than 12 times. Given the strong interest in fitness, *the Parks and Recreation Department should consider offering more fitness-related activities and facilities for their residents.*

Activities related to art and crafts were the next favored recreational interest. 60% of the General Population cited interest in painting, ceramic, origami, pottery and photography. More than three fourth of the Park Users expressed an interest in these activities. Art and crafts category ranked higher for the specific Park Users than for the larger population, even though it was split half ways between the Park Users when it came to choosing it as an important need for the community. Given that more than two-third of the General Population regards it as a major need to the community and there is large interest in them, *the Parks and Recreation Department should consider offering art and craft activities and centers for its residents.*

More than half the population favored social activities. Although around 20% of both groups expressed a “Great Interest” in dancing, teen clubs, social clubs and camps, more than one-third of the General Population and specific Park Users expressed “Some Interest”. Since a moderate segment of the population showed general enthusiasm in these activities, *the Parks and Recreation Department can consider arranging social activities for its interested residents.*

The results presented in Table 1 are arranged in descending order to highlight the most widely shared leisure interests at the top of the table.

Recreation Categories

Recreation Category	GENERAL POPULATION				PARK USERS			
	No Interest	Some Interest	Great Interest	Rank	No Interest	Some Interest	Great Interest	Rank
Outdoor recreation, e.g., Biking, Hiking, Boating, Fishing, Picnicking, Camping	20%	24%	56%	1	13%	32%	54%	3
Special events, e.g., Concerts, Holiday, Environmental, Historical Events	14%	33%	53%	2	6%	33%	61%	1
Performing Arts, e.g., Theater, Concerts, Ballet, Music, Museums	18%	36%	46%	3	10%	35%	55%	2
Sports & Athletics, e.g., Basketball, Volleyball, Soccer, Baseball, Golf	34%	27%	39%	4	27%	26%	47%	4
Aquatics, e.g., Swim Lessons, Open/Lap Swim, Diving, Family Swim	41%	31%	28%	5	38%	30%	32%	7
Fitness, e.g., Boot Camp, Cross Fit, Yoga, Cross Country, 5K, Aerobics	35%	38%	27%	6	30%	37%	33%	6
Arts & Crafts, e.g., Painting, Ceramics, Origami, Pottery, Photography	40%	35%	25%	7	23%	39%	38%	5
Social, e.g., Dancing, Teen Clubs, Senior Clubs, Camps, Afterschool	46%	35%	19%	8	44%	35%	21%	8

Visits to programs and facilities

One section of the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate their frequency of visits to a selected set of programs and facilities.

Beach, lakes and waterways in general were the most widely visited facilities in Palm Beach County. The data implies that approximately 90% of the General Population visited beaches and waterways. The popularity of beaches is also reflected in the high level of interest in outdoor activities elsewhere in the study as well as high need for maintenance of beaches and presence of pathways around lakes. Given a high need for beach parking and presence of more lifeguards, *the Parks and Recreation Department needs to continue to maintain beaches and other waterways and offer facilities that would make them attractive to the community.*

Parks in general, playgrounds and walking areas were the next widely used facilities. More than 80% of the General Population indicated that they had visited parks at least once in the past year. Close to one-third of the Park Users claimed to have frequented parks more than 12 times. Similar proportions of the General Population have visited walking trails. The data in other parts of the study shows that the General Population have expressed high emphasis on presence of neighborhood parks and various facilities like shades and gates in parks and playgrounds as an important need to the community. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should continue to maintain and promote neighborhood parks, playgrounds and walking trails.*

Natural areas and nature centers were also quite popular with the respondents. Around 70% of the General Population and almost 90% of the Park Users indicated that they had visited natural areas at least once in the previous year. More than two-third of the respondents in both sets of the population have indicated a need for open green spaces and similar proportions of people have considered presence of natural areas in parks as a necessity in other sections of the study. Given such a high agreement ratio among the General Population and the Park Users, *the Parks and Recreation Department should make a modest effort to maintain and promote natural areas and nature centers.*

Bike or skate paths and trails were majorly popular with the residents. Nearly 60% of the General Population stated that they had made use of bike paths and skating trails. The data also points out that the proportion of Park Users visiting skating trails were more than the overall population. With a high ratio of agreement among the Park Users and the General Population with respect to bike paths being considered as an important need to the community, *the Parks and Recreation Department should continue to provide bike trails and skating paths for its residents.*

Athletic fields and Pools and Water-parks were largely popular. About half the population stated that they frequently visited athletic fields. However, the Park Users appear to be a more active group with specific special interests that take them to athletic fields more frequently than the General Population. About 52% of the General Population indicated that they had never visited pools and waterparks, although they showed a high interest in aquatic activities and also considered swimming opportunities as an important need. The Park Users here too visited pools more often than the General Population. Given a high interest in sports, athletics and water activities elsewhere in the study and a comparatively higher attendance rate of the Park Users to these facilities, *the Parks and Recreation Department should ensure that they promote and popularize the sports fields, water parks and pools and keep them available for the community.*

Boat ramps, golf courses, outdoor courts, recreation centers and equestrian facilities were less popular than the other parks and recreation facilities. Nearly three-fifth of the General Population affirmed that they had never visited fishing and boat ramps, golf courses or outdoor courts. However, a segment of the population existed who were heavy users of golf courses and outdoor courts. About a fourth of the Park Users stated that they had visited golf courses more than 12 times in the last year. There was agreement among the General Population and the Park Users that equestrian facilities were the least popular recreation

centers in Palm Beach County. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department can continue to provide these facilities for its Park Users and promote and offer activities in these centers to make them more popular to the community.*

The low attendance figures reflect that there is an opportunity to attract more people to the Parks and Recreation Facilities and Programs offered by the Department. There are specific barriers to attendance, as discussed in the next section, but the Department should be able to overcome some of those barriers to boost the number of people visiting the facilities and participating in the programs. It should be noted that the attendance figures do not reflect how close to capacity each facility is. Indeed, if the Parks and Recreation Facilities are operating close to capacity, and the attendance level is reported as low here, it is an indication that more facilities should be considered before trying to attract more people to the current facilities.

The results from the attendance items are presented in the next table.

