

Frankfort Square Park District Community Survey



November 2017

Prepared by:

Office of Recreation and Park Resources

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary	5
1.1 Residents’ Current Patterns of Participation.....	6
1.2 Residents’ Satisfaction with Existing Parks, Programs, Maintenance, and Staff	6
1.3 Future Recreation Interests within the Frankfort Square Community	8
1.4 Residents’ Preferences with the Frankfort Square Park District’s Marketing/Publicity ..	9
2.0 Recommendations.....	10
2.1 Satisfaction with Parks, Facilities, Programs & Services	10
2.2 Similar Needs and Interests	10
2.3 Referendum Efforts	11
2.4 Specific Provision Questions	11
2.5 Marketing	11
2.6 Partnerships	12
3.0 Project Overview.....	13
3.1 Purpose	13
3.2 Goals.....	13
3.3. Study Objectives.....	13
3.4 Study Procedures.....	14
4.0 Study Findings.....	16
4.1 Frankfort Square Park District Participation.....	16
4.2 Other Recreation, Parks, and Exercise Facilities Participation.....	19
4.3 Satisfaction.....	21
4.4 Customer Service	28
4.5 Effectiveness	29

4.6 General Statements32

4.7 Future Recreation Interests 33

4.8 Marketing 39

4.9 Demographics 42

4.10 Comparisons with Previous Studies 47

4.11 General Comments/Open Feedback 55

5.0 Appendix 56

5.1 Survey Cover Letter and Instrument 56

1.0 Executive Summary

The Frankfort Square Park District (FSPD) contacted the Office of Recreation & Park Resources to assist with an assessment of community needs and recreation planning within the boundaries of the Frankfort Square Park District. Interviews with Frankfort Square Park District administration were conducted and benchmark data from the previous FSPD survey was collected to assist in the development of a District-wide survey. Researchers within the Office of Recreation & Park Resources worked alongside the staff and Board of the FSPD to develop a survey that met the needs of all parties. Once developed, the survey was mailed to each of the households within FSPD. The intent of the survey was to gather residents' opinions, attitudes, and preferences regarding Frankfort Square Park District's park areas, programs, and facilities.

A mailing of approximately 7,700 surveys was sent to residents in August of 2017. A total of 660 usable (completed) surveys were returned for a response rate of 9% producing a precision of at least +/- 5%. The surveys were analyzed for the development of the report between August, 2017 and September 11, 2017.

Objectives for the study were established during the initial stages of the project by the Frankfort Square Park District in cooperation with the Office of Recreation & Park Resources. Questions in the survey were developed to meet the following objectives:

- Identify resident/member priorities toward potential improvement projects.
- Investigate the willingness of the Frankfort Square Park District residents to support or spend for recreational services.
- Evaluate the overall performance of and demand for parks, facilities, programs and cultural arts/fine arts opportunities,
 - Evaluate for what purpose the parks, programs and facilities are being used.
 - Measure overall satisfaction with parks, programs and facilities.
- Draw awareness to parks and facilities that need updates.
- Determine how residents are being made aware of the Park District's offerings and opportunities and determine ways to effectively reach Park District residents with information.
- Ascertain the District's strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the residents.

The following is a brief overview of the results of the data analysis regarding the objectives:

1.1 Residents' Current Patterns of Participation

Key findings from the study include:

- During the past year, 70% of the households had visited a Park District park and/or natural area. This is comparable with the national average;
- 58.0% of the households had visited a Frankfort Square Park District facility within the last 12 months. This exceeds the national average of 45%.
- 38% of the households had participated in a Frankfort Square Park District recreation program within the last 12 months. The national benchmark for park districts is 35%.
- Neighboring park districts were the most widely utilized non-Frankfort Square Park District service provider with 57% of respondents indicating they had used/visited neighboring park districts in the past year.

Consultant Notes

The recreation program participation rate for the Frankfort Square Park District is slightly below other park and recreation agencies throughout the state based on recent surveys. Attendance at FSPD facilities appears to be consistent with other community recreation providers within the state of Illinois. Visitor rates for the FSPD District park areas appear to be slightly higher than other agencies in the state.

Data from the Frankfort Square Park District's 2013 attitude and interest community survey was compared to the results of the 2017 study. Participation rates within the three areas had dropped slightly from the 2013 study. Specifically, program participation rates dropped by 11% (38% in 2017 compared to 49% in 2013), while facility and park area visitation each dropped by 7% (58% in 2017 compared to 65% in 2013 for facility visitation and 70% in 2017 compared to 77% in 2014 for park and natural area visitation).

1.2 Residents' Satisfaction with Existing Parks, Programs, Maintenance, and Staff

Key findings from the study include:

- Of those respondents who actively utilize the District's services, an overwhelming majority of them (89%) are satisfied with Frankfort Square Park District. This is exceptionally higher than the national average of 75%.
- 87% of active users expressed an overall satisfaction (satisfied or very satisfied) with the existing programs provided by Frankfort Square Park District.

- 98% of active users expressed overall satisfaction with the courtesy and helpfulness of Frankfort Square Park District staff. Again this is top-notch.
- 94% of active users were either satisfied or very satisfied with the level of safety at Frankfort Square Park District parks, facilities, and programs.
- A large majority of active-user households are satisfied or very satisfied (92%) with the facilities managed by the Frankfort Square Park District. Facilities receiving the highest satisfaction levels (+95%) include the golf course (99.0%), open space and natural areas (98%), community gardens (97%), parking (97.0%), band shells (97%), nature center (96%), sled hill (96%), and picnic areas (95%).
- Similar to the District’s recreation facilities, a large majority of active-user households are satisfied or very satisfied (94%) with the maintenance of the District’s park areas. Only one area received satisfaction ratings at or below 85%: tennis courts (81%).
- An overwhelming majority of households are satisfied with the Park Board and staff (97%).
- The vast majority of active users are satisfied with the quality of Frankfort Square Park District’s customer service (+90%).
- When asked about the District’s effectiveness on a variety of items (involvement of community in planning efforts, partnering w/other agencies, providing a diversity of programming, etc.), a large number of residents (+21%) were unsure or “Don’t Know”.
- 91% of active users feel the Frankfort Square Park District’s program and service fees are a good value for the money.

Consultant Notes

While the data found a significant number of respondents who “Don’t Use” some of the District’s programs, facilities, etc., those that had used these services were generally satisfied or very satisfied with their experiences. The two facilities that were rated the lowest for user satisfaction were the tennis courts (81% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied) and fishing locations (86% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied). Additional attention may be given to these facilities.

