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Dear Mayor Kapszukiewicz,

When you took office in January of 2018, you formed the Recreation Task Force. This group was charged with taking a close look at recreation opportunities for kids, young adults and families in the City of Toledo. The group did a complete assessment of all city parks and facilities as well as a survey of private, non-profit and school-based programs. This group took a look at what is currently offered from swimming to arts & crafts, from team sports to bowling.

The stated goals of the Rec Task Force were to:
1. Identify and quantify all recreation FACILITIES in the City of Toledo, including those owned and operated by the City of Toledo, community partners, nonprofits and for-profit entities, schools and religious organizations.
2. Identify and quantify all recreation PROGRAMS in the City of Toledo, including those operated by the City of Toledo, community partners, nonprofits and for-profit entities, schools and religious organizations.
3. Use the data collected to assess unaddressed needs of particular activities, neighborhoods, schools and sectors of the city in both facilities and programming.
4. Determine short and long term strategies to address the needs and how to pay for them.

This document is a report of the work this group completed from January to October of 2018 toward those stated goals. The recommendations are made with a sincere hope that you as the Mayor, Toledo City Council and the residents of Toledo will support the needed investment and planning necessary to make safe, healthy and fun recreation of all kinds a real possibility for all our residents.

We would like to thank the diverse and engaged group of residents who formed the task force and worked so hard on these issues. We thank you for the great opportunity to lead this group and we hope to stay involved towards the implementation of these policy recommendations.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs
Kelly Andrews
Katie & Brandon Fields
Dennis Hopson
Summary & Background

The City of Toledo Department of Public Service is home to the Parks and Recreations divisions. While the Rec Task Force did not set out to specifically assess city parks, much of what the city offers in terms of recreation and facilities is housed in our parks. Therefore, much park information is contained in this report.

The National Recreation and Parks Association reports, “Just as water, sewer and public safety are considered essential public services, parks are vitally important to establishing and maintaining the quality of life in a community, ensuring the health of families and youth, and contributing to the economic and environmental well-being of a community and region.” The three values that make them essential are:

- Economic value
- Health and Environmental Benefits
- Social Importance

The parks and recreation department has seen a steady decline in funding since 2001, despite community expectations, and maintenance and building capital improvement needs remaining the same or steadily increasing. There are many reasons that contributed to such cuts, including decline in population and reduction of state funding.

- In 2001, departmental funding was over $6 million.
- In 2018, funding is just $3.5 million.
- Currently, there are only 6 full time people staffing recreation initiatives.

The green line shows staffing levels declined by 50% from 2005 to 2018.
The City of Toledo maintains a relatively large parks system. A complete assessment of each park and facility was completed by the task force, including an inventory with photographs. The report is broken down by council district and contains demographic data. The file is attached to this report. Highlights of our findings are as follows:

- 132 parks within the city limits.
- Parks amenities vary, many are undeveloped.
- 77% of City of Toledo parks are within a ten minute walk, a standard set by The Trust For Public Land.
- Roughly 6% of City of Toledo is dedicated park land.
- The median park size in City of Toledo is 5.5 acres.
- The oldest City of Toledo park is Savage Park, established in 1877.
- The largest City of Toledo Park is Ottawa Park, with just under 311 acres.
- Six Community Centers are owned and maintained by the City of Toledo. Programming in those buildings is being conducted by separate non-profits.
- The City of Toledo has six pools and two splash pads open each summer.
- Three municipal golf courses are managed by an independent contractor under the Parks umbrella.
- The City of Toledo conducts limited recreational programming with a six week summer camp provided in eight (8) city parks, while also financially supporting a summer tennis program and a year-round boxing program.
- Events round out the offering with seasonally themed park events and a small summer concert series.
- A list of current recreation opportunities supported by the City of Toledo is attached.

There are several national and regional organizations that study park systems. The Trust For Public Land is one highly regarded source the City of Toledo looked to for data and national standards to inform this report. The Task Force also referred to a 2011 PROS Consulting Report conducted in the Toledo market for additional information.

- City of Toledo spends an average of $42.00 per resident on parks.
- The National average is $83.00 per resident.

The Toledo Regional Chamber of Commerce’s data indicates the top 5 cities that Toledo competes with in terms of attracting and retaining talent. Those cities are Des Moines, Grand Rapids, Boise, Tulsa, and Omaha. As you can see from the chart below, spending in those cities on parks and recreation is greater that City of Toledo’s investment. It has been shown that quality life issues such as park systems, bike shares, restaurants and the arts are tangible things that attract and retain individuals to live and work in a city. To have these quality offerings, investments need to be made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Average Spending Per Resident on Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The City of Toledo owns and operates over 2,177 Acres of park land
- The Residents of the City of Toledo commit approximately 1% of the General Fund Budget to parks and recreation.
- The national and regional standard is for parks and recreation systems to make up 4-5% of General Fund Budgets.
- Best practices for staffing of an urban park system like Toledo’s is 6.2 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff members per 100,000 residents.
- Currently, City of Toledo Parks & Recreation Department is understaffed by at least 5 FTE’s to meet this best practice.