Attendance

Facilities	GENERAL POPULATION			PARK USERS		
	Never	More than 12 times	Rank	Never	More than 12 times	Rank
Beaches, Lakes, Waterways	11%	40%	1	6%	43%	1
General Park & Playgrounds	21%	21%	2	16%	30%	3
Walking Paths & Trails	25%	22%	3	13%	33%	2
Natural Areas	32%	14%	4	11%	27%	4
Nature Centers	41%	11%	5	16%	18%	8
Bike or Skate Paths & Trails	42%	19%	6	32%	22%	7
Athletic Fields	51%	13%	7	42%	25%	5
Pools & Waterparks	52%	12%	8	42%	18%	8
Fishing & Boat Ramps	56%	8%	9	57%	8%	12
Golf Courses	60%	9%	10	53%	24%	6
Outdoor Courts	62%	6%	11	52%	11%	11
Recreation Centers	68%	7%	12	39%	13%	10
Equestrian Facilities	86%	2%	13	81%	2%	13

Reasons for non-use

The question related to use levels was also connected to another section of the questionnaire that asked the respondents to indicate their reasons for not using the recreation opportunities available in the County. The results are described in terms of the percentages of respondents who selected each option as a reason why they or their family have not participated in programs, activities, and/or not visited Parks and Recreation Facilities.

The most important factors affecting participation were lack of time and interest in programs offered and lack of information. 92% of the General Population said that they did not participate in programs

or attend the facilities because they did not have enough time. Even for the Park Users, lack of time was a big factor for non-attendance.

89% of the General Population claimed that they were not interested in the programs offered by the Parks and Recreation Department, although more than half of the Park Users stated that lack of interest was not what kept them away from activities offered by the county.

88% of the General Population said they had not participated in programs or attended the Parks and Recreation Facilities because they were not acquainted with the events or facilities. This is not an unusual reason for non-attendance since 37% of the General Population indicated, elsewhere in the questionnaire, that they were predominantly unaware of the recreation opportunities in the County. However, it can be seen from the data that 82% of the Park Users were more aware of the opportunities offered by the Department. This is in conflict with the fact that nearly half the Park Users chose lack of information as a reason for non-use.

The actual lack of information, along with the perception that the Parks and Recreation Department does not promote its services could lead to fewer people attending events and coming to facilities. As such, *the Department should provide activities that would be of more interest for its residents and also publicize their existing programs and facilities.*

Next in ranking was inconvenient program timing. 83% of the General Population said that they did not participate in Parks and Recreation Department programs and activities because the programs were offered at inconvenient times. This is especially important since 46% of the Park Users also complained that inconvenient timings were a reason for their non-attendance. It is possible to correct this issue by providing more information about the timing and comparing when activities are offered as compared to when people are available for recreation. *The Parks and Recreation Department should examine the times when people are available and offer activities that are available at times more convenient to the community.*

Location and condition of the facilities were ranked next for the General Population. Around 79% of the General Population was concerned about the quality of the Parks and Recreation Facilities, where activities were offered. Similar proportions of them indicated that the distance to the facilities were a hindrance to their attendance. 34% of them found deficient restrooms in the facilities. More than three quarters of the General Population felt that maintenance of facilities was an important need to the society, even though 40% of the Park Users disagreed on that. However, majority of the Park Users disagreed that the facilities were too far away or the facilities had poor condition. This could mean that these are perceptual issues and thus, *Parks and Recreation Department should ensure that the facilities are properly promoted and facilities are well maintained.*

Fees, appropriate programs or programs getting filled up, overcrowding and safety in facilities were the next hindrances. Nearly 75% of the General Population felt that the program fees were too high and programs were not suitable for them. In an economic climate where people have to watch household expenses in view of rising fuel costs along with the increasing cost of daily needs, it is important to consider ways in which recreation activities can be made more affordable. 60% of the General Population and 77% of the Park Users agreed to pay reasonable user fees for their recreational interests.

72% of the General Population blamed overcrowding at facilities as hindrance to their involvement while 69% said that programs filled up too early. Similar number of the general residents found the facilities unsafe. Given that 87% of the Park Users found facilities very safe and elsewhere in the study more than 70% of the General Population said they felt safe in neighborhood parks, it is likely that the locations are indeed safe, but the perception of lack of safety could become very damaging to a recreation agency.

Since a third of the Park Users feel that indeed the user fees could be lowered, programs can be made more interesting and facilities were filled beyond capacity, *the County needs to offer more appropriate programs that would be of interest to the whole population and ensure they provide larger facilities with reasonable user fees or take into account different funding options as indicated in the financing section.*

Next in ranking were lack of parking facilities and transportation, quality of programs, customer services, and maintenance of facilities, child care facilities and accessibility for the disabled. Roughly half of the General Population felt that quality of the programs and customer services were not up to the mark and poor maintenance of the facilities were a barrier to their participation. However, nearly 80% of the Park Users disagreed with them and felt facilities were properly maintained and the County provided good customer services.

58% of the General Population was unhappy with the parking facilities and about a third of the Park Users agreed with them. Elsewhere in the study, majority of the Park Users as well as General Population felt parking services near beaches were inadequate and were ready to pay reasonable parking fees. Around 80% of the General Population and 64-72% of the Park Users felt that parking facilities were an important need to the community.

The residents were split equally when choosing accessibility for the disabled and lack of child care as a barrier to their participation. A segment of the residents who were heavy Park Users, however, chose to disagree with half the General Population, with 91% stating that lack of childcare and disability access did not hinder their participation.

Less than 50% of the General Population claimed that lack of transportation to the facilities prevented them from attending recreation centers while 95% of the Park Users stated that inadequate transportation was not a cause for non-attendance.

The data indicates that those who do not use the recreation opportunities have specific misgivings about the opportunities and generally the Park Users have a better sense of the opportunities. Given that half of the General Population or even less considered the above options as barriers, *the County should ensure that adequate parking spots are available, recreational opportunities are properly publicized and facilities are easily accessible for the general public.*

The remaining factors like inadequate staffing and poor experience were not considered significant limitations since only a third of the General Population and about one-tenth of heavy Park Users cited these factors as reasons for non-use. While they are the lowest-ranked issues relative to the others, they should not be ignored but the other factors need to be addressed first.

The results from the reasons for non-use are presented in the next table.

Reasons for non-use

Barrier	GENERAL POPULATION			PARK USERS		
	No	Yes	Rank	No	Yes	Rank
Not enough time	8%	92%	1	46%	54%	1
Not interested in the programs	11%	89%	2	57%	43%	4
Lack of information	12%	88%	3	52%	48%	2
Inconvenient program times	17%	83%	4	54%	46%	3
Condition of facilities	21%	79%	5	73%	27%	10
Too far away	21%	79%	6	71%	29%	9
Fees too high	24%	76%	7	67%	33%	7
Lack of appropriate programs	26%	74%	8	58%	42%	5
Facilities too crowded	28%	72%	9	63%	37%	6
Not safe	28%	72%	10	87%	13%	16
Programs get filled up	31%	69%	11	74%	26%	11
Lack of parking	42%	58%	12	70%	30%	8
Quality of programs	44%	56%	13	81%	19%	13
Customer service	46%	54%	14	81%	19%	13
Maintenance of facilities	47%	53%	15	78%	22%	12
Accessibility for the disabled	50%	50%	16	91%	9%	17
Lack of child care	50%	50%	17	91%	9%	17
Don't have transportation	54%	46%	18	95%	5%	20
Inadequate staffing	67%	33%	19	83%	17%	15
Poor experience	67%	33%	20	90%	10%	19

Information distribution

The lack of information is a common barrier to participation as has been noted in this study as well. There was a set of questions that asked the respondents to indicate what they felt were the best ways to get information about recreation to the population. The results have been collapsed into the categories “Effective,” “Not effective” and “Not Sure.”