In addition, the data found a significant number of respondents who “Don’t Know” how to evaluate the District’s effectiveness on a variety of items. However, those residents that did provide an evaluation perceived the District to be effective or very effective in these areas. Overall, the data tends to suggest the District might benefit from additional efforts to inform the community of their services and engage them in the District’s planning activities.

1.3 Future Recreation Interests within the Frankfort Square Community

Key findings from the study include:

- Over 30% of residents ranked walking/biking trails (54%), an outdoor swimming pool (39%) and indoor fitness and exercise facilities (37%) as their household's 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th most desired facility/ renovation.
- 41% of respondents identified adult fitness/wellness programs as their first, second, third, or fourth choice for an expanded/developed program for the Frankfort Square Park District followed by summer concerts (40%) and senior programs (28%).
- 62% of active users felt that the Frankfort Square Park District should discontinue maintaining natural ice at the Union Creek Park Hockey Rink.
- Only 37% of residents supported Frankfort Square Park District legalizing gambling in the form of video gaming machines at Square Links Golf Course and Driving Range as an added revenue stream.
- Residents were split on whether Frankfort Square Park District should offer a Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) licensed day care opportunity (47% yes; 53% no).
- The majority of residents (82%) would support a \$1.5 million referendum for the renovation of existing parks, acquisition of property near populations with limited access to current District properties, and increased landscaping throughout the community, if it did not raise Park District taxes.

Consultant Notes

Consistent with opinions expressed by other community park and recreation agencies in Illinois, walking/biking trails, outdoor swimming pools and indoor fitness and exercise facilities were identified as prioritized needs for FSPD residents. This matches desires expressed by respondents in previous FSPD studies and also national benchmarks. The need for senior programming grew since the 2013 survey. This is consistent with the expressed need of residents in other Chicagoland communities as the boomer population continues to grow older and maintain an active lifestyle.

Respondents' desire for outdoor sheets of ice, gambling opportunities and DCFS licensed day care were questionable. It would be recommended to consider eliminating ice rink services and to conduct a more thorough investigation of gambling and DCFS day care services in comparison to other park districts in Chicagoland.

The recommendations review a few important steps related to referendum, but it appears a majority would support the efforts if they did not receive a tax increase.

1.4 Residents' Preferences with the Frankfort Square Park District's Marketing/Publicity

Key findings from the study include:

- The Frankfort Square Park District's brochure (93%) is the most widely utilized method to learn about recreation programs and services. The national average is about 75%.
- The Frankfort Square Park District's website (31%) was the second most utilized marketing medium by households.
- Almost 9 out of 10 (89%) of households prefer to have a copy of the brochure mailed to their home.

Consultant Notes

The brochure is the most preferred marketing tool for the residents of Frankfort Square. Thus, it appears the Frankfort Square Park District should ensure any new programming or recreation services are marketed through the brochure. "Word of Mouth" advertising from "Friends & Neighbors" is also utilized for informing the community about the District's recreational opportunities. It is also worth noting that Frankfort Square's "Word of Mouth" advertising from "Friends and Neighbors" (28%) is slightly higher than other public park and recreation agencies in Illinois who have been found to be at/below 20%.

Data from the Frankfort Square Park District's 2013 attitude and interest community survey was comparable to the results of the 2017 study in marketing preferences. In 2013, 90% of respondents indicated that the brochure was the preferred method to learn about FSPD programs/services and 34% of residents preferred the website.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Satisfaction with Parks, Facilities, Programs & Services

The response to the 2017 community attitude and interest survey was very similar to the results from the 2007 and 2013 surveys. FSPD scored significantly higher in almost every satisfaction category than the national average of 70%. In other surveys conducted by ORPR it has been uncommon for a District to have respondents rank their satisfaction levels as 90%+ extremely satisfied/satisfied. FSPD ranked about 90% in almost every satisfaction category. ORPR encourages focus on any areas in which the dissatisfied/extremely dissatisfied combined response returns at higher than 10%. A few categories were slightly above this benchmark: fishing piers, tennis courts, softball fields, basketball courts, playgrounds and F.A.N. Playgrounds were also listed in the top five as an amenity that respondents desired to see developed or expanded. It may be of use for FSPD to consider a resident led park score study, in which the residents would go to each park site and facility and grade the quality of the location, maintenance and amenities. This may help bring awareness to playground and courts maintenance priorities and also help to make residents feel like they are more involved in the planning process.

Despite slight decreases in resident use of parks, programs and facilities, the core user groups (those actively using these services at 25 or more times per year) were above 25%, which indicates strong use patterns by a sizeable percentage of respondents.

2.2 Similar Needs and Interests

Trails, outdoor swimming pool, indoor fitness and exercise equipment and playgrounds were consistent areas of interest to develop or expand when compared with the 2007 and 2013 studies. Trails are consistently the number one desired amenity in similar studies across Illinois and the United States. Respondents also showed continued interest in adult fitness/wellness programs and summer concerts. Senior programs received higher interest for this study and fits with the growing movement of active aging adults and the large boomer population. Focus groups with older adults may be of interest to further investigate how FSPD may continue to meet their needs. Minority populations and youth user groups are also typically underrepresented in surveys and it would be worthwhile to organize focus groups to engage with them as well.

2.3 Referendum Efforts

Response to the referendum question was supportive of a referendum if it meant no Park District tax increase. Continued efforts to reach out to residents with a clear case for support would be recommended. Minimal evidence existed in the written comments related to respondents being unclear on their Park District portion of their homeowner's tax and FSPD's completed efforts from a previous referendum. These may be starting points for clarifying current goals and stewardship of taxpayer resources.

2.4 Specific Provision Questions

The survey asked a number of specific questions related to current or future services. Respondents showed a majority against (62%) creating and maintaining an ice rink each winter. A majority was also against adding gambling to the golf course. A thorough investigation of other public golf or banquet facility gambling offering should be considered. When considering the big picture for FSPD and their residents, comparisons should be made with other Park District survey responses, financial impact, impact of quality of life, etc. Response was fairly equal when considering whether or not to add DCFS day care services. If FSPD would consider beginning a similar program, it would be recommended to make sure to build a strong case statement and conduct considerable research and focus groups with residents before moving forward.

