COMMUNITY-DRIVEN PLANNING PROCESS
Parks contribute to the sense of community pride and provide opportunities for investment in creation of unique designations for the community. Quality park and recreation amenities inspire activity for all ages and interests.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Community engagement is a priority of the community, and we work to live by the quote of prior Mayor Steve Lampi when he noted: “We have to stop doing things to people, and start doing things with people.” The overarching goal of the Community Engagement Plan for the System Plan was to serve as a framework for how to engage our community members, community organizations, and external partners in the System Plan. The plan serves to not only inform the community and partners of planning activities but to also enhance the community’s understanding of the Parks and Recreation system and programming. Community members and partners were engaged through the plan at three levels described by the International Association for Public Participation’s Spectrum of Public Participation: inform, consult, and involve.

Inform:

We used the following tools to inform the community about community meetings and the survey:

- **Print Media**
  - Press release
  - Utility bill insert
  - Sun Post Newspaper
  - Park Pages Newsletter
  - Emails
  - Meeting flyers posted around the community, at Hennepin County Library, coffee shops, and City Hall
  - Get Up N Go Recreation Program Brochure – direct mail to every household

- **Electronic Media**
  - Brooklyn Park’s Facebook page
  - Developed a webpage on the City of Brooklyn Park website to share opportunities for giving input and share progress updates. Leveraged relationships with community and cultural leaders to share information and promote community input opportunities.
Involve:

By leveraging community volunteers, we were able to reach more community members and ensure that the System Plan deeply reflected the community’s desires.

Community Advisory Team (CAT)

The CAT was comprised of 26 community members to serve as champions of the System Plan process and became fully educated on the Park and Recreation System, understand goals and intended outcomes of the planning initiatives that previously existed, and provided feedback on the draft System Plan. This group was also charged with providing facilitation at community-at-large meetings.

Community Outreach Team (COT)

The COT’s role was to assist the Recreation and Parks staff team with community outreach efforts for the System Plan engagement process. The 40-member COT took turns:

» Facilitating community-at-large meetings as table hosts/note takers;
» Attending community events to answer questions about the System Plan; and
» Soliciting input from community members on their future vision for the System Plan to bring back to the group at large.

Zanewood Youth Facilitators

Engaging the Brooklyn Park youth in the process was important as they are our future. Knowing what they hope to experience in their city was a key component of the planning process. Youth from the Zanewood Recreation Center, Rec on the Go program sites, outreach efforts, and schools were invited, trained, and then facilitated the table conversations with adult Community Advisory members at five Community-At-Large engagement events. The youth facilitators managed the table conversations to gain participants’ insight about what they liked about their neighborhood parks, improvements they would like to see, and what amenities and features they seek out in other communities to meet their family needs. The youth facilitators summarized and prioritized the data with the participants and reported back to the broader group with their insight and findings.

Creating an intentional process to engage youth in planning efforts not only created an opportunity for the young people, but also allowed the community to see that youth are invested in their own future and want an intentional role in it.

Inform and Consult:

Out of a total 3,701 completed surveys, 1,869 were done online. The other 1,832 (approximately half) were conducted in person. We made an effort to proactively convene and meet the community out where they already were gathering. In that way, we were able to inform them of the park system planning process and consult with them through the survey process. Here are examples of how we reached these community members:

» Conducted pop-up meetings at over 20 community events including Tater Daze, Summer Splash, Farmers Market, Dragon Star Grocery Store, the Library, etc.;

» Contracted with community-based organization ACER (African Career, Education and Resource, Inc. to reach renters and immigrant residents who are traditionally under-engaged. They did this through pop-up events at 4 apartment communities, tabling at 2 events including Liberian Independence Day soccer tournament, and a family event at Central Park;

» Attended Rec on the Go events at apartment communities;

» Surveyed residents at places like St. Alphonsus Church, Liberian Independence Day event, and apartment
communities during National Night Out;
» **Conducted surveys** at two senior luncheons;
» **Student peers and fellow community members surveyed** by North Hennepin Community College students;
» **Conducted door to door surveys** and passed out flyers in the Lakeland Park neighborhood;
» **Attended five Community-At-Large Meetings** in different neighborhoods with 140 residents attending; and
» 36 COT members participated at community events.

**What Did We Hear?**

**Survey Response Highlights**

The overall cross-section of the community that replied to the survey represented our demographics fairly well with over 52 percent of respondents being age 19-49 and 43 percent being people of color.