Direct e-mail appears at the top of the ranking. About 70% of the General Population and 87% of the Park Users indicated e-mail as an overall effective mode of communication. Less than a quarter of Park Users indicated it as non-effective and less than a tenth of the General Population were not sure about it. As a large number of people find e-mail a faster and easier mode of information exchange, *the Parks and Recreation Department should continue to consider sending regular updates and notifications via direct e-mails.*

Notification through the websites appeared next in the ranking. Around 63% of the General Residents and close to three-fourth of the Park Users recognized that information placed on the County and department websites was an effective way of keeping them informed about ongoing recreation and leisure activities. Less than 20% of the respondents including Park Users did not find this method of announcement effective or were not sure about it. Nevertheless, since majority of the respondents followed websites to

remain up to date, *the Parks and Recreation Department should ascertain that the County regularly updates its websites.*

The respondents feel that word of mouth and flyers and brochures were moderately effective. Roughly 60% of the residents, including specific user groups, felt that word of mouth is a good way of getting information to the community. Less than one-fourth of the people did not find word of mouth and flyers or brochures effective enough and similar proportions of the residents were unsure about them. As such, *Parks and Recreation Department should consider using posters and flyers in public amenities and printed brochures to promote their activities and facilities.*

Newspapers and radio broadcasts was considered the next effective mode of informing residents. Approximately 45% of the General Population supported the use of radio and newspapers as an important method of communication while only one-third of them deemed it unnecessary. Less than one-fifth of the General Population was not sure about it. The proportion of Park Users, who found newspapers and radio effective, was a little more than the General Population. Nevertheless, the Park Users largely agreed with the General Population, and hence, *the Parks and Recreation Department should consider the use of radio and newspapers to promote events and facilities in the community.*

Marketing recreational facilities and events on Facebook was considered somewhat useful. About 37% of the General Population found Facebook as an effective method of learning about upcoming events. This was supported by 43% of the Park Users. However, more than one-third of the respondents, including Park Users did not find it useful and roughly 20% of the residents were uncertain about this mode of communication. So, *the Parks and Recreation Department can consider using Facebook to communicate with residents and to inform them about facilities and upcoming programs, activities and services.*

The County's monthly magazines and email services like Leisure Times, cable service like Channel 20, parenting magazines, information from County schools and other social media services like Twitter, YouTube and Pinterest appeared next. More than a quarter of the respondents affirmed that information publicized through Leisure Times Print magazine was effectual. 21% of the residents and even less felt that information broadcasted through local cable access channels like Channel 20, announcements through county schools and parenting magazines, and other social media services were effective methods. More than half of the General Population found it ineffective and more than a quarter of them were not sure about this method of communication. Proportion of Park Users, who believed these methods to be effective, were a little more than the general public. Even though 36% of the Park Users thought announcements at schools were beneficial, more than one-third of them largely agree that these methods are futile while similar number of Park Users was not sure about them. *Therefore public announcements through schools, local cable, magazines and social media can be used as a way of publicizing events, but the Parks and Recreation Department can avoid using these modes, if required, and use other more effective ways of communication.*

The findings are reported in the table below.

Communication Methods

Communication Methods	GENERAL POPULATION				PARK USERS			
	Not effective	Not Sure	Effective	Rank	Not effective	Not Sure	Effective	Rank
Email	23%	7%	70%	1	7%	6%	87%	1
Website	19%	18%	63%	2	12%	14%	74%	2
Word of Mouth	20%	19%	61%	3	21%	20%	59%	4
Flyers and Brochures	27%	15%	57%	4	20%	20%	60%	3
Newspapers	32%	20%	48%	5	31%	17%	52%	5
On the Radio	38%	19%	43%	6	31%	21%	48%	6
Facebook	45%	18%	37%	7	36%	21%	43%	7
Leisure Times Print magazine	43%	30%	28%	8	39%	33%	28%	9
From County schools	46%	33%	21%	9	36%	27%	36%	8
Twitter	54%	25%	21%	10	50%	31%	19%	14
Parenting Magazines	53%	27%	20%	11	46%	33%	21%	12
Leisure Times online	48%	35%	18%	12	37%	36%	28%	9
Palm Beach County Channel 20	53%	30%	17%	13	47%	33%	20%	13
You Tube	55%	27%	17%	14	42%	35%	23%	11
Pinterest	54%	34%	12%	15	50%	34%	16%	15

Funding for renovation and new construction

The respondents were asked to indicate what they felt would be the best methods of funding existing operations of the County as well as methods of funding future improvements. In this case, the comparison is primarily between the responses to the mechanisms of funding future improvements and additions.

Respondents felt that grants, individual donations and corporate sponsorships were an excellent choice to finance renovation and new constructions. While 78% of the General Population agreed on grants being considered a notable funding option, nearly 75% of them supported use of individual donations and corporate sponsorships. However, a little less proportion of Park Users (less than three-quarters) found these options satisfactory. As such, *the County should actively seek grants, individual donations and corporate sponsorships for funding renovation and new constructions.*

Bonds came next in ranking. 62% of the General Population felt that bonds to be paid by voter approved property taxes would be an effective method of funding. There was a stronger support from the user group with nearly three-quarters of them considering it favorable. Hence, *the County should consider a bond option based on the strong support from the user group.*

Remaining options were commercial activities in parks, increase in sales tax, property taxes and user fees. Both the sets of General Population and the Park Users were marginally interested in funding renovations and new constructions through commercial activities in parks, property taxes and user fees. However, the user group was a lot more interested than the overall population in increasing the sales tax by half a cent. 60% of the Park Users considered it a good idea. Therefore, *the Parks and Recreation*

Department can consider increasing the sales tax by half a cent more than the other options and avoid charging user fees for renovations and constructions.

The results are presented in the table below.