2.5 Marketing

The use and preference for the FSPD program brochure is significantly higher than other districts (Average use and preference numbers in Illinois are 75%). This speaks to the visibility and marketing/design quality of the brochure. Continued engagement through this marketing channel is recommended for the immediate future. Respondents also stated their FSPD Facebook page use also increased from the last study. Other Park Districts in Chicagoland continue to increase their investment in social media and email marketing. Yearly testing of social media and email marketing engagement will be a critical component in allocating resources in the marketing mix.

2.6 Partnerships

Local government is increasingly called upon to partner in ways that impact the bottom line and quality of life for residents. FSPD is in a unique situation with boundaries over multiple communities. FSPD's survey response shows they are known for partnering well with others. As residents continue to have multiple options for recreation services (parks districts, forest preserve district and private), it is important for FSPD to find ways to partner to serve and also continue to create unique niches of services that add value for residents. Libraries continue to seek new ways to serve their communities and increasingly are adding events and programs that are similar to park district offerings. Private companies like breweries are moving into programming that offers fitness (yoga) and sells their product (alcohol). Therefore, it is important to continue FSPD's openness and creativity when it comes to partnering to lower the need for competition and increase the value of its services.

3.0 Project Overview

3.1 Purpose

A partnership between the Office of Recreation and Park Resources (ORPR) and Frankfort Square Park District (FSPD) was developed to collect feedback through a community survey regarding FSPD residents' needs and interests. A household survey to every household in the district serves multiple purposes. First, it allows tax-paying residents to have the opportunity to voice their opinions related to future services and desired amenities. Second, a community survey provides residents with the opportunity to rate their satisfaction with current services and amenities. Next, community survey results may also be used to identify and clarify concerns and inform leadership decisions related to financial resource allocation, customer service, marketing, trends, quality and cleanliness, programming, partnerships and use patterns. A community survey is also an important step in the strategic planning process. Finally, collecting information and feedback from the park district's constituency should help the organization create achievable and practical goals and objectives to allocate finite resources into the future.

3.2 Goals

FSPD and ORPR established multiple priorities for the community survey. There were several aims of this study: 1) understand overall satisfaction with existing parks, facilities, programs, and services; 2) assess residents' opinions regarding future park, facility and program priorities; 3) assess and analyze the market of the FSPD to avoid duplication of services; and 4) utilize the results to make recommendations for improvements and to engage the FSPD Board and staff in dialogue concerning the future development of and planning for parks, programs and services.

3.3. Study Objectives

1. Identify resident/member priorities toward potential improvement projects.
2. Investigate the willingness of the Frankfort Square Park District residents to support or spend for recreational services.
3. Evaluate the overall performance of and demand for parks, facilities, programs and cultural arts/fine arts opportunities,
 - a. Evaluate for what purpose the parks, programs and facilities are being used.
 - b. Measure overall satisfaction with parks, programs and facilities.
4. Draw awareness to parks and facilities that are in need of updates.
5. Determine how residents are being made aware of the Park District's offerings and opportunities and determine ways to effectively reach Park District residents with information.
6. Ascertain the District's strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the residents.

Ultimately, this study will be used as a tool to help shape the future of parks and recreation within the Frankfort Square Park District.

3.4 Study Procedures

Introduction

This community survey was sent to every household within the District's geographic boundaries. An overview of the study population, questionnaire development, and response rate is presented in the following sections.

Population

The Frankfort Square Park District serves and is supported by a population exceeding 18,000 persons within its district boundaries. A survey was mailed to all the residents (or to a total of 7,700 households) and an adult member (over the age of 18) was asked to complete the survey on behalf of themselves and members of their household.

Initial Meetings

In January of 2017, ORPR staff met with Jim Randall, Executive Director, to discuss goals and objectives for the creation of a community survey. After the meeting, a survey template and drafts of other park district surveys were provided to FSPD to review. A questionnaire was synthesized from these examples, which also included additional questions of interest. Questions from the previous FSPD survey were also considered to establish benchmarking data for FSPD's comprehensive park and recreation services. The Office of Recreation and Park Resources developed a first draft of the questionnaire, which was submitted to FSPD for review. A series of revisions and drafts were produced as the Board of Commissioners and staff reviewed the drafts.

Collection Procedures

The six-page survey, cover letter and pre-addressed, postage paid business reply envelope arrived at the local United States Post Office on 08/02/17. The surveys were sent by route and not address, for a total of 7,700 households. The cover letter and questionnaire are provided in the Appendix. The timing of all communication was guided by best practices as detailed by Dillman et al. (2014, p. 382-383). The survey closed on 09/11/17.

Response Rate

Data collection yielded 660 usable surveys. Because the surveys were sent by route and not address, there were zero returns (i.e., bad addresses). This produced a response rate of 9% and a precision of at least +/- 5% (**e.g., the true population value is within +/-XX% of the sample value**). This response rate represents the confidence (relative to an acceptable level of percent error) from which this survey can be generalized to the population of households within the boundaries of the Frankfort Square Park District. A response that would have generated less than an acceptable number of usable surveys related to this population size would have warranted continued solicitation of response in other communities of similar size to reach a generalizable number.

Data collection was terminated on September 11, 2017. Respondents had two options to complete the survey, through the mail or online. As each survey response was received, the Office of Recreation and Park Resources staff checked the data for completeness and accuracy prior to analysis.

Reference:

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons


4.0 Study Findings

4.1 Frankfort Square Park District Participation

More than 70% of all respondents had visited FSPD parks and/or natural areas in the last year; 58% had visited a FSPD facility; and 38% had participated in a FSPD recreation program. See Figure 1.


Those who are using parks and natural areas use them somewhat regularly, with 42% visiting them more than ten times a year.

Figure 1. Household Participation (at least one visit)




Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 2. Participation Frequency Among All Responses



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 3. Participation Frequency Among Active Users




Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered the question (N).

4.2 Other Recreation, Parks, and Exercise Facilities Participation

Half of the respondents used private/commercial providers at least once last year, including golf courses, fitness centers, and day care. Over 55% visited neighboring park districts at least once last year, including Mokena, Frankfort, and Tinley Park. County Forest Preserves, such as Cook and Will counties, were used by 48% of the respondents at least once last year. Also within the past year, church affiliated recreation activities were used by 20% of the respondents and public/private school based recreation were used by 34% of the respondents. See Figure 4.


Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 4. Household Participation (Other Providers)



“Other” places mentioned just once each: Private gym, Tinley Park Library, Travel Ball Wildcats, Library, and various Chicago-area activities.