*Figure 16 Survey Respondents Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-49</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17 Survey Respondents Race/Ethnicity*

**What is your age?**

Actual Age Demographic Makeup of Brooklyn Park:
» Ages 0-19 – 25%
» Ages 20-49 – 45%
» Ages 50+ – 30%

**What is the race/ethnicity that best describes you?**

Actual Demographic Makeup of Brooklyn Park:
» African American/Black – 28%
» American Indian/Alaska Native – 0%
» Asian – 18%
» Hispanic – 8%
» Multiple Races/Non-Hispanic – 4%
» Pacific Islander/Non-Hispanic – 0%
» White/Non-Hispanic – 46%
If you do not use any parks, facilities or recreation programs, what prevents you from using them? (Check all that apply)

Figure 18 Survey Response to Barriers

Barriers

Survey respondents noted that largest barriers to using Brooklyn Park parks, facilities, and/or recreation programs are:

» Not knowing what is available;
» Not knowing how to sign up for programs or how to reserve a facility; and
» Using amenities in other cities/communities and/or parks not providing amenities that they want to use.

Overall, general lack of information about the park system is the leading cause of preventing the community from using it and feeling comfortable navigating the parks and recreation system. See Figure 17 for Survey Responses.
What improvements or additions to indoor recreation facilities would you or your family like to see in the future? (Choose 3)

Indoor Facilities
The major additions to indoor recreation facilities identified by survey respondents were an indoor aquatics facility and a performing arts/studio arts facility. See Figure 18 for survey response.

Outdoor Facilities
Interaction with water and access to nature were clearly important to survey respondents. The top three future improvements/additions to outdoor recreation facilities identified were outdoor aquatics facilities, interactive water play features, and natural play areas. Improved access to local food sources also ranked high with desire to add community gardens and farmer’s markets. See Figure 19 for survey response.
What improvements or additions to outdoor recreation facilities would you or your family like to see in the future? (Choose 3)

Figure 20 Survey Response to Outdoor Facilities

What improvements or additions to existing park amenities would you or your family like to see in the future? (Choose 3)

Figure 21 Survey Response to Improvements to Existing Park Amenities

Improvements to Existing Park Amenities

Overall survey respondents identified improvements that added to the overall safety and comfort of the user (shade, picnic areas, lighting), as well as playgrounds. See Figure 21 for survey responses.
**Trails**

The key trail improvements or additions survey respondents would most like to see in the future include:

- Increasing trail access to parks by filling in existing trail gaps and sidewalks;
- Expanding walking loops within parks; and
- Increasing access to the Mississippi River and along Shingle/Bass Creeks through the creation/addition of urban greenway and trails.

See Figure 21 for survey response. Full survey results can be accessed through the link in Appendix B.

**What improvements or additions to trails would you or your family like to see in the future? (Choose 2)**

*Figure 22  Survey Response to Trails*
Community-At-Large Meetings Response

During the Community-At-Large Meetings, three questions were asked and the top responses are listed below and correspond to the word clouds that follow.

Meeting attendees noted they are prevented from using parks, trails, and facilities by (See Figure 22):

» Safety and Lighting
» Distance and trails
» Activities/programs

Meeting attendees would most like to see the following improvements to existing parks, amenities, and/or trails (See Figure 23):

» Fields/courts
» Lighting and safety
» Trails
» Aquatics Facility

Meeting attendees wish Brooklyn Park would add (See Figure 24):

» Aquatics facility
» Courts/fields and a fieldhouse
» Art/performing arts
» Trails and river access

In general, the responses heard at the Community-At-Large meetings echoed or complimented the overall survey results. All comments were then reviewed together and categorized to arrive at the emerging themes.

Comments received that focused on individual parks were categorized by park and reviewed by the design team for incorporation into the future considerations for individual parks. Any comments that were focused on small maintenance issues (i.e. grills that are not working) were routed directly to maintenance staff to be addressed.

The following Word Clouds provide another way to access and determine community feedback. The bigger the word, the higher the frequency it was noted as a response to the question.
Figure 24  Meeting Attendees Response to “What would you improve about the parks, amenities and/or trails that currently exist to encourage residents to use them more often?”

Figure 25  Meeting Attendees Response to “What amenities, trails, and facilities don’t currently exist in BP that you wish we had? In other words, what do you go to other communities for that we don’t have here?”
EMERGING THEMES

The emerging themes are based on community comments which represent identified program and park features that emerged as important to the community. These themes were placed into five categories; special use facilities, increased connectivity of trail system, add/improve athletic field/court facilities, improve access and connections to natural resource amenities, and improve safety, security, and conveniences for park users.

