

# CHAPTER 2

## Themes and Trends

Chapter Two compares and contrasts survey data presented in Chapter One and analyzes emerging themes and trends. A needs assessment was created from the theme/trend analysis. The needs assessment was the basis for the Outdoor Recreation Priorities for Public Parks and Recreation Providers and Stakeholders listed at the end of the Introduction (pg. 22). This chapter uses survey data to determine the preferences and needs of the state's users of parks and recreation facilities. The chapter uses the same method to determine the preferences and needs of the state's parks professionals.

### LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEYS

The surveys used by the DNR to create each SCORP are not necessarily scientifically correct in their methodology because of:

- lack of funds and time to create the "ideal" scientific survey before each SCORP planning cycle ends;
- the challenges inherent in successfully surveying an entire state of more than 6.4 million people;
- the challenges of surveying busy park professionals or park board members who work for more than 1,200 units of local government; and
- the moving-target problem, in which constant changes in statewide demographics, economics, legislation, funding, etc., combine to provide DNR staff an uncountable number of variables.

DNR Division of Outdoor Recreation staff members do their best to minimize each of these limitations, and the SCORP surveys are designed to provide the best possible representation of the needs, desires, and preferences of the state's users and managers of parks and recreation facilities. All surveys used in this SCORP are designed to best represent all Hoosiers statewide, while making the most efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars.

### MIXED-METHOD SURVEYING IN THIS SCORP

This SCORP features surveys that use methodologies that range from paper intercept and random telephone surveys to the use of sophisticated electronic touch screens and fully automated online surveys. Mixed-method public-input surveying is generally the best way to ensure diverse demographic representation in a sample. Advances in survey technology provided useful new ways for the DNR to discover what Hoosiers prefer and want from outdoor recreation. All survey methods have advantages and drawbacks. The multiple methods used in this SCORP's surveys were combined to best reach as diverse a demographic statewide sample as possible.

## EXAMINING THE SURVEYS

Two of the surveys for this SCORP were intended to sample all Indiana residents: the 2014 Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey, and the 2014 Trails Activity Survey. These surveys asked about participation in outdoor recreation activities, and barriers to recreation, funding and participation. The other survey used in this SCORP, the 2014 Local Park and Recreation Provider Survey, provides a statewide sample of all Indiana park superintendents, park board members, local government officials, and others who work with county and municipal parks, and recreation facilities and programs. This survey asked what types of facilities these professionals operated, as well as their budgets, capital projects, recreation programming, facility renovations, funding challenges and possible solutions, outside competition, and staffing.

All three surveys were created independently. They have separate goals, question sets, survey populations and results. Direct comparisons between the surveys are not a main goal of the SCORP. The survey variances are deliberate. The

strategy is to provide as diverse a dataset as financially possible, given the time constraints. As mentioned in Chapter One, these three different survey population samples were intended to ascertain outdoor recreation needs statewide from providers and users. Table 2.1 shows the methods used to produce the surveys.

A fourth survey used in this SCORP is the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) 2015 Field Report. That report analyzes data from the NRPA's nationwide Parks and Recreation Operating Ratio and Geographic Information System (PRORAGIS) database. The NRPA created PRORAGIS in 2010 to collect parks and recreation system data at the community, regional and national levels for comparative benchmarking between parks agencies, and in parks research and planning of all types. The yearly Field Report from the NRPA uses a PRORAGIS database analysis to create a valuable synopsis of national trends and statistics gleaned from thousands of individual community datasets from communities of all sizes all over the country.

TABLE 2.1 Survey Methods

Survey Name	Date(s) of Survey	Number of people surveyed (n)	Survey Method(s)	Survey intended for (N)	Subject matter covered
2014 Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey (Survey America)	May through September, 2014	6,381 respondents statewide	Electronic touch screen/ paper intercept mixed-method survey	All IN residents	Recreation participation, barriers, funding, activities
2014 Local Park and Recreation Provider Survey (Ball State University)	January 2014 through August 2014	93 Park professional respondents statewide	Online and paper mixed-method survey	IN Park superintendents, park board members, local government officials, and others who work with local parks and recreation facilities and programs	Park types, recreation programming, facility use, and funding issues
2014 Trails Activity Survey (Survey America)	May through November, 2014	1,067 respondents statewide	Electronic touch screen/ paper intercept mixed-method survey	All IN residents	Trail activities, motivations, barriers, connectivity, surfaces, funding
2015 NRPA * "Field Report"	Database began in 2010	254 Park Systems Reporting data so far: Nationwide	Self-reported local data on park systems and programs	All US park departments, big or small	Park sites, budgets, amenities, staff, management, etc.

\*NRPA=National Recreation and Park Association

## RECURRING THEMES IN THE SURVEYS

Table 2.2 illustrates briefly some of the common themes that emerged during analysis of the data from all three surveys.

### Walking/Jogging/Running now a 20-year #1 Hoosier Recreation Favorite

Since the 1995 SCORP, Walking/Jogging/Running is Hoosiers’ most popular outdoor recreation activity. In the Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey, 44% of respondents said they walked for exercise or pleasure more than once per week, and 45% wanted to do so in the future. In the Trails Activity Survey, 77% of respondents said they walked on trails at least once per year, and 23% of respondents said they walked on trails once per week or more. As noted in the 2006 SCORP, walking requires little or no skill or training, minimum equipment, no special facilities, costs little, and has no age limits. For survey purposes, the term “Walking” may include many related activities, including but not limited to jogging, power walking, strolling, wheeling a wheelchair, pushing a stroller, running, or simply traveling as a pedestrian.

### Hoosiers are still experiencing financial constraints

All three SCORP surveys had question responses indicating financial issues and limitations. In the Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey, 28% (the single-largest percentage of respondents, and an increase from 21% in the 2010 survey) said they spend less than \$100 annually on their favorite recreation activity; 33% of Trails Activity Survey participants (the single-largest percentage of respondents) said the top amount they would spend to support trail upkeep and new trail development via an annual fee was less than \$5. Local parks and recreation providers indicated they currently used mostly non-tax-based funding strategies to pay for their parks: 67% applied for grants, 80% received donations, 53% pursued a community foundation, 32% levied taxes and 14% said they closed facilities (an increase from 5% in 2010).

Many Hoosiers still feel the impact of the recent recession and are still adjusting spending to compensate. This may be driving an increase in the use of local parks and recreation facilities, services and programs—local sites have lower travel costs; low-or-no entry fees; minimum travel

TABLE 2.2 Survey Common Themes

Survey Name	Preferred Recreation or Recreation Facility	Financial Issues Growing in Importance	“Doing more with less”
2014 Outdoor Recreation Participation Survey (Survey America)	Walking (#1 by a huge margin)	Largest single percentage of respondents (28%) spend less than \$100 annually on the favorite recreation activity (Up from 21% in 2010)	Respondents are actually participating at higher rates in mostly very low-cost/no-cost activities (like walking); while they say that the activities they hope to do in the future are more costly traditional outdoor activities, like camping
2014 Local Park and Recreation Provider Survey (Ball State University)	Trails or walking paths are a major priority for many park systems	Vast majority of respondents again reported seeking funding beyond tax revenues	Innovation for funding, staffing, programming, partnerships, etc. determines success or failure of the systems
2014 Trails Activity Survey (Survey America)	Walking	33% of respondents say they would only pay less than \$5 to support trail upkeep and new trail development via an annual trail fee	70% of respondents report that they want to walk/run/jog at least 12 times per year in the future. 23% report walking, jogging or running more than once per week.
2015 NRPA* “Field Report”	Trails or walking paths	Budgets nationwide are tight and still shrinking; non-traditional funding methods are now a necessity	Park agencies report having to add more programs, and more responsibilities, while receiving less funding

\*NRPA=National Recreation and Park Association

time; and offer easier, more convenient access than outdoor recreation activities far from home. Recent decreases in fuel prices may be easing this impact, but those surveyed still appear to be using high-cost recreation options much less.

The 2015 NRPA Field Report showed some significant differences between national data and Indiana data. For example, the report states that the “upper quartile” of park systems (those far larger than most Indiana park systems) nationwide are seeing declines in total park attendance. That report also says that those same upper-quartile park systems are seeing increases in total attendance at programs, classes and small events. Larger park agencies are statistically more likely to offer a wide selection of programs, classes and special events. This may explain some of the difference between park attendance and program attendance in the report. In Indiana, anecdotal data obtained through local park and recreation master plans show that park use in all but the largest communities is stable, and in many cases, increasing. This is likely reflective of a complex set of variables. The variables include individual community population growth/decline, local economic circumstances, size and variety of amenities in local park systems, and competition for local recreation participation from local non-profits, commercial businesses, or larger-scale recreation sources (such as state or national parks or recreation sites).

**Hoosiers are doing more with less**

All three primary surveys in this SCORP show that Hoosier public and park professionals are doing more with less. The Participation Survey clearly indicates that respondents are participating at higher rates in many low- or no-cost outdoor recreation activities. These include, but are not limited to, walking, gardening, relaxation/spiritual renewal, bicycle touring (casual, tour or both), and outdoor-pool swimming or waterpark use. The survey reported that respondents or others in the household participated in these activities more than once per week. A number of factors may be driving the growing user participation in these inexpensive outdoor recreation activities. These factors might include small or no entry fees, low equipment costs, minimal skill needed to participate, no expensive training or assistance needed to start, short time commitments, and little or no travel costs.

Ordinary outdoor recreation activities commonly considered traditional include camping, fishing and canoeing, etc. These activities were reported by respondents as things they wanted to do in the near future. Traditional public outdoor recreation activities often have moderate entry fees and much higher equipment costs, require some skill or training, often require investment of vacation time away from work,



and usually take place far enough from home to require some travel cost. These may be a few of the reasons why this Participation Survey differed significantly in terms of the activities participants do often, versus those they say they want to do.

It is possible that tight budgets at home may restrict some Hoosiers from doing some of the more traditional outdoor recreation activities, versus those activities that are close-to-home and cost less. Another possible explanation for the difference between the actual and future participation in outdoor recreation activities might be human nature. An example would be a survey respondent’s wishful thinking about what would be fun and adventurous outdoor recreation options, versus what life’s circumstances allow. Many people dream of fabulous vacations in exotic locales but most get to no place more exotic than a local amusement park.

Doing more with less has become a vital skill for outdoor recreation providers. Tight budgets, limited revenues, minimal or reduced staff, and increasing public demand for facilities, services and programs have forced providers to innovate. In the Outdoor Recreation Provider survey, public park operators report that new ways of obtaining funds, acquiring staff, creating and operating programs, and forging new partnerships are needed to provide sustainable, high-quality recreation services and amenities.

Similar to the results in the Participation Survey, Trail User Survey respondents said their top three trail activities were Walking, Bicycle Touring (casual, tour or both), and Using trails as alternative transportation routes. All three of these uses are of low or no cost to the user. Asked what trail activity they would like to participate in at least 12 times in the future, Trail User survey respondents said Walking/Running/Jogging; Bicycle Touring (casual, tour or both); and Hiking/Backpacking. As a predicted future trail use, Hiking/backpacking can have a significantly higher equipment/gear cost than the other responses.

This difference in activities completed versus activities intended coincides with the Provider Survey results. Cost of activity may be one of the factors in this difference, but the complexity of variables renders that possibility as purely conjecture. Another possibility is the previously mentioned idea—doing what’s immediately available and easy, within normal daily life, as opposed to pursuing the more difficult to achieve but more attractive “dream” future activity. Because there was only one activity different from “what we do” versus “what we intend/hope to do” results in this survey, that difference is more likely to be circumstantial than significant. Perhaps that can be further investigated in future SCORP/Trails Plan research.

### **NRPA’s “Five Trends” Heads-up Indiana, changes are happening**

The 2015 Field Report published by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) contains the insightful chart: “Where are We Going: Five Trends that will Impact the Future of Parks and Recreation.” The chart lists a series of five trends, each with a bulleted list of sub-trends and impacts resulting from the trends. The trends shown on the chart run the gamut from good to neutral to bad for outdoor recreation. Several of these trends are visible now in Indiana. The following text lists the trends and some of the additional bullet-list items for each, and contains a few examples of how some of these trends are playing out in the Hoosier state.

**Trend 1:** Programs are key to great park attendance.

- “The public is less likely to visit parks unless they are attending programs.”
- “Fewer programs in parks reduce usage rates for parks.”

o These first two bullets are fairly intuitive for most park professionals: the fewer activities offered in any park, the less interaction there is with the public, and therefore the park has reduced public attendance. Many Indiana small-town park systems do not offer recreation, or if recreation happens, it is facilitated by volunteers, external non-profit partners, or others who are not park staff. Most park and recreation experts agree that adding internally organized and staffed programs to a park system will draw more users, provided that the offerings include what users want and need to participate in those programs.

- “Mandates for revenue cost recovery may lead to social inequity.”
  - o This bullet is an especially sensitive subject for many Indiana communities that are still experiencing the aftereffects of the recession: high unemployment, wage stagnation, business closures and business downsizing. In communities whose residents are struggling financially, avoiding the pricing out of low- or moderate-income users with fees becomes a careful balancing act between meeting their park department financial needs and their mandate to provide public recreation opportunities for all residents. Compromise tactics like sliding or income-based fee scales, park prescriptions, free park days, and similar ideas offer ways to avoid unintentional denial of service to community members who may be in the most need of low- or no-cost public recreation.

**Trend 2:** The perceived value of distributed services results in agency functions assigned to various departments.

- “Organizationally, operations are most effective within a single department that carries out all park and recreation responsibilities.”
  - o In Indiana, where the majority of park departments are in smaller communities with limited staff and budgets, this saves the cost of needing several groups of support staff in different government departments to maintain multiple separate groups of vital field staff. Simply, one bigger staff is far more efficient than many smaller ones.
- “Agencies that position themselves as providing valuable, essential services fare best.”
- “Example: Many departments provide all municipal grounds maintenance.”
  - o Local governments in Indiana are learning the wisdom of having the best-qualified, best-trained field staff do the same jobs for other departments besides the parks. An example is when park foresters care for street trees for the streets department instead of having a separate specialist staff for each department.

FLY FISHING



- “Agencies are optimizing services by teaming with other recreation providers.”
  - A small town that can’t currently afford adding professional programming staff to their park system can improve its level of service through cooperative agreements with outside sources of programming staff. YMCAs, fitness clubs, league sports non-profits, and other non-government recreation providers are examples.
- Trend 3:** Agencies are pioneering new funding methods.
- “The lack of municipal funding does not equate to a lack of public support.”
  - In Indiana, many local park departments find that informing their users of the real-world costs of park operations leads to better public support of budget increases and capitol project fundraising.
- “During the recession, special districts that had dedicated funding and agencies invested in revenue-producing facilities fared much better than others.”
  - When compared to the rest of the nation, Indiana has relatively few “special districts” that build in dedicated funding for their parks. In part, having special districts with this ability tends to be an attribute of

larger, wealthier, high-population-density demographic areas. Comparatively, most of Indiana is too lightly populated, too moderate- or lower-income, and has too geographically small a government service area (many small towns versus large, urban cities). Indiana park departments have started investing in more revenue-producing facilities; however, as previously discussed in this section, this has to be applied judiciously in order to have a chance of working.

- “Retaining revenues for agency operation is a key to the model’s success.”
  - If all revenue generated by a park department simply vanishes back into the community’s general fund (where it often never benefits the parks), it serves as a significant disincentive to the effort needed to create that revenue. Parks that take advantage of fiscal tactics like non-reverting, parks-only, dedicated revenue accrual accounts have obvious long-term funding advantages over those that do not.
- “Other sources of funding for operations that can be targeted include: value-capture property taxes related to park proximate values and dedicated sales taxes on recreation-related goods and equipment.”



o This is an area where Indiana is already striving; many communities are already exploring many alternative park funding strategies. These include specialty grants, County Option Income Taxes (COIT), Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Recreation Impact Fees (RIF), Wheel Taxes and many others.

**Trend 4:** The infrastructure deficit means parks will have to fight harder for public dollars.

- “The Public Works Association is estimating that \$356 billion will be spent on the replacement, renewal, and renovation of our municipal and state roads, highways, bridges, dams, sewers, water, and other infrastructure.”
- “These projects, delayed for years, now create public safety issues.”
- “Park and recreation assets that deferred funding must now compete.”
  - o Indiana is no different than any other state—we have billions of dollars in deferred long-term infrastructure maintenance/renovation/replacement needs that have gone unfulfilled for decades. There are opportunities for parks to work themselves into existing projects at little or no additional cost if the project engineers simply add park infrastructure to their designs. One example is adding new sidewalk and bike

lanes and a “road diet” into a previously scheduled street replacement. Under such a plan, valuable new alternative transportation is added at no additional cost to the taxpayer because the design includes a better blend of amenities.

**Trend 5:** Walkable cities draw millennials, fueling a suburban exodus.

- “Millennials are drawn to walkable environments with cultural amenities.”
- “Evidence indicates this will exacerbate the gentrification of cities.”
- “The exodus of disadvantaged populations will be to the nearby suburbs.”
  - o As a case in point, Indianapolis saw an exodus of many wealthier families to the surrounding suburbs in the 1970s and 1980s. They sought better schools, larger yards, and improved local public amenities, such as parks. This demographic trend is beginning to reverse. The City has recently been re-investing in downtown. The new Cultural Trail network is one example. Walkability and improved infrastructure is driving a recent influx of moderate- to high-income professional millennials, empty-nesters, and others interested in the greater cultural amenities now available within walking

distance. One after-effect of this trend reversal is that low- to moderate-income housing downtown is now nearly non-existent, and low-income residents and their families are being forced to seek affordable residences farther and farther from the newly gentrified city core.

- “Will these suburbs acquire a resident base in need of public services?”
  - o Examples gleaned from other gentrified cities clearly indicate this. One recent example happened when Washington, D.C. began its most recent demographic shift toward a gentrified urban core around 2005. As that happened, the surrounding (formerly wealthy, high-income) suburbs like Silver Spring, Maryland started undergoing rapid socioeconomic shifts, and their newly arrived lower-income residents had little choice but to depend to a greater degree on publicly available low-cost recreation options like public parks and recreation programs.
- “Will the cities become centers of prosperity that feature transit and bikes, a service economy, and small rather than large parks?”
  - o In Indiana, at least as far as transit is concerned, that’s a good question. Indiana once had a flourishing transit network. The old electric interurban railways are but one example. The interurban fell out of favor as privately owned cars became common and good-quality public roads and highways made the freedom of private automobile travel more attractive. The individual cost benefits of transit are only one of the arguments that transit advocates are currently using statewide. But so far, not many communities have invested significantly in additional new transit. Indianapolis may be poised to break this trend in lack of transit investment, with the planned creation of its new Red Line bus rapid transit line. The City is in the process of seeking federal grants for the project. The outcome of this effort may drive changes elsewhere in the state.
  - o Demographically, the state reflects the national trend of slow migration out of rural and suburban areas into urban areas. Many smaller communities in Indiana are experiencing significant declines in



BOOGIE BOARDING

population. It remains to be seen if this trend will continue. Communities that are self-investing significantly in quality-of-life improvements, including parks, appear to be avoiding the trend of population loss, and have experienced small to moderate population growth.

- o The main economic engine in Indiana is still industry, but there are signs that this could shift more toward a service economy over time.
- o So far, the main reason why small parks remain the majority in Indiana is likely to be the basic low-population-density nature of the state, combined with opportunity cost. In other words, it simply costs too much for small cities and towns to build large, more regional parks in their park systems, and smaller communities still outnumber large ones in Indiana by a significant margin.

## NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This section of the SCORP provides an overview of the needs identified by analyzing survey data, national trends and related information. These identified needs directly contribute to the Outdoor Recreation Priorities listed at the end of the Introduction.

### Identified needs from the surveys

More and varied kinds of trail or trail-related facilities (especially pedestrian) are needed.

- The results of all three surveys agreed that many kinds of trails use are growing and in great demand statewide by all kinds of users, especially trail uses with a pedestrian emphasis. National data fully agree with this trend, and this growing trend is in its third decade in Indiana.
- Recreation programmers and planners need to remember that there is a wide diversity of types of trails users, and that multi-purpose trail facilities are likely to better serve the needs of their publics than single-use sites. People use trails for all kinds of reasons, in all kinds of ways. Developing a trail system that caters to as many different types of users as possible is not only more likely to be successful, but also likely to result in lowering the opportunity cost for each additional trail-use type.

Natural-resource-based recreation of many kinds is still a major need among Hoosiers.

- Non-consumptive natural-resource-based

TABLE 2.3 Activity Trends

	1989	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
1	Picnicking	Hiking/ Walking/ Jogging	Hiking/ Walking/ Jogging	Hiking/ Walking/ Jogging	Hiking/ Walking/ Jogging	Hiking/ Walking/ Jogging
2	Pleasure Driving	Picnicking	Camping	Fairs/ Festivals	Camping	Camping
3	Walking	Swimming	Fishing	Swimming/ SCUBA/ Snorkeling	Picnicking	Fishing
4	Swimming	Camping	Fairs/ Festivals	Nature Observation/ Photography	Fishing	Swimming
5	Fishing	Fishing/ Hunting	Picnicking	Camping	Swimming	Canoeing, Kayaking, Paddle sports
6	Bicycling	Bicycling	Swimming/ SCUBA/ Snorkeling	Fishing	Boating/ Water Skiing/ personal watercraft	Bicycling
7	Camping	Boating	Nature Observation	Picnicking	Golf	Hunting
8	Nature Observation	Nature Observation	Bicycling	Bicycling	Bicycling	Fairs/Festivals, Outdoor concerts
9	Motor Boating	Play- ground Use	Boating/ Water Skiing/ personal watercraft	Motorized vehicle use	Hunting	Boating, Water skiing, Sailing
10	Golf		Play- ground Use	Boating/ Water Skiing/ personal watercraft	Horseback Riding	Off-road Motorized Use

recreation is a strongly growing area of use that includes bird watching, nature photography and observation, camping, swimming and more. Four out of five of the “most participated in” outdoor recreation activities from the Participation Survey were non-consumptive.

- More traditional consumptive, resource-based recreation uses are still popular and in demand. Examples are hunting, fishing and wild-food gathering. A significant portion of “most likely to do in the near future” outdoor recreation activities from the Participation Survey were consumptive (two out of five).
- Water-based recreation of all kinds is still extremely popular, and has expanded beyond traditional activities such as boating, canoeing

and swimming in lakes, ponds and rivers to more-developed urban-water recreational activities such as splashpads and waterparks/sprayparks.

- Community and individual health and wellness needs are becoming a greater priority.
- The surveys indicate that Hoosiers are choosing to recreate outdoors as part of a growing awareness of the positive effect on their health.
- Health and wellness as motivators for outdoor recreation of all kinds appeared to cross all demographics. All types of people were recreating for health reasons.
- At the state level, Indiana is creating programs and plans to fight the growing obesity epidemic.

STATE PARK FISHING



such as INShape Indiana, the Indiana Healthy Weight Initiative, and the State Department of Health’s Comprehensive Nutrition and Physical Activity Plan – 2010 to 2020. Parks, recreation and trails are an integral part of these efforts.

- Use of, and demand for local parks and recreation appears to be growing.
- Many reasons are driving an increase in use of local parks and recreation.
  - The cost of living is outpacing wage growth.
  - The struggling economy is affecting recreation use in households.
  - Health-conscious visitors are using local and regional parks more.
  - Local parks and recreation offer time- and opportunity-limited users better options to recreate.
- Communities are responding to economic and social pressures.
  - Parks and recreation are being viewed as an economic engine in local communities. Strong parks and recreation programs encourage users to spend their recreation dollars close to home, and not just in parks, but in local businesses, such as restaurants and stores.
  - Tourism dollars are attractive to cash-strapped communities.
  - New businesses gravitate toward communities that offer a strong quality of life, health and wellness for their work force.
  - New residents who are attracted and move to a community bring new tax revenues. Residents leaving a community take away their tax money with them. Hoosiers indicate where they prefer to live by moving there.

- Funding is tight for parks and recreation. Adaptation and innovation are vital.
- Users still rate increased fees as one of their least favorite ways to pay for access to parks and recreation.
  - Due in large part to property tax caps, property tax revenues are down in many communities. This forces tight budgets and has an impact on parks and recreation’s most traditional funding source.
  - Park and recreation providers who actively seek innovative ways to fund their programs or to partner/cooperate with those who can are the most successful providers. Recreation Impact Fees, Tax Increment Financing, County Option Income Taxes and many others offer alternatives for communities to fund not only acquisition, but also development, operations, and long-term maintenance of their parks systems.
  - State-level grants are more important than ever to local communities to acquire and develop

their future parks and recreation resources; however, finding matching money sources to qualify for these grants is perhaps harder than ever. Once again, those who can think creatively to amass matching funds are the most successful.

- Greater use of existing parks and recreation facilities, programs and services are driving up the costs of operation and maintenance of facilities for local providers.
  - Preventive maintenance is more important than ever—it’s cheaper to carefully care for facilities and equipment than to replace them.
  - Use of life-cycle costing, in which the lifetime costs of operating and maintaining facilities and equipment are factored, has become a best management practice for parks and



KAYAKING

- recreation professionals.
- Careful outsourcing or privatizing of operations and maintenance services in some cases can lead to real-world cost savings without a loss of quality in service or product.
- Use of volunteers, creation of friends-of groups, in-kind donation of equipment and services, donations, bequests, corporate sponsorships, and other financial and operational strategies are helping budget-conscious providers meet their organization’s needs.

The next chapter of the document will focus on:

- Guidelines for recreation, parks and open space
- Local, regional, and total outdoor recreation supply
- Total outdoor recreation acres
- Critical counties and regions

# OUTDOOR RECREATION OUTDOOR RECREATION • OUTDOOR

STATE PARK HIKING



# RECREATION • OUTDOOR RECREATION • OUTDOOR