Funding: Renovation and New Constructions

Funding Option	GENERAL POPULATION		PARK USERS	
	Use for Renovation and New Construction	Rank	Use for Renovation and New Construction	Rank
Grants	78%	1	73%	1
Private Individual Donations	75%	2	73%	1
Corporate sponsorships and donations	74%	3	64%	4
Bonds to be paid by voter approved property taxes	62%	4	73%	1
Commercial activities in Parks	44%	5	32%	7
A half a cent increase in sales taxes	38%	6	60%	5
Property Taxes	30%	7	34%	6
User Fees	18%	8	23%	8

Funding for operations

The respondents were asked to indicate what they felt would be the best methods of funding existing operations of the County as well as methods of funding future improvements. In this case, the comparison is primarily between the responses to the mechanisms of funding operations.

User fees were considered the best method of funding. 82% of the General Population regarded user fees as the primary way of funding operations. The Park Users were also in agreement with the General Population, with more than three-fourth of them considering user fees as the primary mode of funding. The data also points out that 60% of the General Population as well as 77% of the Park Users were willing to pay reasonable user fees for recreational opportunities. Hence, *the County should consider charging acceptable user fees for its programs, activities and facilities.*

Property taxes, increase in sales taxes and commercial activities in parks were the next favored methods for funding. 70% of the General Population felt that property taxes could be used to fund recreational activities and facilities, while 62% of them thought increasing sales tax by half a cent was a better idea. 56% of them supported commercial activities in parks to pay for operations. The user population, however, favored the commercial activities over taxes. 68% of the Park Users supported commercial activities in parks while 66% of them gave their approval to property taxes as a method of financing. A half cent increase in sales tax was chosen by only 40% of the Park Users to finance the recreational operations. As such, *the County should consider supporting ongoing activities with funds earned through property taxes and commercial activities.*

Bonds, corporate and individual donations, and grants were the least favored methods for financing recreational operations. Only around a third of the General Population considered bonds as a way of

financing operations, while similar proportion of the Park Users chose corporate sponsorships and donations. 25% of the General Population favored individual donations and even less favored grants. 27% of the Park Users chose bonds, individual donations and grants equally. Given that these methods were highly favored for financing renovations and constructions in a different section of funding, *the Parks and Recreation Department can avoid using them to pay for operations and instead use it for renovation purposes*. The results are presented in the table below.

Funding: Operations

Funding Option	GENERAL POPULATION		PARK USERS	
	Use for Operation	Rank	Use for Operation	Rank
User Fees	82%	1	77%	1
Property Taxes	70%	2	66%	3
A half a cent increase in sales taxes	62%	3	40%	4
Commercial activities in Parks	56%	4	68%	2
Bonds to be paid by voter approved property taxes	38%	5	27%	6
Corporate sponsorships and donations	26%	6	36%	5
Private Individual Donations	25%	7	27%	6
Grants	22%	8	27%	6

Personal opinions

This section of the questionnaire elicited the feelings of the respondents with respect to the recreation opportunities in the County. The questions were designed to explore attitudes and opinions with respect to different aspects of the operations as well as gauge the overall sense that respondents had about the value of “recreation” in their lives. The analysis included computing the ratio of percentage of Park Users who agreed to a statement to the percentage of the General Population who agreed with the statement. The level of agreement was computed by summing the percentage who responded with “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.” The summed percentage of Park Users was divided by the summed percentage of the General Population to obtain the ratio. If the ratio was 0.9, 1.0, 1.1 or 1.2 then it is assumed that the Park Users and General Population felt the same way. If the ratio was 1.3 or higher or 0.8 and lower then there it is assumed that there was a difference between the opinions of the Park Users and the General Population.

Opinions about recreational facilities

Few of the items in the opinions section of the questionnaire addressed the facilities maintained by the Parks and Recreation Department. More specifically, the items tap into the residents’ opinions about parks and recreation facilities in Palm Beach County. When considered alongside the facility-related ideas for new parks and recreation they will help the staff further understand what preferences and needs there may be.

The first pair of opinions dealt with satisfaction level of the residents. More than 85% of the population, including Park Users, considered the recreational programs and services as important to their quality of life. More than three-fourth of the General Population were satisfied by the facilities they visited. 84% of the Park Users supported this opinion. Based on the data, it is safe to say: *Parks and Recreation Department should work towards promoting the opportunities that should be of high quality and suitable for the entire community and continue to provide well maintained park spaces for its residents as they add to the quality of life of the residents.*

The next set of opinions dealt with conditions and cleanliness and maintenance issues. 77% of the General Population found the County parks to be clean and well maintained and almost similar proportion of them felt safe in the parks. About two-third of the common population found the Parks and Recreation Facilities clean while similar segments of them were satisfied with the level of beach cleaning. Exactly three-fifths of the General Population were impressed with the cleanliness of restrooms in parks. Roughly 55% of the residents stated that there were enough signs and maps in County parks and they had adequate lightings. Almost half the population, including the Park Users, stated that insects were well controlled in County parks. Given that the percentage of Park Users who found the facilities well maintained were almost 6 to 7% more than the General Population, and Park Users have a better idea about the condition of facilities, the parks, beaches and other facilities were indeed in a good shape. Thus, *the County should continue to offer facilities that are clean and well maintained and ensure proper pest control in parks.*

There is a lower rate of agreement amongst the Park Users and the General Population when it comes to awareness. Only 63% of the General Population said they were aware of facilities, programs and services offered by the County while 82% of the Park Users said they were aware of the services offered. There seems to be a problem in perception about the programs offered by the County. As such, *the Department should focus on publicizing the facilities and services it offers and ensure that the residents are aware of them.*

The next set of opinions is related to type of facilities that people need. Close to 50% of the respondents believed that special programs were needed for people over the age of 55. Although 37% of the General Population agreed that they needed recreational programs for the whole family, 54% of Park Users felt that they needed programs for the family. However, Less than 25% of the respondents, including Park Users, reported that there were enough opportunities for people with disabilities. As such, *the data suggests that the Parks and Recreation Department should arrange for all-purpose recreational facilities.*

38% of the General Population found that beach parking in the County were adequate. Similar number of Park Users also stated that there was adequate beach parking available. Given that there is a higher need for beach parking and parking in general in other parts of the study, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide sufficient parking slots near the beaches.*

There exists a high level of disagreement on the availability of restrooms in the parks. While only a third of the General Population agreed that there were adequate restrooms in parks, only half the number of Park Users agreed to it. Although there is a difference in the number of people from both sets accepting the fact that there are sufficient restrooms in the park, they point to the same insufficiency. Elsewhere in the study too, restrooms have been voted as the primary need for the community. So, *the County should provide more restrooms in parks and other facilities.*

Only a quarter of the General Population are comfortable in leaving their kids at the County facilities and less than 20% of them find boat ramp parking adequate in the County. The Park Users have a greater degree of trust related to the operations of the County and are willing to leave their kids at the County facilities, with more than 40% of them choosing to do so. 27% of the Park Users stated that they find boat ramp parking adequate. Hence, *the Parks and Recreation Department should ensure that their facilities are safe all the residents are comfortable enough to leave their children in the recreational areas, and should also provide enough specific needs like boat ramp parking.*

The results are presented in the table below.