Build or expanded special use facilities

- Add Aquatics Facilities to accommodate indoor water park swimming and outdoor water/splash pads
- Expand Senior Center Programming Space
- Expand Teen Center Programming Space
- Add Field House with Gym and Synthetic Turf Facilities
- Add Adult Recreation Facilities with Eatery and Outdoor Game Area
- Add Large Event and Performance Venue
- Add Large Gathering Spaces for Picnicking and Special Events
- Add Visual/Performing Arts Venue and Studios
- Add Indoor Gyms Facilities

Add/Improve Athletic Field/Court Facilities

- Add Pickleball Courts
- Add Basketball Courts
- Upgrade Athletic Field Lighting
- Add Cricket Pitch
- Add Synthetic Turf Surfacing Within Existing Athletic Field Areas
- Add Restroom Building Facilities
- Additional Multi-Purpose Field Areas to Accommodate Soccer, Lacrosse, and Cricket
- Add Indoor Sports Courts

Improve Access and Connections to Natural Amenities

- Increase Access to Mississippi River
- Extend Trail Access Along Shingle Creek and Bass Creek Corridors
- Restore Natural Areas to showcase Prairie, Savanna, Forest, Water, and Wetland Resources

Improve Safety/Conveniences for Park Users

- Add Park and Trail Mapping and Wayfinding Signage
- Park Patrol/Security Cameras
- Enhance Security Lighting
- Provide Convenient Access to Restroom Facilities and Drinking Water
- Kitchen Sink Access in Picnic Shelters
- Better Maintenance of Park Facilities
- Shade Shelters and Bench Resting Areas
- Trail Surface Conditions
Stakeholder Team Design Charrette Workshop

An all-day design workshop or “charrette” was held on September 20, 2017 to further advance conceptual design considerations for parks that could best accommodate identified priority park amenities within the park system. Two separate two-hour table top discussions and informal pin up presentations were held during the day with Parks and Recreation and Operations and Maintenance Staff to discuss programming and design ideas for the seven focus areas at four separate work stations. A third two-hour work session and presentation was held in the evening with the CAT, COT, RPAC, and City Council representatives to review and discuss preliminary ideas and thoughts developed by City Staff and the consultant team.

Design ideas and outcomes from the design charrette were then refined and shared at a community at-large meeting for additional comment and feedback. Additional refinements were made to the concept plans and then shared at a City Council work session on November 6, 2017. Additional detail from the charrette and community input can be found in Chapter 4.
IDENTIFYING AND ADDRESSING COMMUNITY GAPS

Once the community engagement process was complete, a method was needed to determine where in the system to best address the emerging themes. Concurrent with the community engagement process, Parks and Recreation Staff conducted an assessment of existing facilities and programming gaps within the system. At this same time, the consultant team analyzed where new facilities should be distributed to provide balanced equity and access in the system.

Facility and Amenity Gaps

In preparation of the 2017 System Plan process, the Recreation and Youth Services divisions, in partnership with Parks and Facilities and Operations and Maintenance divisions conducted, over a four-month period, an assessment of current facilities that support existing programs and identify gaps within the system. Staff provided insight to anticipate facility needs in order to address changing user trends within the community. Staff recommendations were then viewed alongside community comments and reviewed within a system-wide equity lens to arrive on final facility recommendations for the System Plan.

Neighborhood Parks

Park Activity Buildings

Neighborhood park activity buildings are critical spaces for offering year-round recreation programs and act as home base for numerous summer day camp programs held throughout the community. Many of these facilities were not designed specifically to support changing and current program needs, requiring staff to transport equipment and supplies due to limited storage and program space from the site on a regular basis. These facilities cannot also accommodate 80-100 children (a typical day camp population) safely, specifically when inclement weather occurs. To fully serve these program needs will require building renovations to improve bathrooms, indoor activity space, storage areas, outdoor activity spaces, and shade provisions.
New park buildings could be added in areas where there is a gap in service (addressing equity and access within the system). Building expansions and improvements to existing park activity buildings will not only benefit the summer programs but could be used year-round for multi-age programming, adult enrichment, neighborhood programs, after school programs, small events, fitness, arts, and cultural activities.

**Nature Play Areas**

The number of nature active/play areas in the system should be increased. Several neighborhood parks have natural areas within the park that could be used for active play for all ages. Specific parks that should be considered include Northwoods, River Park, Hartkopf Park, Jewel Park, Central Park, and other recommendations as identified in the study conducted through the Resilient Communities Project (2016).