Figure 5. Participation Frequency Among Active Users (other P&R providers)



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who visited/participated in the past year (N).

4.3 Satisfaction

4.3.1 Overall Satisfaction with Frankfort Square Park District


Overall, the majority of active respondents (89%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the Park District. Satisfaction was particularly high in two areas: 1) courtesy and helpfulness of FSPD staff (98% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied and 2% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied) and 2) level of safety at FSPD parks, facilities, and programs (94% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied and only 6% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied). For the purpose of presentation, the respondents selecting, “Don’t Know/Don’t Use” were removed from analysis. See Figure 6.

4.3.2 Satisfaction with Programs

Survey respondents gave high marks to the overall satisfaction of programs. 87% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied and 13% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. 88% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied with the value of recreation opportunities available and 12% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. See Figure 6.

The number of programs and activities offered received slightly lower ratings from active users, with 82% satisfied or very satisfied and 18% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. See Figure 6.

Figure 6. General Statements: Over Satisfaction (Active Users Only)




4.3.3 Satisfaction with FSPD Facilities and Park Areas

Overall, respondents were very positive about Park District facilities and park areas. The golf course received the highest ratings: Of the 271 active users, 99% were satisfied or very satisfied. In eight other cases, active users rated the facility/park area with at least 95% satisfied or very satisfied. These facilities are the open space/natural areas, outdoor inline hockey rink, skate park, nature center, picnic areas, sled hill, community gardens, parking, and band-shell.

Two areas that may need attention are 1) tennis courts: 81% of active users (N=146) were satisfied/very satisfied, while 19% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, and 2) fishing locations: 86% of active users (N=233) were satisfied/very satisfied, while 14% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. See Figure 7.


Figure 7. Overall Satisfaction with FSPD Facilities and Park Areas



4.3.4 Satisfaction with FSPD's Maintenance

Overall, 94% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied with general maintenance and care of facilities and 6% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Active users gave the highest marks to the cleanliness of buildings/facilities: 98% were satisfied or very satisfied and 2% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This was followed closely by active users overall satisfaction with the buildings/facilities: 97% were satisfied or very satisfied and 2-3% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. See Figure 8.

Figure 8. Overall Satisfaction with FSPD Maintenance




Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). "Don't Use" responses have been omitted. Segments that are not labeled represent fewer than 3% of all respondents.

4.3.5 Satisfaction with Staff

This is the area where respondents were the most satisfied. Overall, 97% of active users were satisfied or very satisfied with Park District staff and 3% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Among the specific staff areas surveyed, the front office personnel and golf course personnel received the highest marks: each with 99% of active users being satisfied or very satisfied and 1% being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. See Figure 9.

Figure 9. Overall Satisfaction with FSPD Staff



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). "Don't Use" responses have been omitted. Segments that are not labeled represent fewer than 3% of all respondents.

4.3.6 Satisfaction Comments

In addition to the survey data collected about satisfaction on individual items, question 5 also included an opportunity for respondents to elaborate why they may have indicated dissatisfaction with FSPD programs, facilities, park areas, staff, or maintenance. The comments were compiled and sorted into themes based on content. These comments are summarized below and the full list of comments can be found in the addendum to this report located at the Frankfort Square Park District office.

When discussing the facilities and amenities offered by FSPD, the responses related to dissatisfaction centered on the needs for updates to certain aspects of the park, like more parking, upgrades to playing field amenities, and better lighting in certain areas. Other comments suggested additions that would be welcomed, like more walking/hiking trails, more open spaces, and the transformation of unused spaces into things people would want to use.

Dissatisfaction with programs and events centered around the lack of appropriate and accessible programming for citizens of all ages and interest levels. These issues included time of day that the programs were offered, the level of structure in the programs, and the “limited” offerings provided to certain age sectors of the community.

The majority of dissatisfaction with the maintenance offering of FSPD revolved around the upkeep of the bike path and the appearance of certain areas where grass grows. General comments mentioned that these areas seemed “overgrown” at times and “had too many weeds”.


Other comments included a diminishing friendliness of the staff in certain areas, dissatisfaction with allocation of tax dollars, and disappointment with forgotten promises of new park areas in certain sections of the district.

4.4 Customer Service

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of customer service within three areas of the Frankfort Square Park District: The Administrative Office, Square Links Golf Course, and F.A.N. (FSPD’s Activities at North). To assess customer service quality, respondents were asked to “Rank the quality of customer service within each Frankfort Square Park District facility area.” Respondents rated the quality of customer service on a 5-point service quality scale (0 = don’t use, 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, and 4 = excellent). In an effort to accurately represent the households’ perceived customer service levels for each area, the “Don’t Use/Don’t Know” responses were removed from subsequent analysis.

Of those respondents who had visited a Park District facility area, the quality of customer service was rated positively, with over 96% of respondents claiming high levels of satisfaction (excellent, good) for two of the three services and 90% or more on all three. The highest level of dissatisfaction was with the customer service at F.A.N., with 10% providing marks of fair or poor. See Figure 10.

Figure 10. Quality of Customer Service



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). "Don't Use" responses have been omitted.

4.5 Effectiveness

In most areas, respondents who are active users indicated that the Park District was effective or very effective.

The strongest areas for active users were. See Figure 11:

- Working cooperatively with local school districts (96% felt the PD was effective/very effective, while only 4% indicated that the PD was ineffective/very ineffective)
- Working cooperatively with other units of local government (95% felt the PD was effective/very effective, while only 5% indicated that the PD was ineffective/very ineffective)
- Working cooperatively with local athletic organizations (93% felt the PD was effective/very effective, while only 7% indicated that the PD was ineffective/very ineffective)

When considering the answers from all respondents, five items had relatively higher numbers of respondents who chose “Don’t Know” (45-62% of all respondents). These areas appear to have room for improvement when considering all respondents. See Figure 12.

- Working cooperatively with other units of local governments (62% indicated “Don’t Know”)
- Working cooperatively with local athletic organizations (58% indicated “Don’t Know”)
- Acquiring open space as it becomes available within the community (58% indicated “Don’t Know”)
- Working cooperatively with local school districts (50% indicated “Don’t Know”)
- Attention to improving health/wellness in the community (45% indicated “Don’t Know”)

Figure 11. Effectiveness of FSPD (Active Users)





Figure 12. Effectiveness of FSPD (All Responses)




Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). "Don't Know" responses have been omitted. Segments that are not labeled represent fewer than 3% of all respondents.