Personal Opinions: Facilities

	GENERAL POPULATION	PARK USERS	
Opinion Statement	Agree	Agree	Ratio
Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities and services are important to my quality of life	86%	87%	1
In general the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities I have visited satisfy my needs	78%	84%	1.1
Palm Beach County parks are clean and well maintained	77%	85%	1.1
I feel safe when I am in a Palm Beach County park	73%	83%	1.1
Palm Beach County recreation facilities are clean and well maintained	66%	79%	1.2
I am satisfied with the level of beach cleaning at Palm Beach County beaches	64%	71%	1.1
I am aware of the facilities, programs, and services offered by Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation	63%	82%	1.3
Restrooms in County parks are clean and well maintained	60%	63%	1.1
There is sufficient signage, directions, and maps in County parks	56%	64%	1.2
Palm Beach County parks have adequate lighting	55%	66%	1.2
There is a need for special programs for people over 55 in Palm Beach County parks	48%	47%	1
Insects such as fire ants are well controlled in County parks	47%	51%	1.1
There is adequate beach parking in Palm Beach County	38%	34%	0.9

There is a need for more recreation programs where the whole family can participate	37%	54%	1.4
There are enough restrooms in Palm Beach County parks	34%	51%	1.5
I am comfortable leaving my kids at a Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department program	25%	41%	1.6
There are enough recreation programs for people with disabilities in Palm Beach County parks	21%	24%	1.1
There is adequate boat ramp parking in Palm Beach County	19%	27%	1.4

Opinions about Programs and Administrations

These set of items tap into the residents' opinions about how the Parks and Recreation Department responds to programmatic needs of the community and the perceptions of the community with respect to the way the Parks and Recreation Department handles its internal activities. More than half of the General Population believe that the School board should open its facilities to the Parks and Recreation Department. About two-third of the Park Users agree with the rest of the population.

An agreement ratio of 1.3 exists on the fact that the Parks and Recreation Department should be more responsive to community recreation needs, with more than 55% of the Park Users agreeing to it. 40% of the General Population, and more importantly 62% of the Park Users feel that there needs to be more cooperation with the municipalities. Less than half the Population stated that they found it easy to register for programs run by the county.

Given that Park Users have a better sense of the community facilities, *the County should have more cooperative programs with the municipalities and also ensure that the more number of school facilities are open to the public, registration for programs are easier and the community recreation needs are given high priority.*

The results are presented in the table below.

Personal Opinions: Programs and Administration

	GENERAL POPULATION	PARK USERS	
Opinion Statement	Agree	Agree	Ratio
The School Board should open its facilities to more Parks and Recreation programming	54%	63%	1.2
The Parks and Recreation Department is responsive to community recreation needs	44%	56%	1.3
The Parks and Recreation Department should have more cooperative programs with municipalities	40%	62%	1.5
I find it easy to register for a Recreation program run by the County	38%	47%	1.2

Opinions about funding recreation

As already discussed previously, there was a section of the questionnaire that focused on funding issues to assess how the community felt about different funding mechanisms.

The respondents were moderately satisfied with the value they get for their tax dollars. Roughly two-third of the General Population in both sets claimed satisfaction with the way their tax dollars were spent by the Parks and Recreation Department. Majority of the residents were in favor of corporate and private donations and sponsorships to support renovation and construction of new recreational facilities. Roughly half of the General Population approved commercial activities in parks to fund the leisure needs of the community. *As such Parks and Recreation Department should be careful about levying new taxes for recreation activities and facilities and instead utilize private or public sponsorship, besides also providing satisfying recreational opportunities against the tax paid.*

Respondents felt that user fees were an acceptable way of paying for recreation opportunities. About 60% of the General Population and more than 75% of the Park Users were willing to pay reasonable user fees for newer leisure activities. It can also be seen that, 53% of the residents and 61% of the Park Users were willing to pay reasonable parking fees at the beaches. Thus it is clear that reasonable user fees could be an appropriate way of funding Parks and Recreation Department activities. The Parks and Recreation Department could use this as a way to support activities that would be of special interest to parts of the community. *This being the case, the Parks and Recreation Department should consider developing a fee schedule for some of its activities, keeping in mind that the resident fee needs to remain in line with local economics.*

The respondents were partly willing to pay more taxes. Less than 40% of the General Population and at most half the number of Park Users were more willing to pay additional property taxes to maintain the service level of the County parks. Thus, *the Parks and Recreation Department can consider property taxes for funding recreational needs but should be careful while charging more tax to the residents.*

The results are presented in the table below.

Personal Opinions: Funding

	GENERAL POPULATION	PARK USERS	
Opinion Statement	Agree	Agree	Ratio
I am satisfied with the way my tax dollars are spent by the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department	64%	65%	1
I am willing to pay reasonable user fees for recreation opportunities	60%	77%	1.3
I am willing to pay reasonable parking fees at County beaches	53%	61%	1.1
I would be willing to pay more in property taxes to maintain the level of service in County parks	39%	49%	1.3

Areas of Importance

The respondents were offered a set of choices in terms of future needs to elicit their interest in additions to the opportunities available in the county. There were some differences in the responses of the Park Users and the General Population. The difference was measured by computing the percentage of Park Users who needed an opportunity by the percentage of General Population who also needed the opportunity. The measurement resulted in the computation of a ratio. If the ratio was 0.9, 1.0, 1.1 or 1.2 then it is assumed that the Park Users and General Population felt the same way. If the ratio was 1.3 or higher or 0.8 and lower then there it is assumed that there was a difference between the opinions of the Park Users and the General Population. These results can help the Parks and Recreation Department prioritize its future additions in terms of what the community perceives as necessary; they can also help the Parks and Recreation Department recognize areas that may be perceived as necessary simply because residents are not aware of existing provisions. The objective of this section was to develop a measure of the current and future needs for things that are already available and things that might become available in the near future. The data indicates that there were several items for which the needs expressed by the General Population were higher than the needs of the Park Users. This finding can be attributed to the fact that the Park Users have a better sense of what is available and what is filled to capacity.

Areas of necessity (over 70% support)

To begin with, need for restrooms were highest in the list. 87% of the General Population indicated that restrooms in parks and other facilities were important to the community. However, a little less than 73% of the Park Users indicated that there was a need for restrooms in the County facilities. Although quite a few numbers of Park Users disagree with the General Population, they all majorly point towards a need in restrooms. In other parts of the result, a large portion of the respondents agreed that they required restrooms in parks. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should explore ways to add restrooms in all recreational facilities and parks.*

The respondents were also in favor of shades. About 84% of the General Population considered shaded area for spectators and shades in parks as important to the community. 70% of the Park Users agreed that shaded area for spectators were an important need while 75% of them considered shades in parks as necessary for the community. 78% of the General Population and 62% of the Park Users chose shades for playground as an important requirement. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should direct their attention towards developing and maintaining shaded areas in parks, beaches and other facilities.*

Another potential choice made by the residents was maintenance of beaches. 83% of the General Population indicated that beach maintenance was significant for the region. However, more than 40% of the Park Users found it unnecessary. Given that a significant number of people were satisfied with the level

of beach cleanliness, *the County should continue to maintain that level and ensure that beaches are properly maintained.*

The respondents also indicated a need for parking. Around 81% of the General Population considered beach parking as an essential requirement and an almost similar proportion of them pointed out that parking in general was essential to the society. Close to a quarter of the Park Users found beach parking important while 64% of them supported the importance of parking in general. As specified in other parts of the study, since the residents were more than willing to pay for beach parking, *the Parks and Recreation Department should make certain that adequate beach parking is available for its residents.*

Maintenance of the facilities and presence of natural areas in the parks were the next choice of the residents. 77% of the General Population supported maintenance of Parks and Recreation Facilities and existence of natural areas in parks as essential to the society, while roughly two-third of the Park Users agreed with them. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should see to it that the County facilities are properly maintained and natural areas in parks are created.*

The respondents also indicated that lifeguards at beaches were a necessity to the society. However, there seems to be a disagreement among the General Population and the Park Users when considering presence of lifeguards at beaches. Almost half the number of Park Users disagreed that lifeguards were necessary and about a quarter of the General Population agreed with them. Given that 72% of the General Population indicated that County facilities were not safe, presence of lifeguards can cater to the safety needs of the residents and also prevent any mishaps. Keeping that in mind, *the Parks and Recreation Department should ensure that beaches are safe for its citizens and provide lifeguards at beaches.*

Outdoor recreational activities came next. 75% of the General Population indicated that it was important to have pathways around lakes and outdoor fitness trails. 64% of the Park Users agreed to these choices. More than two-thirds of the population, including Park Users, agreed that nature centers were an important part of the community. About 70% of the General Population was in favor of bike paths and indicated picnicking was essential to their community, even though nearly a third of the Park Users differed from this opinion. Since, a majority of the Park Users were interested in outdoor activities and fitness activities, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide walking and biking trails, nature centers and areas for picnicking for its residents.*

Fitness activities like yoga and other adult programs were deemed necessary by the residents. More than 70% of the General Population pointed out that yoga and adult programs were important to the society. More than half the proportion of Park Users agreed with them. As such, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide recreational opportunities for its adult residents and also provide regular yoga sessions for all its residents.*

Areas of necessity (less than 70% support)

The respondents majorly favored art and craft programs and various other community facilities. More than two-thirds of the General Population considered art and craft programs, waterfront access, adequate lighting and interconnected trails as an important need to the community. While only 51% of the Park Users agreed to the importance of art and craft programs and waterfront activities, 63% of them favored interconnected trails and 55% considered lighting was an important factor. With a large number of people favoring different kinds of trails, as discussed before, *the Parks and Recreation Department should provide interconnected trails for its residents and make sure the waterfronts are accessible and there is adequate lighting, besides providing art and craft programs for the people.*

Less than two-third of the General Population were in favor of amphitheaters, environmental programs and canoeing. 60% of the Park Users believed canoeing and kayaking were an important need for

their recreation. Given a large interest in special events elsewhere in the study, it's only natural that amphitheaters and environmental programs were deemed necessary by the General Population. As such, *the County should make sure that such types of programs and facilities are available for its residents.*

Cameras in parks were the next choice of the residents. While only 57% of the General Population considered it an important need, an almost equal number of Park Users did not find it as important. With a considerable level of disagreement among the Park Users and the General Population, *the County can consider putting up cameras in parks but should focus on other higher priority needs first.*

Fitness related facilities and water related activities came next. Less than 60% of the Park Users indicated that indoor gymnasiums were important to them while even lesser number of Park Users agreed with them. Swimming activities and other water sports were important for a little more than half the population. The proportions of Park Users agreeing with it were almost similar to the proportion of General Population. Given that a segment of the population was largely interested in water sports at the beginning of the study, *the Parks and Recreation Department can continue to offer these activities for its specific user segments.*

Presence of dog beaches and inclusion of history in parks followed. About 53% of the General Population were in support of dog beaches in the region, although 58% of the Park Users considered it as not that important for the community. 53% of both sets of the population were in favor of history in parks. Therefore, *the Department can consider providing dog beaches for its specific user group and incorporate history in parks.*

The respondents also indicated the importance of some special interest activities and facilities that would be of interest to some distinct groups within the community. This includes the interests in signage, swim lessons, camping, teen programs, gated playgrounds, dog parks, mountain biking, pocket parks, beach volleyball, meeting spaces and birthday areas, soccer fields, disc golf and bocce. Since less than half of the General Population and less than two-fifth of the Park Users indicated an interest in these opportunities, they could be addressed after the more pressing needs have been met. These are not the top priorities for the Parks and Recreation Department, but the Department should try and address the special needs of the smaller groups once the more widespread needs have been taken care of.

The results are presented in the table below.

Areas of Importance

Programs/Facilities	GENERAL POPULATION		PARK USERS		Ratio
	Not needed	Needed	Not needed	Needed	
Restrooms	13%	87%	27%	73%	0.8
Shaded area for spectators	16%	84%	30%	70%	0.8
Shade in park	16%	84%	25%	75%	0.9
Maintenance of county beaches	17%	83%	41%	59%	0.7
Neighborhood parks	19%	81%	38%	62%	0.8
Beach parking	19%	81%	28%	72%	0.9
Parking	22%	78%	36%	64%	0.8
Shades for playgrounds	22%	78%	38%	62%	0.8

Maintenance of the facilities	23%	77%	40%	60%	0.8
Natural areas in the parks	23%	77%	33%	67%	0.9
Lifeguards at beach	24%	76%	45%	55%	0.7
Pathway around the lake	25%	75%	36%	64%	0.9
Outdoor fitness trails	25%	75%	36%	64%	0.9
Adult programs	27%	73%	43%	57%	0.8
Nature Centers	27%	73%	35%	65%	0.9
Bike paths	29%	71%	36%	64%	0.9
Picnicking	30%	70%	47%	53%	0.8
Yoga	30%	70%	47%	53%	0.8
Open green spaces	31%	69%	33%	67%	1.0
Arts and crafts programs	31%	69%	49%	51%	0.7
Waterfront access	31%	69%	49%	51%	0.7
Lighting	33%	67%	45%	55%	0.8
Interconnected trails	34%	66%	37%	63%	1.0
Amphitheater	35%	65%	49%	51%	0.8
Environmental programs	38%	62%	42%	58%	0.9
Canoeing Kayaking	38%	62%	40%	60%	1.0
Cameras in parks	43%	57%	59%	41%	0.7
Indoor gymnasium	43%	57%	60%	40%	0.7
Water exercise	44%	56%	54%	46%	0.8
Swimming opportunities	45%	55%	50%	50%	0.9
Dog beach	47%	53%	58%	42%	0.8
History in the parks	47%	53%	47%	53%	1.0
Signage	49%	51%	63%	37%	0.7
Swim lessons	49%	51%	61%	39%	0.8
Camping	50%	50%	61%	39%	0.8
Teen programs	52%	48%	63%	37%	0.8
Gated playgrounds	53%	47%	63%	37%	0.8
Dog park for medium sized dogs	55%	45%	62%	38%	0.8
Mountain bicycle	56%	44%	64%	36%	0.8
Pocket parks	57%	43%	70%	30%	0.7
Beach volleyball	58%	42%	70%	30%	0.7
Meeting spaces	60%	40%	65%	35%	0.9
Birthday party rental area	61%	39%	70%	30%	0.8
Soccer fields	64%	36%	61%	39%	1.1
Disc golf	69%	31%	77%	23%	0.7
Bocce	75%	25%	78%	22%	0.9

Palm beach County Needs Assessment

**Management
Learning
Laboratories**

December 2014

Management Learning Laboratories



Major Findings from Study



Awareness

- ***Other than the following :***
 - *Bike or Skate Paths & Trails*
 - *Outdoor Courts*
 - *Nature Centers*
 - *Natural Areas*
 - *Recreation Centers*
 - *Equestrian Facilities*

Awareness is nearly 100%

Factors that influence participation (75% or more)

- ***Not enough time***
- ***Not interested in the programs***
- ***Lack of information***
- ***Inconvenient program times***
- ***Condition of facilities***
- ***Too far away***
- ***Fees too high***

Communication

- ***Email***
- ***Website***
- ***Word of Mouth***
- ***Flyers and Brochures***
- ***Newspapers***
- ***On the Radio***
- ***Facebook***

Opinions (more than 60%)

- Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities and services are important to my quality of life
- In general the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities I have visited satisfy my needs
- Palm Beach County parks are clean and well maintained
- I feel safe when I am in a Palm Beach County park
- Palm Beach County recreation facilities are clean and well maintained
- I am satisfied with the way my tax dollars are spent by the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department
- I am satisfied with the level of beach cleaning at Palm Beach County beaches
- I am aware of the facilities, programs, and services offered by Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation
- I am willing to pay reasonable user fees for recreation opportunities
- Restrooms in County parks are clean and well maintained

Financial (Operation)

- User Fees
- Property Taxes
- A half a cent increase in sales taxes
- Commercial activities in Parks

Financial (New)

- Grants
- Private Individual Donations
- Corporate sponsorships and donations
- Bonds to be paid by voter approved property taxes

Future Use (more than 75%)

- *Beach parking*
- *Restrooms*
- *Maintenance of county beaches*
- *Shade in park*
- *Maintenance of the facilities*
- *Parking*
- *Amphitheater*
- *Lifeguards at beach*
- *Outdoor fitness trails*
- *Neighborhood parks*
- *Bike paths*
- *Lighting*

Future Use (60% to 75%)

- *Pest control*
- *Shaded area for spectators*
- *Natural areas in the parks*
- *Nature Centers*
- *Pathway around the lake*
- *Canoeing Kayaking*
- *Interconnected trails*
- *Waterfront access*
- *Shades for playgrounds*
- *Adult programs*
- *Open green spaces*
- *Arts and crafts programs*
- *Emergency signage*
- *Yoga*
- *Dog beach*

Questions and Comments

For more information contact Ananda Mitra at:

1-877-789-5247

<http://www.m-l-l.org>



RECREATION INTERESTS

Listed below are many different categories of recreational activities that can be enjoyed year-round. For each activity, please indicate whether YOU and/or your family would have **interest** in the activities.

Category	Example	No Interest	Some Interest	Great Interest
Arts & Crafts	Painting, Ceramics, Origami, Pottery, Photography	1	2	3
Performing Arts	Theater, Concerts, Ballet, Music, Museums	1	2	3
Sports & Athletics	Basketball, Volleyball, Soccer, Baseball, Golf	1	2	3
Social	Dancing, Teen Clubs, Senior Clubs, Camps, Afterschool	1	2	3
Fitness	Boot Camp, Cross Fit, Yoga, Cross Country, 5K Aerobics	1	2	3
Aquatics	Swim Lessons, Open/Lap Swim, Diving, Family Swim	1	2	3
Outdoor recreation	Biking, Hiking, Boating, Fishing, Picnicking, Camping	1	2	3
Special events	Concerts, Holiday, Environmental, Historical Events	1	2	3

TIME AND ATTENDANCE

Palm Beach County wants to schedule recreational activities and special events when it is most convenient for you and your family. Please circle all the times when you and your family would attend recreation activities, programs and facilities.

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Before 8 a.m.	1	2	4	5	6	7	8
8 a.m.-Noon.	1	2	4	5	6	7	8
Noon-4 p.m.	1	2	4	5	6	7	8
4 p.m.-7 p.m.	1	2	4	5	6	7	8
7 p.m.-10 p.m.	1	2	4	5	6	7	8

Please indicate approximately how many times YOU and/or your family visited/attended the following facilities in the past 12 months. Please also indicate if you were aware of the existence of the facility.

	Never	Once	2-6 times	7-12 times	More than 12 times	Knew about it
Athletic Fields	0	1	2	3	4	8
Beaches, Lakes, Waterways	0	1	2	3	4	8
Bike or Skate Paths & Trails	0	1	2	3	4	8
Equestrian Facilities	0	1	2	3	4	8
Fishing & Boat Ramps	0	1	2	3	4	8
General Park & Playgrounds	0	1	2	3	4	8
Golf Courses	0	1	2	3	4	8
Natural Areas	0	1	2	3	4	8
Nature Centers	0	1	2	3	4	8
Outdoor Courts	0	1	2	3	4	8
Pools & Waterparks	0	1	2	3	4	8
Recreation Centers	0	1	2	3	4	8
Walking Paths & Trails	0	1	2	3	4	8

REASONS FOR NOT USE

There are many reasons why people might not be able or willing to participate in public recreation activities. Please indicate why you or other members of your household do not participate in recreation activities available in your community (select all that apply).

	Yes		Yes		Yes
Accessibility for the disabled	1	Inconvenient program times	1	Not interested in the programs	1
Condition of facilities	1	Lack of appropriate programs	1	Not safe	1
Customer service	1	Lack of child care	1	Poor experience	1
Don't have transportation	1	Lack of information	1	Programs get filled up	1
Facilities too crowded	1	Lack of parking	1	Quality of programs	1
Fees too high	1	Maintenance of facilities	1	Too far away	1
Inadequate staffing	1	Not enough time	1	Other	1

AREAS OF EMPHASIS

Please circle which of the following additional facilities and programs are **needed** for the children, teens, adults or seniors in your family **and** if offered would you plan to **use** the program or facility in the next year.

	No	Yes	Not Use	Use		No	Yes	Not Use	Use
Accessible launches	1	2	1	2	Meeting spaces	1	2	1	2
Accessible picnic areas	1	2	1	2	Mountain bicycle	1	2	1	2
Adult programs	1	2	1	2	Natural areas in the parks	1	2	1	2
After school care	1	2	1	2	Nature Centers	1	2	1	2
Amphitheater	1	2	1	2	Neighborhood parks	1	2	1	2
Arts and crafts programs	1	2	1	2	Off road vehicle park (motocross)	1	2	1	2
Baseball/softball fields	1	2	1	2	Open green spaces	1	2	1	2
Beach parking	1	2	1	2	Outdoor fitness trails	1	2	1	2
Beach volleyball	1	2	1	2	Paintball	1	2	1	2
Bike paths	1	2	1	2	Parking	1	2	1	2
Bilingual signs	1	2	1	2	Pathway around the lake	1	2	1	2
Birthday party rental area	1	2	1	2	Pest control	1	2	1	2
Boat ramps	1	2	1	2	Pickleball courts	1	2	1	2
Bocce	1	2	1	2	Picnicking	1	2	1	2
Cameras in parks	1	2	1	2	Pocket parks	1	2	1	2
Camping	1	2	1	2	Remote control park	1	2	1	2
Canoeing Kayaking	1	2	1	2	Restrooms	1	2	1	2
Community Center	1	2	1	2	RV Park	1	2	1	2
Disc golf	1	2	1	2	Senior Center	1	2	1	2
Dog beach	1	2	1	2	Shade in park	1	2	1	2
Dog park for medium sized dogs	1	2	1	2	Shaded area for spectators	1	2	1	2
Educational signs	1	2	1	2	Shades for playgrounds	1	2	1	2
Emergency signage	1	2	1	2	Signage	1	2	1	2
Environmental programs	1	2	1	2	Skate parks	1	2	1	2
Firing range	1	2	1	2	Soccer fields	1	2	1	2
Gated playgrounds	1	2	1	2	Special needs programs	1	2	1	2
Geocaching	1	2	1	2	Summer camp	1	2	1	2
History in the parks	1	2	1	2	Swim lessons	1	2	1	2
Indoor gymnasium	1	2	1	2	Swimming opportunities	1	2	1	2
Interconnected trails	1	2	1	2	Teen programs	1	2	1	2
La Crosse	1	2	1	2	Tennis courts	1	2	1	2
Lifeguards at beach	1	2	1	2	Water exercise	1	2	1	2
Lighting	1	2	1	2	Waterfront access	1	2	1	2
Maintenance of county beaches	1	2	1	2	Yoga	1	2	1	2
Maintenance of the facilities	1	2	1	2	Other	1	2	1	2

You can complete the questionnaire at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PBCNeeds>

PERSONAL OPINIONS

Please circle the number that most closely reflects your attitudes.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
I am aware of the facilities, programs, and services offered by Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation	1	2	3	4	8
I am comfortable leaving my kids at a Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department program	1	2	3	4	8
I am satisfied with the level of beach cleaning at Palm Beach County beaches	1	2	3	4	8
I am satisfied with the way my tax dollars are spent by the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department	1	2	3	4	8
I am willing to pay reasonable parking fees at County beaches	1	2	3	4	8
I am willing to pay reasonable user fees for recreation opportunities	1	2	3	4	8
I feel safe when I am in a Palm Beach County park	1	2	3	4	8
I find it easy to register for a Recreation program run by the County	1	2	3	4	8
I would be willing to pay more in property taxes to maintain the level of service in County parks	1	2	3	4	8
In general the Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities I have visited satisfy my needs	1	2	3	4	8
Insects such as fire ants are well controlled in County parks	1	2	3	4	8
Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation facilities and services are important to my quality of life	1	2	3	4	8
Palm Beach County parks are clean and well maintained	1	2	3	4	8
Palm Beach County parks have adequate lighting	1	2	3	4	8
Palm Beach County recreation facilities are clean and well maintained	1	2	3	4	8
Restrooms in County parks are clean and well maintained	1	2	3	4	8
The Parks and Recreation Department is responsive to community recreation needs	1	2	3	4	8
The Parks and Recreation Department should have more cooperative programs with municipalities	1	2	3	4	8
The School Board should open its facilities to more Parks and Recreation programming	1	2	3	4	8
There are enough recreation programs for people with disabilities in Palm Beach County parks	1	2	3	4	8
There are enough restrooms in Palm Beach County parks	1	2	3	4	8
There is a need for more recreation programs where the whole family can participate	1	2	3	4	8
There is a need for special programs for people over 55 in Palm Beach County parks	1	2	3	4	8
There is adequate beach parking in Palm Beach County	1	2	3	4	8
There is adequate boat ramp parking in Palm Beach County	1	2	3	4	8
There is sufficient signage, directions, and maps in County parks	1	2	3	4	8

FUNDING

Funding is required for 1) the operation of facilities and 2) the renovations to existing facilities/expansion of facilities. Looking at the list below, please indicate which funding source should be used for operations and which of renovation/expansion (please pick either one or none of the two options, not both).

	Operation	Renovation and New Construction		Operation	Renovation and New Construction
A half a cent increase in sales taxes	1	2	Grants	1	2
Bonds to be paid by voter approved property taxes	1	2	Private Individual Donations	1	2
Commercial activities in Parks	1	2	Property Taxes	1	2
Corporate sponsorships and donations	1	2	User Fees	1	2