**Community Gardens**

Community gardens serve an important role in providing residents who do not have yards access to space for gardening (rental properties). Community gardens provide a great opportunity to bring members of multiple cultures together to share gardening experiences. The park system currently has two community garden locations with 160 garden plots for rent. There is a need for additional locations with the system, as these plots are filled very early with a significant waiting list. As part of the System Plan, additional community garden facilities should be considered.

**Sport Courts**

**Pickleball**

Pickleball is the fastest growing sport throughout the Country and within the Brooklyn Park community. The park system currently has two designated locations for pickleball (Norwood and Bass Creek). The City just added six new courts at Norwood Park. The Bass Creek Courts are in marginal condition and prior to reinvestment a review of the entire system should be considered to determine locations for incorporating additional pickleball courts.

**Tennis and Basketball Courts**

Staff has seen a renewed interest in the sport of tennis, and basketball has continued to be popular for teens throughout the community. Recommendations include increasing the numbers of basketball courts adjacent to active use areas in parks and increasing the number of basketball courts within underserved areas in the system to ensure equitable access across our community.

**New Emerging Sport Interests in our Community**

The mix of emerging sports includes cricket, lacrosse, and Takraw. During the planning process, these needs were assessed to help identify areas within the community to address finding designated space for these emerging community needs. Specifically, recommendations include:

- Increase the number of cricket pitches within community. Consider a premier cricket pitch destination in the community requires minimum space requirement of five acres, plus additional space for support amenities;
- Consider transitioning up to 4 existing turf fields into synthetic turf locations for all combined sports/multi-use fields; and
- Assess feasibility of development of a new Bike Park/BMX track.
Special Use Facilities

Zanewood Recreation Center

The activity spaces at the Zanewood Recreation Center have successfully accommodated expanding teen and youth programming in an area of Brooklyn Park that 10 years ago, was a major program area gap. Because of its success, the youth have “loved it to death.” Currently, program space needs exceed the capacity of the recreation center. Zanewood will need upgrades and improvements to ensure program and storage spaces are adequate for the activities, meet the demands, and are safe and well maintained.

Recommendations include:

» Providing additional classroom space for arts, music, and computers, to be built onto the current building along with the addition of staff and resources to maintain the facility.

» Providing additional office work spaces and storage to eliminate needing multiple portable storage units on site.

» Upgrade the Lakeland Park Activity Building to better serve the secondary program site for Zanewood’s programming.

Community Activity Center (CAC)

The fifteen acre site of the Brooklyn Park Community Activity Center, is centrally located in the city near the intersection of Zane Avenue and 85th Avenue North. The 187,000 square foot facility includes two indoor ice arenas, ten locker rooms, four banquet rooms, gymnasium, fitness room, two racquetball courts, Early Learning Center, Senior Center, walking track, skate park, and fishing pond. The Brooklyn Park National Guard Armory owns and operates the east end of the facility which houses the gymnasium that is shared with the City of Brooklyn Park.

The CAC serves as a hub for recreation opportunities for all ages and cultures within the community, serving over 375,000 visitors per year. The CAC is approaching its 35th anniversary, therefore it is important to continue to reinvest in building infrastructure to ensure activity spaces stay current, are high quality, appropriate for the target audience, and can meet programming demands.

With the aging population, designated space for seniors is in high demand and will continue to put pressure on facility space due to competing uses, staff capacity to organize expanding programs, and demand by residents.

The parking lot on the west side of the CAC, currently used for visitor and staff parking is shared with the old Hennepin County Library. Two-thirds of the parking is owned by Hennepin County. During the planning process, the land areas around the Community Activity Center were taken into consideration and included in evaluating the feasibility of reusing the old library as an adult enrichment center (as recommended by the Aging Communities Task Force) or to ensure its continued use for parking to meet expanded CAC programming, which could include a new aquatics and gym facility.

An assessment of the existing Nature Preschool classroom
should also be done and consideration given for possible relocation within the system. The space designated within the CAC for the preschool program is not of high quality with no access to the outdoors for activities in support of the nature-based curriculum.

**NEW FACILITY DEVELOPMENT GAPS & COMMUNITY INTERESTS**

*Performing Arts, Theater and Cultural*

Major gaps include: art classroom space, theater and dance studio space, parks for informal gatherings that could host events, concerts, mini-arts and crafts fairs, and a simple place to rest and read.