4.6 General Statements

Question 8 of the attitude and interests survey asked respondents for their “opinion concerning the recreational issues and opportunities within the Frankfort Square Park District.” Respondents were presented with three issues and/or opportunities and asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Respondents rated each issue and/or opportunity on a 5-point agreement scale (0 = don’t use/no opinion, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree). In an effort to accurately represent the households’ perceptions of effectiveness for each item, the “Don’t Use/Don’t Know” responses were removed from subsequent analysis. 91% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Frankfort Square Park District program and service fees are a good value for the money. Almost 94% of respondents agreed (or strongly agreed) the registration system is convenient for their household, and the park and facility locations are convenient for use for 96% of active users. Complete results are available in Figure 13.

Figure 13. General FSPD Statements



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). "Don't Know" responses have been omitted. Segments that are not labeled represent fewer than 3% of all respondents.


4.7 Future Recreation Interests

Questions 9 and 10 on the attitude and interests survey asked households to identify and prioritize recreation facility needs (question 9) and program needs (question 10) within the Frankfort Square Park District. Respondents were asked to select from a list of 24 various park and recreation facilities and identify which ones were of need to their household. Specifically, respondents were asked to rank the top four facilities they felt were the most needed for their household.

Respondents were then asked to select from a list of 22 programs and identify the programs of need to their household. Then the respondents were asked to rank these top four programs according to their perceived level of need to the household. The following sections summarize the key findings:

There were 492 completed surveys concerning the future facility needs of FSPD. The compiled data show that 54% of completed surveys identify walking/biking trails as their household's first, second, third, or fourth choice for a new/expanded recreation facility in the Frankfort Square Park District. An outdoor swimming pool was second with 39% of respondents, followed by indoor fitness and exercise facilities (37% of respondents). Complete aggregate results showing the total number of responses are provided in Figure 14.

Figure 14. What Facilities Should be Developed




Comparison to Frankfort Square Park District’s 2012 Community-Wide Interest Survey Results

A similar question was also asked on the District’s 2012 community-wide interest survey. The top three facility choices in 2012 were walking/bike trails (46%), outdoor swimming pool (37%), and indoor fitness and exercise facilities (34%). The 2012 findings appear very consistent with the 2017 findings with the same three facility areas identified as the most desired areas of development within the Frankfort Square Park District over the past 5 years. These were also the top three most desired facilities in the 2007 report, as well.

There were 442 completed surveys concerning the future facility needs of FSPD. The compiled data show that 41% of completed surveys identify adult fitness/wellness as their household's first, second, third, or fourth choice for a new/expanded programming in the Frankfort Square Park District. Summer concerts appeared on the second most surveys with 40% of respondents followed by senior programs (28% of respondents). Complete aggregate results showing the total number of responses are provided in Figure 15.

Figure 15. What Facilities Should be Developed



Comparison to Frankfort Square Park District's 2012 Community-Wide Interest Survey Results

A similar question was also asked on the District's 2012 community-wide interest survey. The top three programming choices in 2012 were summer concerts (42% of respondents), adult fitness/wellness programs (40%), and adult educational opportunities (33%).

4.7.1 Addition/Subtraction of Services


Questions 12-15 were asked to gauge interest in subtracting current services or adding new revenue streams to current offerings. Also included was an interest-gauging question about the amount of potential tax increase (if any) the community would be willing to accept.

Survey Question 12: Ice Rink Maintenance

Annually the Park District incurs \$5,000 to \$9,000 in equipment and labor expenses to flood and maintain natural ice at the Union Creek Park Hockey Rink, which is contingent on cold weather. On average, ice is skateable for 2-3 weeks each winter. Should the Park District continue this practice?

Respondents were not in favor of continuing the annual-\$5000-9000 expenses for equipment and labor needed to flood and maintain natural ice at the Union Creek Park Hockey Rink each winter by a margin of 62% against continuation of the program to 38% for program continuation. See Figure 16.

Figure 16. Ice Rink Maintenance




Survey Question 13: Video Gambling

Should the Park District consider legalized gambling in the form of video gaming machines at Square Links Golf Course & Driving Range as an added revenue stream?

Respondents were also not in favor of legalizing gambling in the form of video gaming by a margin of 63% opposed to 37% for. See Figure 17.

Figure 17. Legalized Video Machine Gambling at Golf Course




Survey Question 14: Child Care Center

Should the Park District consider offering a Department of Children & Family Services (DCFS) licensed day care opportunity?

Responses about bringing a Department of Children and Family Services-licensed day care facility to FSPD were almost evenly distributed between yes and no, with 53% of respondents not wanting to add a facility for childcare during the day. See Figure 18.

Figure 18. Offer DCFS Daycare?




Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N).

Survey Question 15: Referendum to Expand

Would you support a Park referendum for the renovation of existing parks, acquisition of property near populations with limited access to current District properties, and increased landscaping throughout our community: at a cost of \$1.5 million if Park District taxes were not raised; at a cost of \$1.75 million if taxes were only raised by less than \$15/annually on a home with a \$250,000 value; at a cost of \$2 million if taxes were raised less than \$25/annually on a home with a \$250,000 value?

Respondents were asked to state their opinion on the four options provided for this question and 82% of respondents were in favor of a \$1.5 million referendum as long as no tax increases were accrued. Full results are listed in Figure 19.

Figure 19. Support for a Park Referendum



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion


4.8 Marketing

Questions 3 and 4 of the recreation attitude and interest survey sought to obtain information regarding household's preferences with the Frankfort Square Park District's marketing and publicity methods. Question 3 asked respondents to identify all the ways they learned about the Frankfort Square Park District's programs and services. Question 4 asked respondents to indicate their preferred method for receiving the District's programming and service brochure.

Respondents were asked, "How have you or members of your household found out about the programs and services offered by the Frankfort Square Park District?" A list of 10 options was provided with respondents being asked to indicate all the ways they have learned about the District's programs and services.

The results indicated that greater than 90% of respondents utilized the Frankfort Square Park District brochure for learning about the District's recreation programs and services. A significant difference was identified between the most popular marketing method (FSPD brochure) and the other nine options. Complete results are provided in Figure 20.

Figure 20. Preferred Method to Learn about FSPD Programs/Services



Note: Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N). There were 12 responses of "Other" and for these 12 responses; no answer was specified in the space provided though an answer was requested.