The blue line represents yearly budgetary changes from 2001 to 2018. The red line indicates the downward trend.
In examining all of these factors, it is clear to the Task Force that a commitment to reinvestment, short and long term planning, and greater community partnerships on programming are critical to reaching the goals of the City of Toledo’s Parks and Recreation department. The recommendations of the Task Force are more clearly outlined in this report.
A. EFFICIENT & APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS

a. The City of Toledo should create an ordinance that requires any person or organization working with youth and young adults as a coach or trainer to meet minimum safety requirements, should that person or party be using City of Toledo parks or facilities or receive City of Toledo funding. This could include:
   - insurance or bonding
   - background checks
   - safety training
The intent is not to create another layer of bureaucracy, but to establish a minimum set of requirements that protect residents, coaches and the City. We will look to national recreational sporting organizations to establish this reasonable set of requirements, while also providing participating organizations guidance on resources available to meet these requirements.

b. The City of Toledo should work to standardize the fee schedule and permitting process for use of all City of Toledo parks and facilities, including fields and play areas to be used by for profit and nonprofit organizations, or individuals. The process to apply for parks or facility permits should be streamlined and technology implemented to give residents easier access to engaging in the process.

B. FUNDING INCREASE AND EXCELLENCE IN BUDGET MANAGEMENT

a. Currently City of Toledo parks and recreation receives approximately 1% of the general fund budget. It is believed that, at a minimum, that budget should be increased to 2% of general fund in the next 18 months. While this would double the size of available funding, it is still less than half of what Midwest and national standards are for parks and recreation funding. A solid plan to move to 4% over the next five years is critical to meet the needs of Toledo residents.
b. What could going from 1% to 4% look like? What does it produce?

![Graph showing Parks & Rec Investment]

1% represents current breakdowns of spending on recreation programming, facilities maintenance and parks maintenance. 4% represents where we should be for best practice.

Results:

- Intentional increases in programming, with a combination of city and collaborative efforts. This would be more heavily weighted toward providing additional support to organizations with strong expertise in particular areas of programming, as well as those that have credibility and success with diverse populations among City residents.
- An initial heavier investment in the backlog of maintenance projects for City owned recreational facilities, including everything from tennis courts to pool houses. As capital investments are made in new, cutting edge facilities, maintenance will be needed for these assets as well.
- Meaningful increases in parks maintenance to continue providing platforms for both organized and personal recreation in City Parks.
- A new look and logo for the City of Toledo park system to reflect the investments, improvements and community pride in the park system. The signage and logo currently in use has not been updated since 1979.
c. The Mowing Question:
   - More than 80% of the current parks budget is used to maintain grass mowing.
   - As parks and recreation funding increases, the amount of grass to be mowed does not increase.
   - This leaves the bulk of new funding dedicated to:
     o Increased support of recreational offerings
     o Improving and maintaining current infrastructure
     o Building and maintaining new features and attractions

d. It is the recommendation of the Rec Task Force that, should a levy to increase taxes be placed on the ballot, it should be communicated to voters that 5-10% of the levy would be dedicated for the parks and recreations department. Assuming a ¼ percent increase, the possible amount raised is $20 million. This could be an additional $1-$2 million annually available for investment by this department.

e. It is recommended that the city makes sure that any and all proceeds, receipts and revenue collected at City of Toledo parks and recreation facilities be returned to the parks and recreation division to further fund their operations and programming. Currently some of those funds are being used in the General Fund to support non-park related initiatives. This change would allow parks and recreation staff to better budget events and keep track of proceeds for each event, program and facility. This money should not in any way reduce budgeted funding.

f. It is recommended that City of Toledo parks and recreation department fully invest in the application and execution of grant funding for facilities, parks and programming. This will further enhance the ability to install new and meaningful park features.
C. EXCELLENCE IN PARKS MANAGEMENT

a. It is recommended a complete assessment of City of Toledo Parks boards be completed. It is further recommended that all parks, whether representing multiple parks in a specific geographic region or a single park, have an operating board. The simple fact is that a group of engaged residents and neighbors involved in the operation and care of their local park makes the parks better. Parks that currently have boards are much better off than those that do not. A serious examination of a “zone model” should be considered, taking into consideration the following variables:

- geographic proximity of parks
- size and amenities
- diversity of residents surrounding parks
- expressed and/or cultivated interest in city park operations as it relates to neighborhood vitality

b. The new park board of each zone would be lead by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, which would serve as a liaison between the zone boards and the administration. The current Parks Advisory Board would be abolished and recreated with a representative of each zone as a member, appointed by the Mayor. Ideally these representatives would be active on a “zone” park board. Parks and Recreation Advisory Board responsibilities could include general oversight of facilities, programming, requests for funding, neighborhood engagement and other coordinated development and fundraising projects. These nine members would receive Civil Service pay for their time and attention to this important oversight, management and development role. It is understood by the task force that any change of this nature would require Council action.

The “Zone” model organizes City of Toledo parks by zip code, and assigns a park board for each region.
c. It is recommended that a complete assessment of the Adopt-A-Park program be completed. It is understood by the Rec Task Force that this program has been allowed to deteriorate over the years. It is believed that this program is an excellent opportunity to engage members of the business, religious and education communities that surround COT parks. Additionally, any and all help from business, religious, educational and neighborhood communities should be welcomed and encouraged by the City of Toledo parks and recreation department. A new Adopt-A-Park agreement has already been drafted by the parks and recreation department and approved by the law department.

![Bowman Park](image2)

Bowman Park is adjacent to Start High School. Toledo Public Schools helps to maintain the fields, which they frequently use for athletic practice.

![An old adopt-a-park sign in Kessler Park](image3)

An old adopt-a-park sign in Kessler Park


d. It is the recommendation of the Rec Task force that a position be created and fully funded in the City of Toledo Parks and Rec Department that would be solely responsible for enhancing the parks and recreation department as a revenue-generating department. This position would work on creating business development strategies, a marketing plan and other strategies to increase the funds available to the department to increase the quality and the quantity of the department’s offerings to the community. A complete assessment of other staffing needs will be conducted by the department and further recommendations made.

D. ACTIVE GROUP OF VOLUNTEER PARKS SUPPORTERS

a. It is the recommendation of the Rec Task Force that the City of Toledo ask the Parks and Rec Department to recruit and retain a volunteer army of parks volunteers who would have the opportunity to help in city parks with events, kids programs, beautification and more. The group would be considered ambassadors for the department to the
community. The Rec Task Force acknowledges that this will likely require funding for staff support of this function.

E. INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT & MANAGEMENT

a. A cursory review of City of Toledo parks was completed by the Rec Task Force. You can see that survey attached to this report. It is the recommendation of the Rec Task Force that a more in-depth capital needs assessment be completed by qualified professionals. These individuals would identify repair, replace and investment needs for all City of Toledo recreation facilities and equipment. It is recommended the trained professionals in the City of Toledo Department of Neighborhoods partner with Parks facilities employees to accomplish this in the next six months. The possible recommended goals should be:

- Reduction in the number of undeveloped parcels that are identified as “parks.” Suggestions include selling land to adjacent neighbors, neighborhood associations, businesses and schools.
- Removal of any and all outdated, dangerous and dilapidated equipment in City of Toledo parks including swing sets, jungle gyms, benches and grills. Whether or not items would be replaced would be decided with engagement from affected neighbors and the volume of use of the park. Any features replaced will include inclusive, accessible elements. Other suggestions include dog parks and increase of cardiovascular outdoor equipment to parks.
- Removal of all City of Toledo pools that are no longer in working order. Or as an alternative, a capital improvement plan to get them fixed and open. In either instance, a decision needs made on the pool facilities. (Detweiler, Savage, and Collins)
- Sale or gift of larger “natural” green spaces to Metroparks Toledo or other similarly situated organization where these spaces better support their mission.
- Creation of a plan or schedule to update the parks and park elements to accessible and inclusive design elements as the equipment is maintained, installed, or altered. This will help to ensure that COT parks are usable by the greatest number of residents of all abilities and that there is a plan in place to implement those improvements.
F. CITY OF TOLEDO COMMUNITY CENTERS

a. It is recommended that City of Toledo do more with organizations running programming in City of Toledo-owned community centers. There are a number of them in a variety of neighborhoods that serve young and old alike. Often, they sit in the heart of our neighborhoods and often in or adjacent to a City of Toledo Park. They are important gathering spaces for play, work, education and recreation. The City of Toledo is responsible for capital improvements to the buildings as well as the utilities. The Task Force discussed a number of opportunities that could be given more attention or created with these community organizations.
b. City of Toledo Community Centers include Grace, Fredrick Douglas, Believe, and East Toledo. Each offers a wide array of services, programming and support for the families and children in the surrounding communities.

- Through a loosely held organization called the Toledo Community Alliance, a series of basketball, baseball, flag football and other sports teams are created by each individual community center and then play one another as a league. It is the recommendation of the task force that this program and process should be fully supported by the City of Toledo with funding and organizational support.
- It is the recommendation of the Rec Task Force that a Community Center Management Commission be created by the City of Toledo. Members could/should be appointed by the Mayor, to include representatives from each community center. Goals of this organization could include more efficient management and infrastructure improvements at all centers, joining forces in purchasing power or supplies, coordination of events and recreation items offered, better coordination with the City of Toledo on all matters and coordination of efforts in both budget funding as well as grant applications and fundraising. All functions and operations of the Community Centers would remain independent.

G. RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMMING

a. The Rec Task Force took a close look at the recreation offerings of the City of Toledo currently. It is believed that these offerings do not adequately meet the needs of our residents: kids, families and adults.

b. After analysis, it is also believed by the Rec Task Force that that City of Toledo is not in a financial position at this time to create and then manage a large recreation program such as a league, sports programs in schools or a lengthy summer day camp program.

c. As a result of the above, the Rec task force strongly urges the City Of Toledo to contract with community partners such as the YMCA, Boys and Girls Club and others. These contracts would empower community partners to create and implement high quality recreation programs, and/or further support and expand those programs that already meet these criteria. It is recommended the contracts require rec programs for kids to be housed in City of Toledo Parks and other recreational facilities such as ball diamonds, fields, gymnasiums and pools. These organizations, and others like them, have the staff and programs that the COT does not and cannot reasonably create with limited available funding.
d. The members of the Rec Task Force believe, that with this shift to a partnership/contract model, the parks and recreation department can and should devote themselves to the creation and implementation of more shorter term events. Suggestions include golf outings, concert series, safe swim lessons, 3 on 3 basketball tournaments, kickball tournaments and more.

H. MARKETING AND COMMUNICATION

a. The Recommendation of the Rec Task Force is to improve the marketing and communication of the things the City of Toledo and all of our community partners currently provide. It is believed there are many programs within the city residents do not access simply because they are unaware. The goal is to change this through a dedicated social media presence, community events, use of ambassadors, an interactive map and other items.
   - The Task Force recommends starting with fully developing the Parks and Recreation website.
   - The Rec Task Force encourages the publication of an interactive map that shows where all City of Toledo Facilities and programs are located and how to access them.
   - The Rec Task Force recommends all information about City-wide recreation be included in the Engage Toledo App.
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Recreation Task Force

GOALS

1. Identify and quantify all recreation FACILITIES in the City of Toledo. This list should include those owned and operated by the City, community partners, non-profits and for-profit entities, schools and religious organizations.

2. Identify and quantify all recreation PROGRAMS in the City of Toledo. This list should include those owned and operated by the City, community partners, non-profits and for-profit entities, schools and religious organizations.

3. Use data collected to assess the unaddressed needs of particular sports, neighborhoods, schools and sectors of the City in both FACILITIES and PROGRAMMING.

4. Determine short and long term strategies to address the need and how to pay for them.

5. Make a final report to the Mayor and Toledo City Council. This final report will be used by the administration, specifically through the Department of Public Services, on a strategic way forward.
**Recreation Section**

The following information identifies current partnerships the City of Toledo-Division of PRF has in place to support recreation-based activities. These relationships allow both the partner organization and the City to be more efficient, create opportunities, and realize operational cost savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organization</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description/Details</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Co Special Olympics</td>
<td>Adaptive Ice Program/ice time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Ice Crew-Tam-o-shanter</td>
<td>Learn to skate/ice time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hopson</td>
<td>Youth basketball/financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Griffin</td>
<td>Youth boxing/gym &amp; financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Project-Worl’s Largest Swim</td>
<td>Event/pool time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Toledo Family Center</td>
<td>Adult softball &amp; Youth soccer/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heatherdowns Youth Baseball</td>
<td>Youth baseball/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Toledo Inline Hockey League</td>
<td>Adult hockey/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Football Academy</td>
<td>Youth soccer/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Celtics</td>
<td>Youth soccer/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass City Athletics</td>
<td>Youth baseball/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel Parker-USTA</td>
<td>Youth tennis/court time &amp; financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Community Rec-Jan Scotland</td>
<td>Youth baseball/field usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Athletic League</td>
<td>Youth baseball/field usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wizards Girls Softball Organization</td>
<td>Youth girls softball/usage of property with “in kind options” for fee reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Public Schools</td>
<td>Youth tennis, cross country, softball &amp; baseball/court time, field usage, park usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Parks and Recreation are Essential Public Services

Parks and recreation have three values that make them essential services to communities:

1. Economic value
2. Health and Environmental benefits
3. Social importance

Just as water, sewer, and public safety are considered essential public services, parks are vitally important to establishing and maintaining the quality of life in a community, ensuring the health of families and youth, and contributing to the economic and environmental well-being of a community and a region.

There are no communities that pride themselves on their quality of life, promote themselves as a desirable location for businesses to relocate, or maintain that they are environmental stewards of their natural resources, without such communities having a robust, active system of parks and recreation programs for public use and enjoyment.

Economic Value

- Parks improve the local tax base and increase property values. It is proven that private property values increase the value of privately owned land the closer such land is to parks. This increase in private property value due to the proximity to parks increases property tax revenues and improves local economies.

- A Texas A&M review of 25 studies investigating whether parks and open space contributed positively to the property values of surrounding properties found that 20 of the 25 studies found that property values were higher. “The real estate market consistently demonstrates that many people are willing to pay a larger amount for property located close to parks and open space areas than for a home that does not offer this amenity.”

- American Forests, a national conservation organization that promotes forestry, estimates that trees in cities save $400 billion in storm water retention facility costs.

- Quality parks and recreation are cited as one of the top three reasons that business cite in relocation decisions in a number of studies.
• Parks and recreation programs produce a significant portion of operating costs from revenue generated from fees and charges.

• Parks and recreation programs generate revenue directly from fees and charges, but more importantly, provide significant indirect revenues to local and regional economies from sports tournaments and special events such as arts, music, and holiday festivals. Economic activity from hospitality expenditures, tourism, fuel, recreational equipment sales, and many other private sector businesses is of true and sustained value to local and regional economies.

Health and Environmental Benefits
• Parks are the places that people go to get healthy and stay fit.

• Parks and recreation programs and services contribute to the health of children, youth, adults, and seniors.

• According to studies by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, creating, improving and promoting places to be physically active can improve individual and community health and result in a 25 percent increase of residents who exercise at least three times per week.

• A study by Penn State University showed significant correlations to reductions in stress, lowered blood pressure, and perceived physical health to the length of stay in visits to parks.

• Parks and protected public lands are proven to improve water quality, protect groundwater, prevent flooding, improve the quality of the air we breathe, provide vegetative buffers to development, produce habitat for wildlife, and provide a place for children and families to connect with nature and recreate outdoors together.

Social Importance
• Parks are a tangible reflection of the quality of life in a community. They provide identity for citizens and are a major factor in the perception of quality of life in a given community. Parks and recreation services are often cited as one of the most important factors in surveys of how livable communities are.

• Parks provide gathering places for families and social groups, as well as for individuals of all ages and economic status, regardless of their ability to pay for access.

• An ongoing study by the Trust for Public Land shows that over the past decade, voter approval rates for bond measures to acquire parks and conserve open space exceeds 75%. Clearly, the majority of the public views parks as an essential priority for government spending.
- Parks and recreation programs provide places for health and well-being that are accessible by persons of all ages and abilities, especially to those with disabilities.

- In a 2007 survey of Fairfax County, VA, residents of 8 of 10 households rated a quality park system either very important or extremely important to their quality of life.

- Research by the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods indicates that community involvement in neighborhood parks is associated with lower levels of crime and vandalism.

- Access to parks and recreation opportunities has been strongly linked to reductions in crime and to reduced juvenile delinquency.

- Parks have a value to communities that transcend the amount of dollars invested or the revenues gained from fees. Parks provide a sense of public pride and cohesion to every community.

National Recreation and Park Association
For more information on the value and benefits of parks go to www.nrepa.org
Toledo, OH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Amenities Average</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Park Size</th>
<th>Park Land Percent of City Area</th>
<th>Spending per Capita</th>
<th>Basketball Hoops per 10,000 Residents</th>
<th>Dog Parks per 100,000 Residents</th>
<th>Playgrounds per 10,000 Residents</th>
<th>Percent within 10-minute walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of 20 points</td>
<td>out of 20 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td>out of 40 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Acres</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$42.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Population Served**</th>
<th>Percent Served**</th>
<th>Population Not Served</th>
<th>Percent Not Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>278,130</td>
<td>213,738</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64,392</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19 and Younger</td>
<td>72,426</td>
<td>57,581</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,845</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-64 Years Old</td>
<td>165,867</td>
<td>127,666</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>38,201</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 64 Years Old</td>
<td>39,846</td>
<td>28,501</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11,345</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 75% Median City Income</td>
<td>41,204</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%-125% Median City Income</td>
<td>31,811</td>
<td>23,721</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 125% Median City Income</td>
<td>43,573</td>
<td>31,388</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12,185</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each city can earn a maximum of 160 points. Points are awarded for ten statistical measures in four categories: acreage, investment, amenities and access. The total is then normalized to a scale out of 100. This final value is the city's ParkScore.

The Trust for Public Land works with communities to ensure that everyone has parks, gardens, playgrounds, trails, and other natural places within a 10-minute walk from home. Learn more at www.tpi.org
The Trust for Public Land 2018 ParkScore® index

TOLEDO, OHIO

The Trust for Public Land ParkScore® index analyzes public access to existing parks and open space. The analysis incorporates a two-step approach: 1) determines where there are gaps in park availability, and 2) constructs a demographic profile to identify gaps with the most urgent need for parkland. Park gaps are based on a dynamic 1/8 mile service area (10 minute walking distance) for all parks. In this analysis, service areas use the street network to determine walkable distance - streets such as highways, freeways, and interstates are considered barriers.

Demographic profiles are based on 2017 Census block groups provided by Esri to determine park need for density of youth, density of individuals in households with income less than 75% of city median income (Toledo less than $25,000), and population density (people per acre).

The combined level of park need result shown on the large map combines the three demographic profile results and assigns the following weights:

- 50% = population density (people per acre)
- 25% = density of youth age 19 and younger
- 25% = density of individuals in households with income less than $25,000

Areas in dark red show a very high need for parks.
City of Toledo Median Household Income by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Percentage of Individuals Living Below Poverty by Census Tracts, 2016

Legend

City Council Districts

City of Toledo Below Poverty

- 2.39% - 10.78%
- 10.79% - 19.7%
- 19.71% - 32.33%
- 32.34% - 47.28%
- 47.29% - 74.21%

Source: American Community Survey, 2016

Created By: Brittany D. Jones, Doctoral Candidate
City of Toledo Percentage of Female Population by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Percentage of Female Headed Households by Census Tracts, 2016

City Council Districts
City of Toledo
Female Head of Household
1.93% - 9.54%
9.55% - 16.37%
16.38% - 24.54%
24.55% - 32.42%
32.43% - 44.34%

Legend
- City Council Districts
- City of Toledo
- Female Head of Household
  - 1.93% - 9.54%
  - 9.55% - 16.37%
  - 16.38% - 24.54%
  - 24.55% - 32.42%
  - 32.43% - 44.34%

Created By: Brittany D. Jones, Doctoral Candidate
Source: American Community Survey, 2016
City of Toledo Percentage of Male Population by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Total Number of Households by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Total Population by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Percentage of Under 18 Population by Census Tracts, 2016
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City of Toledo Percentage of White Population by Census Tracts, 2016

Legend
- City Council Districts

City of Toledo
White Population
- 0.73% - 22.64%
- 22.65% - 55.11%
- 55.12% - 74.94%
- 74.95% - 86.95%
- 86.96% - 98.75%

Created By: Brittany D. Jones, Doctoral Candidate
Source: American Community Survey, 2016
CITY OF TOLEDO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE
DIVISION OF PARKS, RECREATION AND FORESTRY

ADOPT-A-PARK AGREEMENT

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

This Adopt-a-Park Agreement, hereinafter referred to as the “Agreement”, made and entered into this ____ day of ____________, 20____, by and between the City of Toledo, a municipal corporation of the State of Ohio, (hereinafter referred to as the “City”), and __________________________, a corporation/partnership, an unincorporated association, an individual, or other, hereinafter referred to as the “Participant”.

Whereas the “Adopt-a-Park” Program was authorized by the Council of the City of Toledo in Ordinance 185-14;

Whereas, the City is promoting the Adopt-a-Park Program, hereinafter called the “Program”, to encourage organizations, corporations and/or individuals to provide care and maintenance to the City’s parkways, rights-of-ways, downtown planters, parks, and/or other public areas; and

Whereas, The City recognizes the Participant as the servicing organization/individual for the public area designated as __________________________, (hereinafter referred to as the “Volunteer Area”);

Whereas, by signature, the Participant acknowledges and agrees to the following duties, terms and conditions:

1. Participants may not hire, pay, or contract with other participants, another group, or professional company to perform the work within the designated area.

2. Participants may partner with other Participants, but may not pay anyone to perform the service.

3. Employees of businesses or commercial establishments may sign up as volunteers but shall not be paid to perform the service.

4. Disabled Participants are encouraged to participate.

5. For each Park, regular participants in Adopt-A-Park programs should have a Release Form on file with the City. At each Program event, all Participants without a Release Form on file shall sign and initial the Release Form in the form provided by the City before they are permitted to participate.

6. Any group of Participants containing personnel under 18 years of age must have adequate adult supervision. Persons under 18 years of age must be accompanied and supervised by a parent, guardian or responsible adult. For each separate Program event, written parental consent on the Parent/Guardian Consent and Release Form shall be required for each person under 18.

7. Work shall be restricted from one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset. No work shall be performed under conditions of restricted visibility (fog, snow, rain, etc.)

8. The Participant may perform the following services in accordance with City, state and federal guidelines:

   a. Pick up trash
   b. Mow, trim and edge the lawn.
   c. Spring and fall leaf clean up.
   d. Reporting of any issues to the Administration Office of Parks, Recreation and Forestry
   e. Remove graffiti.
   f. Other activities as agreed to with City Park administration.
9. Participants shall maintain its/his/her Volunteer Area at a minimum of four (4) times per year.

10. The Participant shall notify the City if problems arise or repairs to the Volunteer Area are necessary which the Participant is unable/authorized to perform.

11. The Participant shall understand that its/his/her participation in the Program shall be denied if the Participant prevents volunteer involvement on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, color, national origin, or disability.

12. The Participant shall take full responsibility for instructing all volunteers as to the provisions of this Agreement.

13. The City shall neither be responsible nor incur any liability for the actions, inactions, omissions, or commissions of the Participant or any of its members, officers, agents, or volunteers in performing under this Agreement. Participants agree to indemnify, defend and hold the City harmless for any claims of damage to person or property as a result of the Participant’s participation in the Adopt-a-Park Program.

14. The City reserves the right to modify these terms and conditions at any time without notice or cancel the Program at any time without notice.

15. The Participant accepts the responsibility of maintaining and beautifying the Volunteer Area for the period beginning ____________, 20__ and ending ____________, 20__ (minimum of two years). The period of this Agreement shall automatically extend for successive one (1) year periods under the same terms and conditions, unless either party provides the other with written notification forty-five (45) days prior to the end of any one (1) year term of its intent not to extend the Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, City and Participant have executed this Agreement as of the date first above written.

Participant

Signature _____________________________ Date ____________

Printed Name _____________________________

Address _____________________________

Phone # _____________________________ e-mail address _____________________________

Approved as to Form:

Department of Law _____________________________ Date ____________

Wade Kapszukiewicz, Mayor _____________________________ Date ____________

Approved as to Content:

Karen Ranney Wolkins _____________________________ Date ____________
Commissioner
Division of Parks, Recreation and Forestry

Paul M. Rasmusson _____________________________ Date ____________
Director of Public Service

Project Approval:

AFSCME Local 7 _____________________________ Date ____________
In April 2018, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) published the 2018 NRPA Agency Performance Review. This annual report summarizes the key findings from NRPA Park Metrics—NRPA’s benchmarking tool that assists park and recreation professionals in the effective managing of their operating resources and capital facilities. The 2018 NRPA Agency Performance Review features 22 charts and tables highlighting the characteristics and offerings of 1,069 park and recreation agencies across the United States.

The 2018 NRPA Agency Performance Review and NRPA Park Metrics together represent the most comprehensive collection of park and recreation benchmarks and insights which inform professionals, key stakeholders and the public on the state of the park and recreation industry. In addition to the insights within the NRPA Agency Performance Review, NRPA Park Metrics provides tools to build customized reports easily and compare your agency to others to gain more funding support, improve operations and better serve your community.

Park and recreation agencies are as diverse as the populations they serve, and no two park and recreation agencies are the same. Different agencies serve different constituencies with unique needs, desires and challenges.

This white paper highlights data from those park and recreation agencies based in urban locales with populations of at least 250,000 participating in NRPA Park Metrics. Because these agencies are significantly larger than other ones, they may deliver a broader set of services, offerings and amenities. They may also face some unique challenges. This white paper presents data not only for larger agencies, but also for those agencies smaller than the median size in NRPA Park Metrics (36,000 residents) to highlight key differences between urban and larger agencies and those serving fewer residents.

Data show that even urban agencies differ from each other; they tend to serve more residents with each of their facilities and do so with fewer resources (on a per capita basis) than do smaller agencies. Urban and larger park and recreation agencies:

- Have a median of one park for every 5,107 residents in their community
- Have a median of 12.7 acres of park land per 1,000 residents
- Are more likely than smaller agencies to offer natural and cultural history activities, visual arts programming and cultural crafts activities. They are less likely to offer team sports and racquet sports.
- Offer a wide variety of programming targeted to children (summer camps, after-school programs, teen programs), older adults and people with disabilities
- Have a median payroll staff of 4.3 full-time equivalents (FTEs) for every 10,000 residents
- Have median annual operating expenditures of $44.01 per capita and operating expenditures of $3,515 per acre of park land
- Generate a median of $7.16 per capita of revenue annually, including revenue from admission and registration fees and sponsorships. Agencies typically recover 20.7 percent of its operating expenditures through revenue recovery.
AMENITIES AND OFFERINGS OF URBAN AND LARGER PARK AND RECREATION AGENCIES

At the typical agency, there is one park for every 2,114 residents. The number of people served per park rises as the population of the town, city, county or region served by the agency increases. A park managed by urban and larger park and recreation agencies typically serve far more people than one managed by smaller agencies. Agencies in a jurisdiction of at least 250,000 people serve a median of 5,107 people per park, with one park for every 6,159 residents at agencies serving more than 500,000 residents.

Residents Per Park Served
(Median, By Jurisdiction Population)

![Bar chart showing residents per park served by different agency jurisdictions.]

While more residents living in urban and larger jurisdictions may have to “share” each park with a larger number of their neighbors, they live in areas that typically have more park acreage to enjoy. The typical park and recreation agency oversees 10.1 acres of park land for every 1,000 residents in its jurisdiction. The median park acreage per 1,000 residents rises to 12.7 acres at agencies that serve at least 250,000 people. Urban areas are more likely to have benefited from formal planning and design that included parks, trail networks and other space amenities. Also, urban locales—particularly in medium to large cities—are more likely to include larger regional and flagship “central” parks in their portfolios, which add to their park acreage.
Park and recreation agencies may have thousands, if not millions, of interactions with their residents and visitors each year. The typical park and recreation agency in the United States has nearly 200,000 contacts annually. The number of interactions, however, rises sharply at urban and larger agencies. For example, the typical agency that serves at least 250,000 residents has 2.3 million “contacts” per year, with the 75th percentile agency registering nearly 4.3 million contacts with residents annually.

(“Contacts” include visits to a local park, running or biking on a local trail, visits to the local recreation center or other interaction with any of an agency’s park and recreation facilities.)

Programming is a key method of engagement that drives the use of park and recreation facilities. The typical urban and larger agency offers 620 programs each year; 297 of those programs are fee-based events. These figures increase sharply with any population increase in the jurisdiction. For example, park and recreation agencies serving at least 500,000 people typically offer 804 program events per year with the agency at the 75th percentile offering 5,000 program events annually.

Urban and larger park and recreation agencies offer a diverse set of program and activity offerings to meet the various needs and desires of their residents. Urban agencies are more likely than other agencies to offer their residents programming and activities for:

- Health and wellness education
- Natural and cultural history activities
- Visual arts
- Cultural crafts
- Performing arts
Conversely, urban park and recreation agencies are less likely than other ones to offer team sports and racquet sports in their communities. (To be clear, a majority of urban agencies offers their residents both.)

### Programming Offered by Park and Recreation Agencies

(Percent of Agencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programming Offered</th>
<th>Agencies Serving 250,000+ Residents</th>
<th>Agencies Serving 250,000 – 499,999 Residents</th>
<th>Agencies Serving 500,000+ Residents</th>
<th>All Agencies</th>
<th>Agencies Serving Fewer than 36,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themed special events</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and cultural history activities</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recreation events</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness enhancement classes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety training</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural crafts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team sports</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual sports</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips and tours</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet sports</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parks and recreation is an invaluable provider of services and programming for children, seniors and people with disabilities. One area in which parks and recreation is a leader is out-of-school time (OST) offerings. OST programs are critical providers of child care, affording parents and caregivers the opportunity to earn a living. These programs include education about nature and nutrition, tutoring, mentoring and enrichment opportunities that improve the mental, physical and emotional health of youth. Even more, OST programs often fill a critical need by providing healthy meals to children during out-of-school times.

Eighty-seven percent of urban and larger park and recreation agencies offer summer camp programs for their communities' children, with more than seven in ten of these agencies also delivering programs for teens and after-school care as a part of their OST offerings. Urban and larger agencies also are more likely to offer before-school programs and full daycare as a part of their offerings, although these programs are offered by only 31 percent and 16 percent of these agencies, respectively.
Urban agencies also are more likely than other park and recreation agencies to deliver programs specifically for people with disabilities (75 percent). In addition, three-quarters of urban and larger agencies deliver programming designed for older adults in their communities.

### Targeted Programs for Children, Seniors and People with Disabilities

(Percent of Agencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agencies Serving 250,000+ Residents</th>
<th>Agencies Serving 250,000 – 499,999 Residents</th>
<th>Agencies Serving 500,000+ Residents</th>
<th>All Agencies</th>
<th>Agencies Serving Fewer than 36,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer camp</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific senior programs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for people with disabilities</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific teen programs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school programs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before-school programs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full daycare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFFING

Staffing at the typical park and recreation agency includes 36 full-time equivalent employees (FTEs) comprised of a mix of both full-time and part-time staff. The size of the staff, however, expands greatly as the size of the jurisdiction served by the agency expands. Agencies serving populations of at least 250,000 typically have 250 FTEs on their payrolls. The median count of FTEs rises to nearly 300 at agencies that serve at least half a million residents.

One way to gauge agency staffing is to measure it relative to the population of the area that the agency serves. The typical park and recreation agency has 7.9 FTEs on staff for every 10,000 residents in the jurisdiction served by the agency. Agencies located in more populated areas tend to have fewer FTEs on staff. Agencies serving jurisdictions with at least 250,000 people have 4.8 FTEs on staff for every 10,000 residents served. This ratio declines to 3.8 FTEs at agencies serving more than 500,000 residents. Lower per capita staffing is in part a function of increased scale and efficiencies from serving a larger population.

Urban and larger agencies are more likely than other ones to have staff members who belong to a labor union as a part of their team. Fifty-six percent of park and recreation agencies serving populations of at least 250,000 have staff covered by a collective bargaining agreement. This percentage rises to 65 percent at agencies that serve at least half a million residents.

Operations and maintenance is the primary responsibility of park and recreation professionals. However, there are other areas where staff devote their energies. On average, full-time staff at urban and larger agencies dedicate their time to the following general activities:
- Operations/Maintenance (57 percent)
- Programming (22 percent)
- Administration (11 percent)
- Capital development (three percent)
- Other (seven percent)

**Park and Recreation FTEs per 10,000 Residents**
(Median, by Jurisdiction Population)
FINANCE

The typical park and recreation agency has annual operating expenditures of $3,313,040. Operating expenditures are much higher at urban park and larger recreation agencies. For example, the median annual operating expenditure for agencies serving at least 250,000 residents is $25.0 million, with the median rising to $31.1 million at agencies serving at least half a million residents.

**Annual Operating Expenditures**
(Median, by Jurisdiction Population)

One way to get a better handle on agency funding is to normalize operation expenditure data by the size of the population an agency serves. The typical park and recreation agency has annual operating expenses of $78.26 on a per capita basis. Per capita operations spending is, however, inversely correlated to the population of the area served, reflecting in part greater scale and efficiency among urban and larger agencies. Median per capita operations expenditures are $44.01 per resident at agencies serving jurisdictions with at least 250,000 people, and $39.73 at agencies in areas with populations of at least half a million.
Median operating expenditures are $6,589 per acre of park and non-park sites managed by the agency. Non-park sites are also public spaces—such as lawns at a city hall—not designated as parks but whose maintenance and/or operation costs often are borne by the local park and recreation agency.

Operating expenditures per acre are lower, however, at urban and larger park and recreation agencies. Agencies serving populations with at least 250,000 residents have a median operating expenditure per acre of $3,515, dropping to $3,120 per acre at agencies that serve jurisdictions of at least 500,000 residents.
At the typical urban park and recreation agency, personnel services account for 57 percent of the agency’s operations budget. This includes expenditures for all salaries, wages and benefits for both full-time and non-full-time personnel, along with contracted individuals. Another 37 percent of operating expenditures fund agency operations, including operational support where the capital fund repays the operating budget, all enterprise funds, interdepartmental transfers, and, in some cases, the capital debt service. Four percent of operations spending include capital expenses that are not part of the agency’s capital improvement plan (CIP). This includes expenditures for capital equipment (e.g., computers, vehicles, large-area mowers, tractors, boats), some periodic cyclical maintenance (carpets, conference chairs, push mowers) and, perhaps, debt services paid from the agency’s operating funds.
On average, park and recreation agencies derive 54 percent of their operating budgets from general fund tax support. The second largest source of funding for most agencies is earned/generated revenues, accounting for an average of 22 percent of operating expenditures. Some agencies have access to special, dedicated taxes and funding for part of their budgets. These park and recreation districts obtain the majority of their funding from tax levies dedicated to park and recreation purposes approved by citizen referenda.

Generating revenue through registration and admission fees, concessions, and sponsorships are another funding source for park and recreation agencies. The typical park and recreation agency generates just over $5 million in non-tax revenues on an annual basis, although this amount can vary greatly based on agency size, services and facilities offered by the agency and the mandate from leadership and policymakers. This translates into a median of $19.36 in generated revenue for every resident living in the agency’s jurisdiction.

Urban and larger park and recreation agencies typically generate $7.16 in revenue annually for each resident living in the jurisdictions they serve. Larger agencies generate even less—agencies serving at least 500,000 residents generate just $5.84 in revenue, per capita.
Another way to gauge the impact of agency-generated revenue is to examine cost recovery as a percentage of operating expenditures. While the typical agency recovers 28 percent of its operating expenditures from non-tax revenues, the percentage is significantly lower at urban and larger agencies. For example, agencies serving populations of at least 250,000 recover nearly 21 percent of their operating expenditures from revenues, while even larger agencies (serving a population of at least 500,000) have cost recovery of just 17 percent.
Revenue as a Percentage of Operating Expenditures
(Cost Recovery)
(Median, by Jurisdiction Population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Serving 250,000+</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Serving 250,000-499</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Serving 500,000+</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Agencies</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Serving Fewer Than</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,000 Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

The 2018 NRPA Agency Performance Review reveals that park and recreation agencies are as diverse as the towns, cities, counties and regions they serve. Agencies differ not only in size and service offerings but also in their core mission and how they fund their offerings.

This diversity is apparent when reviewing the data of urban and larger agencies. Agencies in jurisdictions with populations of at least 250,000 typically have more park acreage per resident and deliver a more extensive menu of service offerings and programming than do other agencies. At the same time, they likely are delivering these amenities with fewer human and financial resources on a per capita basis than are other agencies. However, the only way to truly understand how your park and recreation agency compares to its peers is to interact with NRPA Park Metrics' and report resources.

The data from these resources certainly help inform park and recreation professionals. We can, however, do better. The wealth of insights gleaned from NRPA Park Metrics will be even stronger when all park and recreation agencies—including those in urban settings—enter and update their data in the database. You can start the process today by going to www.NRPA.org/metrics.
Because everyone deserves a great park
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