*Aquatics*

The City will always have a need to teach children how to be safe around water through lessons, open swim, and general water play activities. Current major gaps in learn-to-swim programs exists, due to the lack of pool time and a facility that is comfortable to use for user groups. The top interest for the community was to develop an indoor pool available year-round and outdoor water play splash parks would help fill this gap.

*Indoor Field Houses*

A new field house/artificial turf sports fields is important to support the growing need for athletic fields and gymnasiums for youth and adult leagues. Artificial turf sports fields can serve many different functions and are beneficial to the community due to the diverse programming potential. The fields can serve as year-round access platforms for multi-use recreational sports, field sports, and other sporting courts. There has been community interest in an indoor field house that can accommodate both an artificial field and a gym facility with a walking track.

*Gymnasium Space*

A major gap in the system includes the need for additional access to daytime gym space for adult open gym, basketball, pickleball (spring, fall and winter) and fitness classes. Additionally, there is need for after school and summer gym time for the Brooklyn Park Athletic Association youth sports and City teen activities. Currently, the youth gymnastics program uses the high school gymnastics facility and access is inconsistent, depending on the school needs. Tennis continues to be popular and indoor gym space at the Armory is used for tennis during the winter months. Scheduling tennis at scattered sites equally around the community ensures the program is easy for youth to get to and that programs are equally offered in all areas.

*Adult Recreation Facilities*

A significant program area gap is in our adult participant user groups, age 18 – 45 years. Driven by the millennial generation, social recreational activities such as bag toss, shuffle board, pickleball, disc golf, and activities tied to food and adult beverage offerings have become popular. Reinventing Central Park/Brookland Golf Park as the hub for adult recreation should be considered as a potential revenue-generating Adult Recreation Center that incorporates a community “restaurant incubator” concept as part of its business plan.
Determining Equitable Distribution and Access

The number of people of color in Brooklyn Park has increased rapidly over the past 20 years, from 10 percent in 1990 to more than 50 percent today. In order to stay relevant to the changing needs of the community, City leadership believes it is important to create an equitable and inclusive parks and recreation system for the entire community. Therefore, putting an equity lens on the entire park and recreation system, was critical to meeting the goals for the Plan. How was the parks and recreation system measuring up to the values of our community? Is there an equitable distribution of resources within the community?

How did we analyze equitable distribution? Our methodology.

We started with looking to Trust for Public Land (TPL), a national non-profit organization that is focused on creating parks and protecting land for all people to enjoy. TPL is a respected organization that collects data and conducts rigorous analysis for agencies to use. They have developed a “ParkScore” index which is a comprehensive tool for evaluating park access and quality for the 100 largest U. S. cites.

The methodology used for analyzing the equitable distribution of existing park amenities in Brooklyn Park is based partly on The Trust for Public Land’s ParkScore.² The ParkScore evaluation takes into account three main characteristics: acreage, facilities and investment, and access. In an effort to create a simple evaluation that incorporates demographics, this analysis focuses on the facilities measurement methods used in ParkScore. As done in ParkScore, this analysis measures per capita provision of four main park amenities representative of different user types throughout an effective park system: playgrounds, basketball courts, recreation centers, and dog parks.

Using the measurement tools from ParkScore, Table 2 summarizes the level of service on a scaled per capita basis for Brooklyn Park in terms of playgrounds, basketball courts, recreation centers, and dog parks. For comparison, the table also includes the ParkScore evaluation of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and the national median of the top 100 most populous cities in the nation.

Table 3  Citywide Level of Service of Park Amenities, 2017
(Source: City of Brooklyn Park. ESRI Community Analyst, 2017. The Trust for Public Land, ParkScore, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>PLAYGROUNDS PER 10,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>BASKETBALL COURTS PER 10,000 RESIDENTS*</th>
<th>RECREATION CENTERS PER 10,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>DOG PARKS PER 100,000 RESIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROOKLYN PARK</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL MEDIAN OF TOP 100 MOST POPULOUS U.S. CITIES</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNEAPOLIS</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. PAUL</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Originally reported as per basketball hoop, data was recalculated to per basketball court using an assumed 1.75 basketball hoops per 1 basketball court.

A smaller geographic unit of measurement – smaller than the city-level – is needed in order to better understand how equitably park amenities are distributed within Brooklyn Park today. To achieve this, the following analysis uses the census block group, the finest-grained level of geography where detailed demographic data are available. To quantify equitable distribution of park amenities in Brooklyn Park in this analysis, we measure the level of service available to residents on a per capita basis at the census block group level.