Comparison to Frankfort Square Park District's 2012 Community-Wide Interest Survey Results

A similar question was also asked on the District's 2012 community-wide interest survey. The responses provided in 2017 are very similar to those provided in 2012. In fact, the top three overall preferences remained the same. The preference for receiving a brochure in the mail increased in desirability from 89% to 93% and "Website" and "Friends/Neighbors" decreased 2% each in desirability. The only increase in preference was with the Park District's Facebook page, which grew from 3% in 2012 to 11% on the most recent survey. Figure 37 on page 55 of this report provides visual representation.

Brochure Access Preferences

Respondents were asked, "How do you prefer to access brochure information?" A list of 3 options (copy mailed to your home, copy available at Frankfort Square Park District Administrative Office and online at the Frankfort Square Park District website) was provided with respondents being asked to indicate their household's most preferred option. The results identified unanimous support for mailing the brochure to the residents' homes. In particular, 89% of respondents preferred to have the brochure mailed to their home; only 1% preferred to have a copy of the brochure available at the Frankfort Square Park District Administrative Office, and 11% preferred to have a copy of the brochure available at the Frankfort Square Park District's website. These results are provided in Figure 21.

Figure 21. Preferred Method to Access Brochure Information



Note: Percentages are based on the number of respondents who expressed an opinion (N).

Comparison to Frankfort Square Park District's 2012 Community-Wide Interest Survey Results

A similar question was also asked on the District's 2012 community-wide interest survey and the results were virtually identical across the five-year span.

Note: It should be taken into consideration that since the surveys administered to the Park District communities are operated through the mail that the respondents to the survey may be more comfortable receiving and interacting with things in the mail. As was noted in the Executive Summary, over 90% of the surveys mailed were returned so this preferential data regarding marketing may be skewed away from the general consensus of the larger population.


4.9 Demographics

Questions 16 thru 22 of the community-wide attitude and interest survey assessed respondent and household characteristics. The following sections summarize the key findings:

4.9.1 Household Characteristics


Household characteristics obtained with this study included: type of family unit, number of people in the household and total household income. A majority of the respondents were married/living with a partner (82%), and this majority was divided by those with children (48%) and those without children (34%). Over two-thirds of respondents (66.67%) had a total household annual income above \$80,000. The complete household demographic breakdown is listed in Figures 22- 24 below.

Figure 22. Household Income




Note: Percentages based on the respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 23. No. of Children in Household



Note: Numbers based on the respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 24. Respondent Family Composition



Note: Percentages based on the respondents who answered the question (N).

4.9.2 Respondent Characteristics

Respondent characteristics obtained with this study included: gender, age, race/ethnicity, and years lived in the Frankfort Square Park District. Over 90% of the respondents were over the ages of 35, with a virtual split in respondent age between 35-54 (46%) and 55+ (48%) with the majority of respondents (72%) having lived in the FSPD area for less than 20 years. The complete details of respondent characteristics are provided in Figures 25 - 29.

It should be noted that the population sample returned rates higher/lower than those reported in the acquired census data in the areas of gender (females overrepresented), age (population over 65 overrepresented in relation to other age groupings), and ethnic distribution (overrepresentation of whites; underrepresentation of African American and Hispanic populations). Detailed census information located below each figure.

Figure 25. Respondent Gender





Figure 26: Respondent Age




Note: Percentages are based on the respondents who answered the question (N). The population of respondents does not accurately represent the entire population of the FSPD community according to FSPD records as it does not adequately address the concerns of the population under the age of 45. This is common in situations where surveys are collected by hard copy alone. Research shows that multiple collection opportunities (i.e. electronic and hard copy) are beneficial in reducing this disparity (Israel, 2012).

Reference:


Israel, G. D. (2013). Combining mail and e-mail contacts to facilitate participation in mixed-mode surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(3), 346-358.

Figure 27. Respondent Ethnicity



Note: Respondents could choose multiple items. Percentages based on the respondents who answered the question (N) and rounded to the nearest full number.

Figure 28: Length of Residence



Note: Percentages based on the respondents who answered the question (N).

4.10 Comparisons with Previous Studies

In 2012, ORPR worked with FSPD on a similar project. During that process, many of the same questions were asked. Below are some of the comparison charts for what's changed in the last three years.

Figures 29-31 display the comparisons in usage of FSPD recreation programs, facilities, and park areas between the 2012 and 2017. **Note:** Percentages for all graphs in this section are based on the respondents who answered the question (N). For purposes of readability, only 2017 response figures are displayed within the graph(s)

Figure 29. Comparison of Household Use of Programs




Figure 30. Comparison of Household Use of Facilities





Figure 31. Comparison of Household Use of Park Areas



The following six graphs – Figures 32-37 – examine the number of instances that survey respondents engaged in recreation activities that were not directly related to the Park District itself.

Note: Percentages for all graphs in this section are based on the respondents who answered the question (N). For purposes of readability, only 2017 response figures are displayed within the graph.

Figure 32. Comparison of Household Use of Private/Commercial Recreation




Figure 33. Comparison of Household Use of Neighboring Park Districts




Figure 34. Comparison of Household Use of County Forest Preserve Districts




Figure 35. Comparison of Household Use of Church Affiliated Recreation





Figure 36. Comparison of Household Use of School Based Recreation




Note: Response information was provided about the number times a recreation activity not listed was engaged, but there was no significant response other than “None” in either 2014 or 2017 (91% and 95%, respectively).

The final set of comparisons between the 2012 and 2017 surveys details how people learn about the programs and services offered at FSPD.

Note: Percentages for the graph in this section is based on the respondents who answered the question (N).

Figure 37. Comparison of How you Learned About FSPD Programs and Services



Note: An information delivery method (FSPD Email Newsletters) that was asked about in 2012 was not repeated in the 2017 survey. On the 2012 survey, 14% of respondents stated that this was a method through which they received their information regarding programs and services.

4.11 General Comments/Open Feedback

The conclusion of the survey provided space for any additional comments or concerns to be voiced. These comments were compiled and sorted into themes based on content. These recurring themes included facilities/amenities, programs and events, youth sport and youth sport programming, maintenance, costs/fees, and praise of the district amongst other things. Below these comments are summarized and the full list of comments can be found in the addendum to this report located at the Frankfort Square Park District office.

In similar fashion to the feedback provided in the section on satisfaction, much of this feedback focused on providing extra services and programs for members of the community of all ages and facilities that were safer and kept in better shape. Some respondents suggested modeling the program and service offerings after those offered in neighboring communities, as well.

Other respondents echoed the points made in the questions included in the survey about reducing expenditures for the ice rink, updates and expansion to the hike/bike/jog trail including facilities along the trail, and the continuation of services that work to bring the community together like the summer concert series.

Many community members also suggested an expansion of the variety of programs that are offered so that they would not have to travel to a different park district, lengthening of the hours of operation of certain services, and updates in the manner in which the current offered programs are managed, especially in the youth sport programming.

A large group of respondents suggested priorities of which the FSPD should take note, including increased monitoring of certain areas of the park for safety purposes, working with neighboring park districts on program offerings, and more frequent communication via the internet letting the community members know about upcoming events or programs.

5.0 Appendix

5.1 Survey Cover Letter and Instrument



7540 W. BRAEMAR LANE
FRANKFORT, IL 60423

815-469-3524

www.fspd.org



Dear Residents:

Find enclosed an Attitude & Interest Survey that is being sent community-wide. We hope all residents will take the time to complete the survey, providing much needed direction to your Frankfort Square Park District.

This is the fifth community-wide survey during my tenure with the FSPD. Resident input accounts for every action in areas of Park District operation.

Past surveys supported the development of Union Creek Park, the largest FSPD-owned location that includes the survey-supported Skate Park, Inline/Hockey Rink, Dog Park, and our largest community playground.

A 9.9 mile bike/walking path was developed, Before and After School programming, and our expanded dance program, Braemar Dance Center, are all directly related to resident input.

This is equally true of this latest community-wide survey, with one exception. The last referendum approved by Park District residents was in 2002. The funding from this referendum led to \$5 million in tax supported improvements throughout the District, and over \$4 million in grant funds provided by the State of Illinois.

The FSPD is now in the unique position to ask residents to support a \$1.5 million, considered a mini-referendum, without a tax increase to residents. This is possible due to the elimination of Park District debt, allowing for referendum funding to support needed capital improvements. This would enable the Park District to respond to resident requests for playground replacement, walking/bike path repair, ball field renovation, tennis court resurfacing, and similar tangible improvements.

This needed infusion of capital funds will allow the FSPD to complete repairs and improvements, not all at once, but gradually over the next 5-6 years. Without resident support, we will do our best to meet resident needs, but will be hard-pressed to provide the level of facilities of which residents have grown accustomed.

Our largest debt obligation is retiring in January, 2022. At this future date, residents can decide to accept a reduced tax rate, approve a new referendum meeting the needs that 2022 brings, or some combination of both.

This mini-referendum would allow a no-tax increase bridge, allowing for much-needed fix, repair, and replacement budget **WITHOUT ANY TAX INCREASE**. No growth is calculated in FSPD estimates, so if we have any new growth, your annual tax rate will decline.

This is a community decision, and we ask for your consideration and support. Without a positive result provided through this survey, the Park Board will not move forward on a spring, 2018 referendum.

As always, if you have any questions or concerns on any Park District issue, call, email, and/or attend our monthly Board Meetings.

We encourage all residents to follow us at our website, www.fspd.org, through the Park District brochure, or follow us on Facebook.

Sincerely,
Jim Randall
Executive Director

You can access this survey online at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/fspd2017> using UIN: xxxx



The Frankfort Square Park District 2017 Attitude & Interest Survey

Section 1: Current Participation Patterns & Attitudes

1. During the last 12 months, approximately **HOW MANY TIMES** did members of your household visit or participate in the following: (Please check one box for EACH service area.)

Household Participation	More than 25 times	11-25 times	6-10 times	1-5 times	None
Frankfort Square Park District Recreation Programs					
Frankfort Square Park District Facilities					
Frankfort Square Park District Park Areas					

2. During the last 12 months, approximately **HOW MANY TIMES** did members of your household utilize the following **other providers** for parks and recreation services? (Please check one box for EACH service provider.)

Service Provider	More than 25 times	11-25 times	6-10 times	1-5 times	None
Private/Commercial (e.g., golf course, private fitness center, day care, etc.)					
Neighboring Park Districts (Mokena, Frankfort, Tinley Park, etc.)					
County Forest Preserve Districts (Cook, Will, etc.)					
Church Affiliated Recreation Activities					
Public or Private School-Based Recreation Activities					
Other (please list):					

3. **HOW** has your household learned about the programs and services offered by the Frankfort Square Park District? (Please check all that apply.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Frankfort Square Park District brochure
<input type="checkbox"/> Frankfort Square Park District website
<input type="checkbox"/> Frankfort Square Park District Facebook page
<input type="checkbox"/> Friends and neighbors
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Flyers/posters at Frankfort Square Park District facilities
<input type="checkbox"/> Frankfort Square Park District staff
<input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers
<input type="checkbox"/> Marquees/banners |
|---|---|

4. **HOW** do you prefer to access brochure information? (Please check one option.)

- Copy mailed to your home
 Copy available at Frankfort Square Park District Administrative Office
 Online at the Frankfort Square Park District website

5. Please rate your household's general level of **SATISFACTION** with the Frankfort Square Park District; Facilities and Park Areas; Maintenance; and Staff. (Please check one box for EACH statement.)

General Statements	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Use
Variety of recreation opportunities offered for me and members of my household					
Number of programs and activities offered for me and members of my household					
Overall satisfaction with programs					
Days and times of programs and activities offered					
Level of safety at Frankfort Square Park District parks, facilities, and programs					
Value of recreation opportunities available					
Courtesy and helpfulness of Frankfort Square Park District staff					
<i>What is your overall level of satisfaction with FSPD</i>					

Facilities and Park Areas	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Use
Baseball fields					
Softball fields					
Tennis courts					
Basketball courts					
Soccer fields					
Football fields					
Walking/bike paths					
Playgrounds					
Disc golf course					
Splash Park					
Open space & natural areas					
Outdoor inline hockey rink					
Skate Park					
Golf course					
Nature Center					
Picnic areas					
Fishing locations					
Sled hill					
Community gardens					
Parking					
<u>Bandshells</u>					
<i>What is your overall level of satisfaction with the FSPD's Facilities & Park Areas?</i>					

Maintenance	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Use
Building/facilities					
Building/facilities cleanliness					
Athletic fields					
Park areas					
Playgrounds					
<i>What is your overall level of satisfaction with the Frankfort Square Park District's Maintenance?</i>					

Staff	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Use
Front office personnel					
Park personnel					
Administrative personnel					
Recreation personnel					
Golf course personnel					
Program instructors					
<i>What is your overall level of satisfaction with the Frankfort Square Park District's Staff?</i>					

If you indicated that you are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with any of the Park District programs, facilities, park areas, staff, or maintenance, please tell us why.