Categorizing Census Block Groups Based on Demographics

This analysis evaluates the equitable distribution of park amenities through two demographic lenses: race/ethnicity and income.

For race/ethnicity, two groups were identified: people of color (POC) and non-POC. POC was defined as those who self-identify as American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or two or more races and/or ethnicities. Non-POC were defined as those who self-identify as White (non-Hispanic or Latino).

In terms of income, two groups were identified: lower income households and non-lower income households. Lower income households were defined as those earning less than 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold for a family of four (weighted average), annually [i.e., $24,563 * 1.85 = $45,442].

Using 2017 data, 33 of 52 block groups were defined as Majority POC block groups, and 11 of 52 block groups were defined as Lower Income block groups.

Additionally, a third type of census block group was identified, which combines the Majority POC and Lower Income determinations. Census block groups where 50 percent or more of the population are people of color and the median household income is less than $45,442 were defined as Areas with Majority People of Color and Lower Income (POCLI). Both criteria were required to meet the definition as a POCLI. This method of determining areas of concentrated lower income households and POC is similar to that used by the Metropolitan Council to define a similar measure, Areas of Concentrated Poverty, where 50 percent or more of the residents are people of color (ACP50). Using 2017 data, 10 of 52 block groups in Brooklyn Park were defined as POCLI.

Quantifying Service to Census Block Groups

Distribution of the select park amenities was measured using a coverage-based approach, coupled with a per capita measure to approximate level of service. A standard service area distance was attributed to each of the four select park amenities: Playgrounds and basketball courts were assumed to serve an area within 0.5 mile, representative of a reasonable walking distance for most potential users; and

> Recreations centers and dog parks were assumed to serve areas within 0.75 mile and 1 mile, respectively, representing their potential attraction for both nearby residents and those living elsewhere in the city.

---


Once the individual service area for each the 91 unique park amenities was created, each census block group was attributed with the number of playgrounds, basketball courts, recreation centers, and dog parks, respectively, that served it. Next, the number of each park amenity type serving the census block group was divided by the population living in the census block group to arrive at a per capita provision of service. The following were calculated for each census block group:

- Playgrounds per 1,000 residents;
- Basketball courts per 1,000 residents;
- Recreation centers per 2,000 residents; and
- Dog parks per 10,000 residents.

This per capita provision of service to census block groups, by type of park amenity, is the basis for the evaluation of the distribution of amenities citywide by race/ethnicity and income.

### Determining Average Level of Service

The weighted level of service was calculated for the total population and the populations living in Majority POC block groups, non-Majority POC block groups, Lower Income block groups, non-Lower Income block groups, POCLI block groups and non-POCLI block groups, respectively. Using this method, the impacts of the level of service for each census block group are proportionate to both the demographics of the census block groups and the degree of level of service. For more detailed information on this process refer to Appendix B.

The weighted average level of service of the four select park amenities, by census block group type, are summarized below in Table 3. Note that those numbers highlighted in orange reflect numbers that are not equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENSUS BLOCK GROUP TYPE</th>
<th>PLAYGROUNDS PER 1,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>BASKETBALL COURTS PER 1,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>RECREATION CENTERS PER 2,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>DOG PARKS PER 10,000 RESIDENTS</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority POC (n=33)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Majority POC (n=19)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Index</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Income (n=11)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-lower income (n=41)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Index</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCLI (n=10)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-POCLI (n=42)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Index</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Census Block Groups-Citywide (n=52)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 27 Level of Service of Basketball Courts by Census Block Group

Level of Service
Number of basketball courts serving each census block group, per capita
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Key Findings:

» On average, POC and Lower Income households are better served by recreation centers and dog parks than the average non-POC and higher income households.

» On average, census block groups defined as POCLI have playground level of service that is 90 percent that of non-Lower Income block groups.

» On average, census block groups defined as POCLI have basketball court level of service that is 68 percent that of non-Lower Income block groups.

» Based on this method of analysis, income seems to be a more powerful determinant of inequity in park amenity distribution than race/ethnicity.

Geographically, the areas highlighted in red (see Figure 28) are the census block groups which are being underserved today based on this analysis. When distributing new amenities or reinvestment in the system, these areas should be considered in the highest priority to help balance equity within the parks system.

Figure 28 Level of Service of Dog Parks by Census Block Group

Level of Service
Number of dog parks serving each census block group, per capita
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Figure 29 Level of Service of Playgrounds by Census Block Group

Level of Service
Number of playgrounds serving each census block group, per capita
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Figure 30  Census Block Equity Analysis Map
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