6. Using the following scale, please rank the **QUALITY OF CUSTOMER SERVICE** within each of the Frankfort Square Park District's facilities. (Please check one box for EACH facility.)

Facility	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Use
Administrative Office					
Square Links Golf Course					
F.A.N.					

7. How **EFFECTIVE** is the Frankfort Square Park District as it relates to: (Please check one box for EACH statement.)

Statement	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know
Working cooperatively with other units of local government					
Working cooperatively with local school districts					
Attention to improving health/wellness in the community					
Protecting open space					
Informing the community of its recreation programs and activities					
Involving the community in the planning of future projects					
Offering affordable recreational opportunities for the residents of the community					
Acquiring open space as it becomes available within the community					
Offering quality programs and special events					
Working cooperatively with local athletic organizations					

8. What is your **OPINION** regarding the statements listed below regarding the Frankfort Square Park District? Please indicate your level of agreement. (Please check one box for EACH statement.)

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The Frankfort Square Park District program and service fees are a good value for the money.					
Park and facility locations are convenient for use.					
The registration system is convenient for me and members of my household.					

9. Are there **FACILITIES** within your Park District that you or members of your household feel should be **DEVELOPED OR EXPANDED**? If so, indicate **which** facilities your household would like to see developed or expanded. Please **RANK THE TOP FOUR FACILITIES** you feel are most important to your household. *(Using the space next to each facility, place a "1" next to your top choice; "2" for your 2nd choice; "3" for your 3rd choice, and; a "4" for your 4th choice.)*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pickleball courts | <input type="checkbox"/> Picnic areas and shelters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fishing piers | <input type="checkbox"/> Indoor golf practice facility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Indoor fitness and exercise facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Outdoor swimming pool |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Additional dance studios | <input type="checkbox"/> Multigenerational playground |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Large community parks | <input type="checkbox"/> Walking/biking trails |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nature Center and trails | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community farm | <input type="checkbox"/> Dog Park |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outdoor basketball courts | <input type="checkbox"/> Golf course |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outdoor tennis courts | <input type="checkbox"/> Playground equipment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parking lots | <input type="checkbox"/> Restaurant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disc golf course | <input type="checkbox"/> Banquet facility / wedding venue |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lacrosse field | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

10. Are there **PROGRAMS** at the Frankfort Square Park District that you or members of your household feel should be **DEVELOPED OR EXPANDED**? Please indicate which programs your household would like to see developed or expanded. Please **RANK THE TOP FOUR PROGRAMS** you feel are most important to your household. *(Using the space next to each program, place a "1" next to your top choice; "2" for your 2nd choice; "3" for your 3rd choice, and; a "4" for your 4th choice.)*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult art, dance, performing arts | <input type="checkbox"/> Summer concerts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult fitness/wellness programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth art, dance, performing arts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult sports programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth educational opportunities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adventure/travel programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth fitness/wellness programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gymnastics/tumbling programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth sports programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Group exercise | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Martial arts instruction | <input type="checkbox"/> Child care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preschool programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Open gyms |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Senior programs | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult health/safety programs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Indoor rental space | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult educational opportunities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hockey/ice skating | <input type="checkbox"/> Teen Programs |

11. Are there programs/facilities **NOT LISTED** above that you would like the Frankfort Square Park District to offer?
If so, please list here: _____

12. Annually the Park District incurs \$5,000 to \$9,000 in equipment and labor expenses to flood and maintain natural ice at the Union Creek Park Hockey Rink, which is contingent on cold weather. On average, ice is skateable for 2-3 weeks each winter. Should the Park District continue this practice? Yes No

13. Should the Park District consider legalized gambling in the form of video gaming machines at Square Links Golf Course & Driving Range as an added revenue stream? Yes No

14. Should the Park District consider offering a Department of Children & Family Services (DCFS) licensed day care opportunity?
 Yes No
15. Would you support a park referendum for the renovation of existing parks, acquisition of property near populations with limited access to current district properties, and increased landscaping throughout our community?
(Please check one for EACH statement.)
- If:
- A. At \$1.5 million if it did not raise Park District taxes. Yes No
- B. At \$1.75 million if it raised taxes by less than \$15.00 annually on a \$250,000 home. Yes No
- C. At \$2 million if it raised taxes by less than \$25.00 annually on a \$250,000 home. Yes No
- D. Would not support referendum despite NO or minimal tax increase Yes No

Section 3: Demographics

The following information allows us to describe different groups of households for better management and planning. Your answers will be used for statistical purposes and classification only. The data will not be identified with you personally.

16. What is your gender? **(Please check one.)** Male Female
17. What is your age? **(Please check one.)**
- 18-24 years 25-34 years 35-44 years 45-54 years
- 55-64 years Over 65 years
18. How would you describe your race/ethnicity? **(Please check all that apply.)**
- Asian/Pacific Islander
 Black/African American
 Hispanic/Latino
 White
 American Indian
 Middle Eastern
 Other: _____
19. Which best describes your household? **(Please check one.)**
- Single, no children living in household
 Married/living with partner, no children living in household
 Single, with children living in household
 Married/living with partner, with children living in household
20. If you have children living in your home, please indicate the number of children you have in each category.
- Under 2 years old Preschool age K - 2nd Grade
- 3rd - 5th Grade Middle School High School Over 18 years old

21. How long have you lived within the area serviced by the Frankfort Square Park District? _____ years (approximate)

22. What is your approximate **TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME** before taxes in 2016? (**Please check one.**)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,001 to \$40,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,001 to \$60,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,001 to \$80,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,001 to \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 to \$150,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$150,001 or more | |

Thank you for your input! All participating households will be entered into a raffle, and three (3) \$100 cash prizes will be awarded to survey participants. Personal information will be used for the **SOLE** purpose of the raffle. Please share your return address information on the enclosed envelope to be entered in the survey. Survey responses are kept anonymous and personal information will be shredded after raffle winners are drawn.

*Entering the raffle is **OPTIONAL**.*

Please feel free to share any additional feedback below: