

The Rockford Park District

Citizen Survey 2010

August 2010



Rockford Park District
401 South Main Street
Rockford, Illinois 61101
815.987.8800

Prepared by



University of Illinois
College of Medicine at Rockford
1601 Parkview Avenue
Rockford, Illinois 61107
815.395.5639

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Response	2
Chapter 2 RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS	
Introduction.....	4
Comparison of Respondents to District Census Characteristic.....	4
Comparison to Previous Survey Administrations	4
Chapter 3 IMPORTANCE OF THE ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT TO RESIDENTS	
Introduction.....	7
Importance Views	7
Rockford Park District Importance Statements by Demographic Group	8
Comparison to Past Surveys.....	10
Chapter 4 PARK DISTRICT PARTICIPATION, REASONS AND BARRIERS	
Introduction.....	12
Level of Participation in Park District Programs	12
Reasons for Participation in Park District Programs	15
Barriers to Participation	17
Chapter 5 ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PERFORMANCE	
Introduction.....	21
Rockford Park District Performance	21
Differences Among Demographic Groups.....	23
Comparisons to Prior Surveys.....	23
Chapter 6 TARGET GROUPS FOR USE OF RESOURCES	
Introduction.....	24
Target Group Importance	24
Target Group Importance by Demographic Group	27
Mean Scores: 1999-2010	28
Chapter 7 APPEARANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF PARKS AND FACILITIES	
Introduction.....	29
Survey Results	29
Variations Among Demographic Groups.....	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
Chapter 8	PROGRAM AND SERVICES RESOURCE ALLOCATION	
	Introduction.....	32
	Resources for Programs, Activities	32
	Activity Differences Among Group	33
	Comparison to Past Surveys.....	35
	Devoting Resources to Nature and Good Environmental Practices.....	35
	Nature Differences Among Demographic Groups.....	38
	Comparisons to Past Surveys	38
Chapter 9	PRIORITIZATION OF USE OF FUNDS	
	Introduction.....	39
	Comparison: 2008 and 2010 Priority Uses of Funds.....	40
	Top Actions by Demographic Group	44
	Differences Among Demographic Groups.....	47
Chapter 10	SAFETY AT PARKS, PATHS AND FACILITIES	
	Introduction.....	48
	Safety Results: 2010 and 2008	48
	Safety Perceptions of Demographic Groups	50
Chapter 11	FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	
	Introduction.....	51
	Fees and Financial Assistance.....	51
	Exploring Ways to Save	54
	Financial Comments.....	54
Chapter 12	OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS	
	Introduction.....	55
	Advice for the Commissioners.....	55

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		
1.1	Rockford Park District Citizen Survey Distribution by Zip Code: 2010	2
.1.2	Rockford Park District Citizen Survey Mail Response by Zip Code: 2004-2010	3
2.1	Respondent 2010 Characteristics With Comparison to Census	5
2.2	Comparison of Surveys by Respondent Characteristics: 1999-2010	6
3.1	Agreement With Rockford Park District Importance Statements.....	7
3.2	Agreement With Importance of Rockford Park District Role in Community by Demographic Characteristic: 2010	9
3.3	Agreement With Importance of RPD to Continue to Invest Resources to Keep Parks and Recreation Facilities Well Maintained	10
3.4	Comparison of Parks/Recreation Importance to Quality of Life 2010 to Similar 2006, 2008 Questions	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1	Rockford Park District Participation: 1999-2010.....12
4.2	Rockford Park District Participation by Respondent Demographic Characteristic: 201012
4.3	Park District Household Participation in the Past Year by Respondent Demographic Characteristics: 1999-201014
4.4	Reasons for Participation in Leisure and Recreation Activities: 2008-2010.....15
4.5	Reasons for Participating in Recreation by Respondent Demographic Characteristics: 2010.....16
4.6	Reasons For Not Participating in Rockford Park District Programs or Activities: 2008-201017
4.7	Barriers to Participation in Rockford Park District Programs or Activities: 1999-201018
4.8	Barriers to Participation in Rockford Park District Programs or Activities by Demographic Group19
5.1	Agreement With Rockford Park District Performance Statements21
5.2	Agreement With RPD Performance Statements by Demographic Group22
6.1	Target Group Importance24
6.2	Target Group Importance Summary Measures25
6.3	Mean Rating For Targeting of Resources by Population: 201026
6.4	Top Three Demographic Groups Giving Highest Target Group Mean Scores: 201027
6.5	Top Three Demographic Groups Giving Lowest Target Group Mean Scores: 201027
6.6	Mean Rating For Targeting of Resources: 1999-201028
7.1	Excellent Ratings For Parks and Outdoor Areas: 2001-201029
7.2	Excellent Ratings For Buildings and Facilities: 2001-201030
7.3	Appearance and Maintenance of Rockford Park District Areas and Facilities by Demographic Characteristic: 201031
8.1	Agreement With Activity Statements32
8.2	Agreement With Activity Statements by Demographic Group34
8.3	Historical Responses on Selected Activities: 2004-201035
8.4	Agreement With Actions Related to Nature: 2010.....36
8.5	Agreement With “Green” Actions Related to Nature by Demographic Group: 201037
8.6	Historical Responses on “Green” Actions: 2006-201038
9.1	Agreement With Using Funds For Selected Purposes39
9.2	Mean Scores For Funds Use40
9.3	Priority Use of Funds Statement Agreement: 2008-2010.....41
9.4	Mean Scores: Priority Use of Funds By Demographic Group42
9.5	Top Three Priority Fund Uses By Demographic Groups45
9.6	Top Three Demographic Groups by Fund Uses: 201047

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
10.1	Rockford Park District Safety: 2010	48
10.2	Safety in Rockford Park District Outdoor and Indoor Places By Demographic Characteristic: 2010.....	49
10.3	Perception of Group Safety When Visiting Rockford Park District Parks, Paths, Outdoor Spaces	50
10.4	Perception of Group Safety When Visiting Rockford Park District Indoor Facilities	50
11.1	Agreement With Fee Statements	51
11.2	Agreement That Fees Are Reasonable.....	51
11.3	Fees, Scholarships, Revenue By Demographic Group.....	53
11.4	Agreement With Savings Steps.....	54
12.1	Opened Ended Comments.....	55

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Survey Instrument	57
Appendix 2	Survey Frequencies	65
Appendix 3	Open-Ended Comments.....	95

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The Citizen Survey asked about current and proposed Park District policies in order to guide strategic planning. Residents also had the opportunity to express their satisfaction with facilities, programs and services and to give their ideas for improvement.
- This was the sixth in a series of citizen surveys and was sent by mail to a random sample of 4,000 households. Response was 635 or 16% of those sent.
- Citizens agree that maintenance of existing parks and facilities is vital and essential to the quality of life. Some increase was seen in the proportion supporting activities along the Rock River and expansion of the recreation path system.
- In comparison to 2008, satisfaction improved for the appearance and maintenance of outdoor areas, buildings and facilities and safety of indoor facilities. Fees are generally seen as reasonable.
- However, support was not strong for new development or acquisitions. For instance there was a ten percent drop for acquiring land for new neighborhood parks.
- From a list of 12 possible uses for funds, the leaders were maintaining existing parks and facilities, providing recreation programs for youth/teens and adults/seniors, maintaining museums and supporting activities along the Rock River.
- When asked which groups should be given special attention, the top proportions went to children 12 and under, teens 13-18 and people with disabilities. However, some respondents commented that the Rockford Park District should serve everyone.
- Questions on programming yielded favorable responses for teaching introductory sport skills and outdoor environmental education.
- Visits to RPD programs and facilities by a household member fell a bit from 82% to 75%. Though feelings of safety improved at indoor facilities, a small decrease took place in feelings of safety when using parks, paths and outdoor spaces.
- Top reason for leisure and recreation participation is fun and enjoyment. Health and wellness and relaxation/stress reduction also are important reasons.
- Barriers to participation include lack of time, cost and lack of awareness, though awareness was less of a factor than in the past.
- Citizens want the District to pursue reforestation, green alternatives and help to address childhood obesity.
- Respondents offered a wide range of comments which will be reviewed and evaluated by the District.

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

To determine what Rockford Park District residents, the “owners of the District,” think about programs, services, parks and facilities, and current and proposed policies so as to guide strategic planning and funding priorities, the Rockford Park District contracted with Health Systems Research at the University of Illinois College of Medicine to conduct a household mail survey of District residents in June of 2010. Similar surveys were completed by Health Systems Research every two or three years, in 1999, 2001, 2004, 2006, and 2008 so that comparisons may be made when questions are alike.

The Rockford Park District Commissioners and staff believe that park space and recreational activities are essential for the quality of life of District residents. Further, the District seeks to achieve a high return on this investment in resources.

Questions for this survey were developed by Park District staff working with Health Systems Research and approved by the Board of Commissioners. Park District priorities guided the choice of questions.

Specifically, the questions in this study cover views regarding the relationship of leisure and recreation to quality of life, where to invest funds most effectively, reasons for participation in Park District programs and activities, importance of the preservation of current park space, recreational paths/trails, future land acquisition, ecological initiatives, teaching lifetime sports, affordability of fees, safety and maintenance at indoor facilities and outdoor parks, targeting of programs for selected populations and citizen ratings of Park District performance.

Methodology

A variety of survey methods have been used to assess citizen views during the series of citizen studies. The 2010 survey was conducted entirely by mail, as was 2008. In 2004 and 2006, the survey was a combination of telephone interviews and mailed questionnaires, while the 2001 and 1999 surveys were conducted only by telephone.

The mailed 2010 questionnaire included a cover letter from the Commissioners, the survey which was presented in an 8-page booklet format, a postage-paid return envelope to guarantee anonymous response, plus coupons for a variety of Park District facilities to reward survey completers for their time.

The survey sample was drawn proportional to the population in the zip codes within the Park District and was chosen randomly. Every household in the Park District had an equal chance to be chosen to participate in this study. Table 1.1 shows the number of surveys which were mailed to each zip code as compared to the number returned from each zip code along with the zip code response rates.

Table 1.1
 ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT CITIZEN SURVEY
 DISTRIBUTION BY ZIP CODE: 2010

Area* Zip Code	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Cherry Valley – 61016	44	5	11.4%
Northwest – 61101	390	45	11.5%
Southwest – 61102	320	26	8.1%
North End – 61103	473	68	14.4%
East Central – 61104	364	35	9.6%
Near Northeast – 61107	627	146	23.3%
Southeast – 61108	551	80	14.5%
Bypass – 61109	470	71	15.1%
Loves Park – 61111	461	75	16.3%
Far Northeast – 61114	300	60	20.0%
Zip Code not given		24	---
Total	4,000	635	15.9%

*Responses from Cherry Valley zip code 61016 have been combined with those from nearby 61108 for the remainder of the report.

Response

Of the 4,000 surveys mailed, 635 were completed and returned for an overall response rate of 15.9%, improved from 11.0% in 2008, but below the 22.0% mail response received in both 2006 and 2004.

Though the overall response was 15.9% of those mailed, these zip codes had higher response rates: 61107 – Near Northeast (23.3%) and 61114 – Far Northeast (20.0%). Those zip codes with lower percentages returned were 61104 – East Central (9.6%) and 61102 - Southwest (8.1%), primarily covering portions of west and central Rockford.

Table 1.2 reveals the historical response percentages for surveys mailed in each zip code comparing 2010 response rates to 2008, 2006 and 2004 mail responses. Response to household surveys of all types has been declining, though response improved in 2010 as compared to 2008 across all zip codes. Proportionately, the most improvement for response took place among residents of 61101 and 61109.

Table 1.2
 ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT CITIZEN SURVEY
 MAIL RESPONSE BY ZIP CODE: 2004-2010

Area - Zip Code	2010	2008	2006	2004
Cherry Valley – 61016	11.4%	9.1%	37.5%	25.0%
Northwest – 61101	11.5%	6.2%	16.7%	19.6%
Southwest – 61102	8.1%	7.1%	14.0%	17.1%
North End – 61103	14.4%	10.8%	24.9%	24.8%
East Central – 61104	9.6%	6.9%	9.7%	15.7%
Near Northeast – 61107	23.3%	16.3%	28.1%	27.5%
Southeast – 61108	14.5%	11.7%	23.3%	24.0%
Bypass – 61109	15.1%	8.7%	17.3%	19.8%
Loves Park – 61111	16.3%	9.8%	23.3%	17.6%
Far Northeast – 61114	20.0%	13.8%	26.7%	26.3%
Total	15.9%	11.0%	22.0%	22.0%

For the entire sample (635) chances are 95 out of 100 that the margin of error can be no greater than plus or minus 3.8%. While the reader may interpret results of the larger sample segments with confidence in their relative accuracy, smaller segments, such as age groups, a certain zip code or respondent educational levels should be judged in light of their own standard errors, which are considerably higher and, in fact, may be very large. Thus, not all results should be viewed as being equally adequate. In general, results from larger samples should be considered to be more truly reflective of the actual population characteristics than the smaller samples.

Non-response is merely the failure to obtain answers to a questionnaire. Non-response bias is often a major problem in survey work. People may refuse to answer, be on vacation, or have any of a variety of personal reasons for not responding. Non-response poses no problem if replies from non-respondents are similar to those of the respondents. However, when the views of those who respond are different from those who do not, the value of the survey may be diminished. For instance, respondents to this survey could be those most interested in Park District services or individuals expressing opposition to expanding services. In Chapter 2, respondent characteristics are analyzed to see whether the sample is representative of the District population as compared to Census characteristics.

Chapter 2 RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

Since exact Census information is not available for the Park District boundaries, 2000 Census data have been derived using the populations of the Park District zip codes combined in order to estimate characteristics of Park District residents. Some changes may have taken place in the characteristics of the District population since 2000.

Comparison of Respondents to District Census Characteristics

Compared to Census characteristics, as shown in Table 2.1, women, those over 45 and college graduates were overrepresented as respondents to the survey. Almost two-thirds (65.0%) of survey respondents were female. Three-quarters (75.0%) were 45 or older whereas the Census would predict just 54.8%. College graduates constituted 38.1% of survey participation, about double the actual District level.

Minorities were underrepresented with a dominantly white response. Black (4.9%) and Hispanic (2.4%) response was not quite half of the true population levels though the Asian population was similar to the Census proportion.

Comparison to Previous Survey Administrations

Comparing the 2010 Survey administrations to earlier surveys, as shown in Table 2.2, reveals that participant characteristics in 2010 were similar to those in 2008. The 2010 survey had the smallest participation by younger persons of any survey in that only 24.6% of respondents were under 45. The 2010 median age of 55.8 was similar to 2008's median age of 55.7. The median age was 49.0 in 1999 and has risen regularly since.

Individuals holding a bachelor's or graduate degree (38.1%) participating in 2010 was slightly under 2008 at 39.1%. The educational level of respondents has also risen over time.

Minority participation was similar to 2008, but a bit less than 2006 when phone was part of the methodology. Race/ethnicity was not asked until 2004. In the analysis to follow, all persons not marking white, non-Hispanic are grouped as non-white. While the largest minority segment is black, the category also includes Hispanic, Asian, multiracial, other and those who did not mark a race/ethnic group.

Whether households included children under 18 was first asked in 2006. This year's survey reached 27.9% of homes with children compared to 27.6% in 2008 but 35.5% in 2006 when phone was used. The actual level in the Park District zip codes is 21.8%

Table 2.1
RESPONDENT 2010 CHARACTERISTICS WITH COMPARISON TO CENSUS

GENDER	2010		2000 Census Percent ¹
	Number	Percent	
Male	214	33.7%	48.5%
Female	413	65.0%	51.5%
No answer	8	1.3%	---
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%
AGE GROUP			
18-29 years	33	5.2%	14.3%
30-44 years	123	19.4%	30.8%
45-64 years	290	45.7%	32.9%
65+ years	180	28.3%	21.9%
No answer	9	1.4%	---
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%
EDUCATION			
Less than high school	22	3.5%	20.0%
High school diploma/GED	112	17.6%	32.1%
Some college, no degree	175	27.6%	22.2%
Associate or similar degree	73	11.5%	6.1%
Bachelor's degree	122	19.2%	12.8%
Graduate degree	120	18.9%	6.8%
No answer	11	1.7%	---
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%
RACE/ETHNIC GROUP			
White	538	84.7%	78.0%
Black or African American	31	4.9%	11.8%
Asian	9	1.4%	1.4%
Hispanic	15	2.4%	5.0%
Multi-race	11	1.7%	1.4%
Other	6	0.9%	2.4%
No answer	25	3.9%	---
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME			
Yes	177	27.9%	21.8%
No	448	70.6%	78.2%
No answer	10	1.6%	---
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%

¹Based on zip codes within Rockford Park District.

Table 2.2
COMPARISON OF SURVEYS
BY RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS: 1999-2010

GENDER	2010	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Male	33.7%	35.8%	34.5%	40.9%	37.7%	38.8%
Female	65.0%	62.8%	64.6%	58.7%	62.1%	61.0%
No Answer	1.3%	1.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AGE GROUP						
18 - 29 Years	5.2%	5.3%	9.4%	7.9%	13.3%	13.7%
30 - 44 Years	19.4%	20.5%	23.3%	21.5%	24.6%	29.5%
45 - 64 Years	45.7%	45.2%	40.6%	37.3%	32.1%	33.9%
65+ Years	28.3%	27.4%	25.5%	32.6%	29.7%	22.7%
No Answer	1.4%	1.6%	1.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
EDUCATION						
Less than high school	3.5%	2.1%	6.2%	4.8%	11.4%	7.1%
High school diploma/GED	17.6%	21.5%	24.0%	25.9%	38.6%	50.2%
Some college, no degree	27.6%	22.1%	25.6%	26.8%	19.8%	16.8%
Associate or similar degree	11.5%	12.8%	10.3%	10.9%	6.3%	5.6%
Bachelor's degree	19.2%	19.9%	20.1%	18.4%	14.0%	13.4%
Graduate degree	18.9%	19.2%	12.8%	12.2%	9.2%	5.4%
No Answer	1.7%	2.5%	0.9%	1.2%	0.7%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RACE/ETHNIC GROUP						
White	84.7%	85.4%	82.9%	88.0%	Not asked in 2001 or 1999	
Black or African American	4.9%	5.3%	8.2%	6.2%		
Asian	1.4%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%		
Hispanic	2.4%	2.1%	4.2%	2.1%		
Multi-race	1.7%	1.6%	0.9%	---		
Other	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%		
No Answer	3.9%	3.9%	1.6%	1.4%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME						
Yes	27.9%	27.6%	35.5%	Not asked in 2004, 2001, or 1999		
No	70.6%	71.0%	64.0%			
No answer	1.6%	1.4%	0.5%			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Chapter 3
 IMPORTANCE OF THE ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT TO RESIDENTS

Introduction

Four questions asked survey participants about the importance of the Rockford Park District for themselves and their families as well as for the entire community.

Importance Views

Agreement was strong that the Park District plays an important role in the life of District residents. For three of the four questions related to Park District importance, 95% or more residents strongly agreed or agreed while about two-thirds strongly agreed. The three questions receiving broad support were “Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community” (96.1% agree), “It is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest resources to keep parks and recreation facilities well maintained” (96.2% agree) and “It is important that Rockford Park District residents have exceptional parks and recreation facilities, services and programs at reasonable cost” (95.2% agree). Just slightly lower in agreement, but still exceptionally high with 93.6% agreement, was that “Rockford Park District should provide residents with diverse and well supported activities.”

Table 3.1
 AGREEMENT WITH ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT IMPORTANCE STATEMENTS

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No answer
Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community.	68.2%	27.9%	2.2%	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%
It is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest resources to keep parks & recreation facilities well maintained.	66.1%	30.1%	2.7%	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%
Rockford Park District services should provide residents with diverse and well-supported recreational activities.	57.2%	36.4%	4.6%	0.9%	0.2%	0.8%
It is important that Rockford Park District residents have exceptional parks and recreation facilities, services and programs at reasonable cost.	63.5%	31.7%	3.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.6%

Results yield clear evidence that residents support the importance of investment in diverse, well-maintained resources and programs offered at reasonable costs.

Rockford Park District Importance Statements by Demographic Group

Table 3.2 displays the proportions of agreement (strongly agree plus agree) for each of these four questions arrayed by demographic factors. “No answers” have been excluded from the calculations.

With overall agreement being high for the four questions, the same was true across demographic groups for all questions.

Several cross-tabulations reveal total agreement within certain groups. All respondents agreed for these questions and groups: park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community (61101); it is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest in resources to keep parks and recreation facilities well maintained (61102, 61111); it is important that Rockford Park District residents have exceptional parks and recreation facilities, services and programs at reasonable cost (61102, white, non-Hispanic).

Few questions/groups dipped under 90% for any of the questions related to the importance of the Rockford Park District.

Table 3.2
 AGREEMENT WITH IMPORTANCE OF ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT ROLE IN COMMUNITY
 BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC: 2010¹

Group Characteristic	Parks, recreation essential quality of life	RPD should invest in parks, facilities	Diverse, well-supported recreation	Exceptional parks/recr. at reasonable cost
ALL	96.6%	97.0%	94.5%	95.8%
AGE GROUP (Years)				
18 - 29	97.0%	99.2%	87.9%	97.0%
30 - 44	98.4%	99.2%	97.6%	97.6%
45 - 64	95.8%	96.5%	95.1%	95.2%
65+	97.2%	96.0%	92.7%	95.5%
EDUCATION				
Less than H.S.	90.9%	90.9%	90.9%	86.4%
H.S. diploma/GED	93.8%	93.8%	90.1%	94.6%
Some college	96.5%	99.4%	96.0%	94.8%
Associate degree	97.3%	98.6%	90.4%	97.3%
Bachelor's degree	98.4%	95.1%	95.9%	96.7%
Graduate degree	98.3%	98.3%	97.5%	98.3%
RESIDENCE				
Northwest-61101	100.0%	95.6%	95.5%	93.3%
Southwest-61102	84.6%	100.0%	88.5%	100.0%
North End-61103	97.0%	97.0%	95.5%	97.0%
East Central-61104	88.6%	97.1%	91.4%	97.1%
Near Northeast-61107	97.9%	97.2%	94.4%	97.2%
Southeast-61108	98.8%	96.4%	97.6%	95.2%
Bypass-61109	97.2%	94.4%	93.0%	94.4%
Loves Park-61111	98.7%	100.0%	94.7%	94.7%
Far Northeast-61114	95.0%	96.7%	93.3%	95.0%
GENDER				
Male	94.8%	94.4%	93.0%	92.5%
Female	97.6%	98.3%	95.3%	97.6%
RACE				
White, Non-Hispanic	96.8%	94.4%	95.7%	100.0%
Non-white	98.6%	95.8%	98.6%	98.6%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME				
Yes	97.2%	99.4%	95.5%	97.7%
No	96.6%	96.2%	93.9%	95.3%

¹Excludes no answers. Agreement includes strongly agree and agree.

Comparison to Past Surveys

Clear comparisons over time are not possible for this question set, but some match is possible for two of the questions.

For the statement “Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community, two questions were similar in 2008 and 2006 – “Recreation is a vital (essential) part of the quality of life in our community” and “Parks and open space are essential for the quality of life in our community.” Whereas the 2010 question elicited 96.1% agreement, levels were the same (96.3%) for both questions in 2008 and slightly higher (98.5%, 99.3%) for the second question (Table 3.4).

Another question was also asked in 2008 – “It is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest resources to keep parks and recreation facilities well maintained.” Five choices were available in 2010 compared to two in 2008.

Table 3.3
 AGREEMENT WITH IMPORTANCE OF RPD TO CONTINUE TO INVEST
 RESOURCES TO KEEP PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES WELL MAINTAINED

Response	2010		2008		2006
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	
Strongly agree	420	66.1%			No comparison available
Agree	191	30.1%	Agree	87.9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	17	2.7%			
Disagree	3	0.5%	Disagree	2.3%	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%			
			Don't know	7.8%	
No answer	4	0.6%	No answer	2.1%	
Total	635	100%	Total	100.0%	

Some improvement appears to have taken place in that 96.2% agreed in 2010 (strongly agree and agree) compared to 87.9% (agree) in 2008.

Table 3.4
COMPARISON OF PARKS/RECREATION IMPORTANCE
TO QUALITY OF LIFE 2010 TO SIMILAR 2006, 2008 QUESTIONS

Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community. (2010)

Recreation is a vital part (“essential” in 2006) of the quality of life in our community. (Question from 2008 and 2006.)

Response	2010		2008		2006	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	Response	Percent
Strongly agree	433	68.2%			Strongly agree	59.4%
Agree	177	27.9%	Agree	96.3%	Agree	39.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	2.2%				
Disagree	6	0.9%	Disagree	1.8%	Disagree	0.8%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%			Strongly disagree	0.0%
			Don't know	1.8%	Don't know	0.7%
No answer	3	0.5%				
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%		100.0%

Parks and open space are essential for the quality of life in our community. (Question from 2008 and 2006.)

Response	2010		2008		2006	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	Response	Percent
Strongly agree	433	68.2%			Strongly agree	61.5%
Agree	177	27.9%	Agree	96.3%	Agree	37.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	2.2%				
Disagree	6	0.9%	Disagree	1.1%	Disagree	0.3%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%			Strongly disagree	0.0%
			Don't know	2.5%	Don't know	0.4%
No answer	3	0.5%				
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%		100.0%

Chapter 4
PARK DISTRICT PARTICIPATION, REASONS AND BARRIERS

Introduction

Three questions explored the topic of participation in Park District programs or activities including reasons for participation as well as barriers which might be preventing taking part in Park District programs or activities.

Level of Participation in Park District Programs

Three-quarters (75.3%) of respondents said that they or someone in their household had visited a Park District facility or attended a Park District program in the past year, a bit lower than recent years. All prior surveys found participation levels near or over 80%. A higher proportion this year, 6.6% did not respond to the question.

Table 4.1
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PARTICIPATION: 1999-2010

Response	Percent of Respondents Who Visited RPD Facility or Attended RPD Program in Past Year or Someone in Their Household Did					
	2010	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Yes	75.3%	81.5%	87.2%	79.6%	86.7%	85.6%
No	15.3%	13.7%	9.4%	16.2%	12.1%	8.5%
Not sure	2.8%	3.0%	1.5%	2.2%	1.2%	5.6%
No answer	6.6%	1.8%	1.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.2%

When examined by demographic group, participation ranged from 47.4% to 90.7% (Table 4.2). The three groups with the highest participation included respondents with graduate degree education (90.7%), associate degree (90.3%) and residents of 61114 - far northeast Rockford (89.1%). Exhibiting lower participation were individuals with less education – less than high school (47.4%), high school diploma (63.5%) and senior citizens (67.7%).

Table 4.2
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PARTICIPATION
BY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC: 2010

Demographic Group	Percent
HIGHER PARTICIPATION (Top 3)	
Graduate degree education	90.7%
Associate degree	90.3%
Far Northeast - 61114	89.1%
LOWER PARTICIPATION (Lowest 3)	
Less than high school	47.4%
High school education	63.5%
Senior citizens	67.7%

Participation in Park District programs and activities appears to be related to education with greater 2010 participation in evidence as educational attainment increases. At household participation rates above 85% were respondents obtaining an associate's degree or more, much lower participation characterized households of respondents with less education. The presence of children under 18 at home made a difference with 86.2% of households with children participating versus 78.1% of households without children at home.

Use of RPD programs and services was relatively similar across all zip code areas in the District except that participation was much higher in 61114 (89.1%) and 61107 (87.1%), the northeast portion of Rockford. Female respondents (83.3%) reported greater use in their households than did males (75.5%) and white, non-Hispanic use (81.9%) exceeded that for non-white (70.6%).

As compared to prior years, declines in participation took place for senior citizens, persons with less education and non-white participants. Samples for those groups, however, are relatively small.

Table 4.3
**PARK DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD PARTICIPATION IN THE PAST YEAR
 BY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS: 1999-2010**

Group Characteristic	Percent of Households Participating					
	2010	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
ALL	75.3%	81.5%	87.2%	79.6%	86.7%	85.6%
AGE GROUP (Years)						
18 - 29	87.9%	82.6%	97.1%	78.3%	89.1%	92.9%
30 - 44	87.9%	85.6%	96.4%	91.5%	94.1%	90.0%
45 - 64	84.1%	84.8%	91.6%	85.7%	91.0%	86.3%
65+	67.7%	75.0%	74.6%	69.5%	74.8%	75.3%
EDUCATION						
Less than H.S.	47.4%	77.8%	76.1%	50.0%	76.6%	51.7%
H.S. diploma/GED	63.5%	69.1%	81.6%	76.1%	87.5%	84.4%
Some college	80.8%	82.5%	90.3%	82.4%	84.1%	91.3%
Associate degree	90.3%	85.7%	97.3%	91.6%	92.3%	95.7%
Bachelor's degree	86.6%	86.2%	92.5%	83.6%	91.4%	94.5%
Graduate degree	90.7%	89.3%	93.7%	91.0%	89.5%	95.5%
RESIDENCE						
Northwest-61101	78.6%	69.2%	83.9%	76.2%	91.3%	81.8%
Southwest-61102	76.9%	87.5%	93.3%	88.9%	80.0%	75.0%
North End-61103	78.5%	87.5%	89.2%	78.9%	86.8%	88.9%
East Central-61104	71.0%	70.4%	89.5%	76.5%	85.0%	88.6%
Near Northeast-61107	87.1%	79.2%	91.3%	81.8%	88.1%	91.1%
Southeast-61108	76.8%	79.4%	84.8%	83.6%	85.2%	86.0%
Bypass-61109	78.5%	81.5%	89.2%	85.1%	87.0%	86.0%
Loves Park-61111	78.6%	77.8%	90.0%	76.4%	85.7%	79.4%
Far Northeast-61114	89.1%	97.6%	88.4%	85.3%	91.2%	91.2%
GENDER						
Male	75.5%	80.3%	88.0%	85.1%	86.5%	89.9%
Female	83.3%	82.9%	89.4%	78.5%	86.8%	83.1%
RACE¹						
White, Non-Hispanic	81.9%	86.0%	89.1%	87.9%	---	---
Non-white	70.6%	86.2%	88.3%	77.8%	---	---
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME²						
Yes	86.2%	90.9%	95.3%	---	---	---
No	78.1%	78.5%	85.4%	---	---	---

¹Race was not asked in 2001 or 1999.

²New question in 2006.

Reasons for Participation in Park District Programs

Leading the reasons why people participate in leisure and recreation activities is fun/enjoyment as indicated by nearly three in four (72.1%) respondents (Table 4.4). Ranking second is health and wellness with just over half (55.4%) of respondents choosing that reason. Relaxation and stress reduction were mentioned by 52.6% and family time by 51.0%. Rounding out the participation reasons are the opportunity to socialize (35.6%), and skill development (18.9%).

Table 4.4
REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN
LEISURE AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES: 2008-2010

Participation Reason	2010	2008	2006
Fun/Enjoyment	72.1%	74.9%	73.3%
Health and wellness	55.4%	67.8%	50.2%
Relaxation, stress reduction	52.6%	62.1%	73.3%
Family time	51.0%	58.0%	61.4%
Socialize	35.6%	41.8%	45.3%
Skill development	18.9%	15.3%	22.9%
Other reasons	8.2%	5.5%	6.1%

A reason given by nine persons for participation is to see nature.

Reasons for participating in recreation and leisure are shown by demographic group in Table 4.5. Fun and enjoyment was named as the top reason for all groups.

Levels for fun and enjoyment were highest for those persons with an associate degree (86.3%), 30-44 (85.4%) and 61114 (85.0%). The following groups gave the highest scores for health and wellness – 61114 (68.3%), and graduate degree (66.7%). Relaxation and stress reduction was most important for 61114 (66.7%) and graduate degree (63.3%).

For family time, the following groups were well above others: children at home (78.0%), 30-44 (72.4%), and 18-29 (69.7%). On top for socialize as a participation reason were zip codes 61102 (46.2%), and 61104 (45.7%). Skill development is most important for those respondents with a graduate degree (34.2%) and children at home (33.9%).

Table 4.5
REASONS FOR PARTICIPATING IN
RECREATION BY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS: 2010

Group Characteristic	Family time	Health and wellness	Fun/enjoyment	Relaxation stress reduction	Skill development	Socialize
ALL	51.0%	55.4%	72.1%	52.6%	18.9%	35.6%
AGE GROUP (Years)						
18 – 29	69.7%	63.6%	75.8%	48.5%	33.3%	42.4%
30 – 44	72.4%	58.5%	85.4%	51.2%	32.5%	37.4%
45 – 64	55.5%	58.6%	76.6%	60.7%	19.0%	38.3%
65+	27.2%	47.8%	57.8%	42.8%	7.8%	29.4%
EDUCATION						
Less than H.S.	45.5%	45.5%	54.5%	36.4%	4.5%	40.9%
H.S. diploma/GED	41.1%	35.7%	58.0%	36.6%	7.1%	27.7%
Some college	53.7%	57.1%	71.4%	53.1%	19.4%	38.9%
Associate degree	53.4%	57.5%	86.3%	60.3%	12.3%	32.9%
Bachelor's degree	55.7%	63.1%	79.5%	56.6%	21.3%	36.9%
Graduate degree	53.3%	66.7%	77.5%	63.3%	34.2%	39.2%
RESIDENCE						
Northwest-61101	53.3%	40.0%	68.9%	55.6%	11.1%	40.0%
Southwest-61102	53.8%	46.2%	73.1%	61.5%	11.5%	46.2%
North End-61103	57.4%	63.2%	66.2%	48.5%	20.6%	29.4%
East Central-61104	54.3%	51.4%	74.3%	54.3%	17.1%	45.7%
Near Northeast-61107	47.3%	63.0%	76.7%	54.1%	25.3%	34.2%
Southeast-61108	50.0%	55.0%	76.3%	61.3%	20.0%	41.3%
Bypass-61109	52.1%	52.1%	67.6%	46.5%	14.1%	35.2%
Loves Park-61111	56.0%	48.0%	69.3%	38.7%	13.3%	38.7%
Far Northeast-61114	55.0%	68.3%	85.0%	66.7%	28.3%	31.7%
GENDER						
Male	42.1%	56.1%	68.7%	54.7%	17.3%	36.4%
Female	54.0%	55.9%	75.1%	52.3%	20.1%	35.6%
RACE						
White, Non-Hispanic	50.2%	55.4%	73.6%	53.2%	17.8%	35.1%
Non-white	46.4%	43.3%	48.5%	35.1%	21.6%	33.0%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME						
Yes	78.0%	57.6%	80.2%	49.7%	33.9%	41.2%
No	40.8%	55.1%	69.9%	54.5%	13.4%	33.9%

Barriers to Participation

Survey respondents also indicated what barriers kept them or other household members from participating in Rockford Park District programs or activities. Although instructed to respond only if they or household members had not participated in the past year, most responses were from participants. Therefore, all answers were maintained.

Comparability to prior years was impeded by the fact that only non-participating households were instructed to respond so that levels were lower than seen in earlier surveys. Table 4.6 shows results for all answers for 2008 and 2010. Table 4.7 shows results relative to all survey participants.

Table 4.6
REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING
IN ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES: 2008-2010

Barrier	2010		2008
	Number	Percent	Percent
Lack of time	103	23.6%	26.2%
Cost to participate	68	15.6%	23.4%
Not aware of offerings	68	15.6%	17.3%
Age, health or disability	64	14.7%	---
Location or times not convenient	48	11.0%	20.8%
Not interested	25	5.7%	6.0%
Lack of ease	16	3.7%	---
Need public transportation	14	3.2%	4.9%
Language	5	1.1%	1.3%
Other	25	5.7%	---
Total	436	100.0%	100.0%

Of the responses marked, almost one-fourth (23.6%) were for lack of time as a barrier. Multiple responses could be marked. Three other reasons also received sizable support – cost to participate (15.6%), not aware of offerings (15.6%) and age, health, disability (14.7%).

Table 4.7
BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES: 1999-2010

Barrier	2010	2008	2006	2001	1999
A lack of time	16.2%	37.7%	29.4%	6.0%	1.7%
Lack of awareness of offerings	10.7%	33.6%	Not asked		
Cost to participate	10.7%	24.9%	17.0%	9.7%	0.2%
Age, health or disability	10.1%	Not asked			
Locations or times not convenient	7.6%	Not asked			
Times not convenient	NA	16.7%	Not asked		
Locations not convenient	NA	13.5%	9.6%	1.9%	2.9%
Not interested	3.9%	8.7%	7.0%	1.4%	0.5%
Lack of transportation	2.2%	7.1%	5.0%	1.2%	1.0%
Language	0.8%	1.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%
Lack of (social) ease	2.5%	Not asked			
Other	3.9%	10.0%	12.8%	17.9%	5.6%

Nevertheless, some conclusions may be drawn. Lack of time also was the top barrier in 2008 and 2006. Lack of awareness and cost to participate, which tied for second were also strong factors in 2008.

Table 4.8 analyzes 2010 barriers among demographic groups. Lack of time poses the primary barrier for most population groups, but not all.

Among the age groups, cost (18.2%) and lack of awareness (18.2%) are the leading barriers for the respondents 18-29. Cost (15.4%) tied lack of time (15.4%) in the 30-44 age group while age, health and disability (23.9%) is clearly the top barrier for persons 65+, persons with a high school diploma or less and residents of 61101.

In the non-white population, cost (14.4%) and lack of awareness (14.4%) edged out time constraints.

For homes with children, cost (18.6%) stood as the top barrier.

Table 4.8
BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP

Group Characteristic	Lack of time	Location/ Time	Cost to participate	Not aware	Age, health, disability	Not interested	Lack of social ease	Need bus
ALL	7.6%	16.2%	10.7%	10.7%	10.1%	3.9%	2.5%	2.2%
AGE GROUP (Years)								
18 - 29	3.0%	15.2%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
30 - 44	7.3%	15.4%	15.4%	9.8%	2.4%	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%
45 - 64	8.6%	19.3%	8.6%	11.4%	5.9%	3.1%	2.4%	1.4%
65+	6.7%	12.2%	8.9%	8.9%	23.9%	7.8%	4.4%	3.9%
EDUCATION								
Less than H.S.	4.5%	22.7%	22.7%	22.7%	36.4%	4.5%	4.5%	9.1%
H.S. diploma/GED	8.9%	17.0%	17.0%	9.8%	17.9%	9.8%	6.3%	2.7%
Some college	9.1%	16.0%	12.6%	12.0%	11.4%	2.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Associate degree	9.6%	12.3%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	1.4%	0.0%	2.7%
Bachelor's degree	5.7%	16.4%	8.2%	10.7%	5.7%	2.5%	1.6%	3.3%
Graduate degree	4.2%	16.7%	4.2%	7.5%	1.7%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%
RESIDENCE								
Northwest-61101	0.0%	15.6%	13.3%	13.3%	17.8%	6.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Southwest-61102	15.4%	30.8%	15.4%	23.1%	19.2%	3.8%	3.8%	11.5%
North End-61103	8.8%	20.6%	13.2%	7.4%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
East Central-61104	14.3%	17.1%	17.1%	11.4%	11.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%
Near Northeast-61107	6.2%	16.4%	8.9%	8.9%	5.5%	2.7%	4.8%	0.7%
Southeast-61108	10.0%	20.0%	11.3%	16.3%	8.8%	3.8%	1.3%	0.0%
Bypass-61109	8.5%	15.5%	14.1%	9.9%	9.9%	5.6%	4.2%	2.8%
Loves Park-61111	6.7%	14.7%	8.0%	13.3%	17.3%	4.0%	2.7%	0.0%
Far Northeast-61114	6.7%	8.3%	5.0%	5.0%	6.7%	3.3%	0.0%	1.7%

Table 4.8 (cont'd.)
**BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN
 ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP**

Group	Lack of time	Location/ Time	Cost to participate	Not aware	Age, health, disability	Not interested	Lack of social ease	Need bus
GENDER								
Male	6.5%	17.3%	7.5%	11.2%	10.3%	6.1%	0.9%	2.3%
Female	8.2%	15.7%	12.3%	10.7%	10.2%	2.9%	3.4%	2.2%
RACE								
White, Non-Hispanic	6.7%	16.5%	9.9%	9.9%	10.0%	4.6%	2.4%	1.5%
Non-white	10.3%	12.4%	14.4%	14.4%	8.2%	0.0%	3.1%	5.2%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME								
Yes	9.6%	15.3%	18.6%	13.0%	5.6%	1.7%	1.1%	2.8%
No	6.9%	16.7%	7.8%	10.0%	12.1%	4.9%	3.1%	2.0%

Chapter 5
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PERFORMANCE

Introduction

One portion of the survey asked five questions about various elements of Park District performance. Topics explored how successful RPD is in serving the recreation needs of residents. In each case, the respondent could indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the question.

Rockford Park District Performance

Agreement was very strong within this set of questions. More than nine in ten (90.7%) respondents could strongly agree or agree that “There are excellent park spaces and recreation opportunities in our community.”

Table 5.1
AGREEMENT WITH ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Dis-agree	Strongly disagree	No answer
There are excellent park spaces and recreation opportunities in our community.	43.3%	47.4%	6.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.9%
Rockford Park District parks and recreation facilities are well maintained.	29.3%	54.0%	12.3%	3.1%	0.3%	0.9%
Rockford Park District services meet my/my family’s recreational needs.	28.0%	52.3%	15.6%	2.0%	0.8%	1.3%
Recreation is an essential part of my health/life.	36.7%	43.3%	15.0%	3.3%	0.3%	1.4%
Recreational opportunities offered by the Rockford Park District encourage me to have a healthy lifestyle.	23.9%	41.9%	27.2%	4.7%	0.0%	1.3%

Just over 80% strongly agreed or agreed with these statements:

- Rockford Park District parks and recreation facilities are well maintained. (83.3%)
- Rockford Park District services meet my/my family’s recreational needs. (80.3%)
- Recreation is an essential part of my health/life. (80.0%)

Enthusiasm was not quite as great for “Recreational opportunities offered by the Rockford Park District encourage me to have a healthy lifestyle.” While almost two-thirds (65.8%) could strongly agree or agree, about one-fourth (27.2%) marked “neither agree nor disagree.”

Table 5.2
 AGREEMENT WITH RPD PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS
 BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP¹

Group Characteristic	Excellent parks and recreation	Park/Rec facilities well maintained	RPD meets family rec needs	Recreation an essential part of my health, life	RPD encourages me for healthy lifestyle
ALL	91.6%	84.1%	81.3%	81.2%	66.7%
AGE GROUP (Years)					
18 - 29	93.9%	78.8%	87.9%	87.9%	72.7%
30 - 44	90.2%	78.9%	80.5%	90.2%	71.5%
45 - 64	90.7%	85.1%	81.5%	84.4%	67.8%
65+	94.9%	88.0%	81.1%	68.0%	60.1%
EDUCATION					
Less than H.S.	86.4%	90.9%	72.7%	85.7%	71.4%
H.S. diploma/GED	91.9%	78.4%	74.3%	72.5%	57.3%
Some college	92.4%	87.1%	85.5%	80.2%	70.3%
Associate degree	89.0%	80.8%	80.8%	82.2%	60.3%
Bachelor's degree	89.3%	80.3%	80.2%	82.6%	59.8%
Graduate degree	95.8%	89.9%	84.9%	87.4%	79.0%
RESIDENCE					
Northwest-61101	93.3%	84.4%	81.8%	77.8%	57.8%
Southwest-61102	92.0%	80.8%	80.8%	73.1%	61.5%
North End-61103	88.1%	82.1%	77.6%	80.3%	74.2%
East Central-61104	82.9%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	77.1%
Near Northeast-61107	93.1%	87.5%	81.3%	87.4%	70.6%
Southeast-61108	92.8%	91.5%	84.3%	73.5%	59.0%
Bypass-61109	91.5%	80.3%	81.7%	83.1%	60.6%
Loves Park-61111	92.0%	76.0%	81.1%	77.0%	60.8%
Far Northeast-61114	95.0%	86.7%	81.7%	84.7%	71.7%
GENDER					
Male	93.0%	84.0%	80.7%	81.1%	65.4%
Female	90.9%	84.4%	81.6%	81.3%	67.2%
RACE					
White, Non-Hispanic	93.4%	86.5%	83.6%	80.5%	65.7%
Non-white	79.2%	68.1%	65.3%	84.7%	76.4%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME					
Yes	88.1%	77.4%	80.1%	89.8%	74.0%
No	93.0%	86.7%	81.6%	77.4%	63.2%

¹Excludes no answers.

Differences Among Demographic Groups

With broad agreement across four of the five questions, demographic differences were not large.

As for “excellent parks and recreation,” agreement for most groups was near 90% reaching 95.8% for persons with a graduate degree and 94.9% among the elderly. Lowest in agreement, though still very high, was the non-white population at 79.2%.

Park maintenance, too, is viewed very favorably, especially by persons in 61108 (91.5%) and those without a high school diploma (90.9%). Younger households did not agree quite as readily, notably those with children at home (77.4%). Also lower were Loves Park residents at 76.0% along with non-white respondents (68.1%).

Rockford Park District is also widely viewed as meeting family needs especially for respondents aged 18-29 (87.9%) and those with some college (85.5%). Non-white respondents (65.3%) again gave somewhat lower ratings.

Most survey participant groups see recreation as an essential part of their lives, most true for those in the 30-44 (90.2%) and 18-29 (87.9%) age groups plus respondents with children at home (89.8%). However, senior citizens (68.0%) are less likely to feel that way.

Agreement for most groups was lower for the statement that “Recreational opportunities offered by the Rockford Park District encourage me to have a healthy lifestyle.” Most agreement came from respondents holding a graduate degree (79.0%) along with residents of 61103 (74.2%) and 61104 (77.1%). Fewer than 60% concurred, however, for several groups including high school graduates (57.3%) and bachelor’s degrees (59.8%) plus residents of 61101 (57.8%), and 61108 (59.0%).

Comparisons to Prior Surveys

Agreement appears to have increased since 2008 that “there are excellent park spaces and recreation opportunities in our community.” In 2008, responses were agree (81.1%), disagree (7.3%) and don’t know (11.6%). Results for 2010 were strongly agree (43.3%), agree (47.4%), neither agree nor disagree (6.8%), disagree (1.6%) and 0.9% for no answer. Therefore, agree rose from 81.1% to 90.7%.

The statement “Rockford Park District parks and recreation facilities are well maintained” was worded as “Rockford Park District parks and outdoor facilities” in the 2001-2008 surveys and choices were excellent, good, fair and poor. In 2010, 83.3% responded strongly agree or agree while in 2008, 81.4% answered with excellent or good.

Only one more question in this group had been asked before – “Recreation is an essential part of my health, life”. In 2008, 95.0% agreed (agree/disagree choices) while in 2010, 80% agreed with a five-choice continuum.

Chapter 6
TARGET GROUPS FOR USE OF RESOURCES

Introduction

Each Citizen Survey has investigated resident preferences for designating key target groups for allocations of Park District resources with some of the groups named changing from year-to-year. This year's response choices ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree whereas in all prior years, the respondent rated each group from 10 (very important) to 1 (not important).

Target Group Importance

Respondents were asked whether they judge providing programs and services to each of six groups named as important to them. Choices available were: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree.

Results indicated relatively high support for serving each of the six groups. However, support was somewhat greater for three groups: children, teenagers and the disabled.

Table 6.1
TARGET GROUP IMPORTANCE
"Providing recreation programs and services for the following groups is very important"

Response	Children 12 & under	Teenagers 13-18	Low Income	Adults 18+	Adults 55+	Disabled Persons
Strongly agree	59.7%	56.4%	42.7%	33.2%	40.6%	54.2%
Agree	31.5%	34.6%	33.2%	47.2%	42.4%	35.3%
Neither agree/ disagree	4.7%	4.4%	15.4%	13.5%	11.8%	6.8%
Disagree	1.1%	1.3%	4.7%	2.4%	1.9%	0.5%
Strongly disagree	0.3%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%
No answer	2.7%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean Score	4.53	4.51	4.16	4.14	4.24	4.46

When level of agreement is considered for the leading groups, the proportions of strongly agree and agree combined was as follows: children 12 and under (91.2%), teenagers (91.0%) and disabled (89.5%).

When scores are created using strongly agree = 5 and strongly disagree = 1 (no answers excluded), the order is again the same, children 12 and under (4.53), teenagers (4.51) and disabled (4.46).

Table 6.2
 TARGET GROUP IMPORTANCE
 SUMMARY MEASURES

Group	Rank	Mean	Rank	Percent
Children 12 and under	1.	4.53	1.	91.2%
Teenagers 13-18	2.	4.51	2.	91.0%
Low income	5.	4.16	6.	75.9%
Adults 18+	6.	4.14	5.	80.4%
Adults 55+	4.	4.24	4.	83.0%
Disabled persons	3.	4.46	3.	89.5%

Support levels were lower (but still high) for the other three population groups. Adults 55+ (seniors) led the group with 83.0% importance agreement and a mean score of 4.24. Following were adults 18+ and low income. While low income (4.16) recorded a higher mean score than adults 18+ (4.14), adults 18+ received higher importance agreement at 80.4% than low income (75.9%). However, the low income “strongly agree” responses at 42.7% exceeded adults 18+ with 33.2%.

Disagree responses were greater for the low-income population resulting in their lower mean score. These two groups, adults 18+ and low income should probably be viewed as receiving equal support.

As for comments that were written in by respondents, 19 said that Rockford Park District should try to serve everyone rather than targeting specific groups. Seven persons, however, emphasized the need to serve children and youth.

Table 6.3
MEAN RATING FOR TARGETING OF RESOURCES BY POPULATION: 2010¹

Group Characteristic	Children 12 and under	Teens 13 -18	People with disabilities	Low income persons	55+ Senior citizens	Adults 18 and over
ALL	4.53	4.51	4.46	4.16	4.24	4.14
AGE GROUP (Years)						
18 - 29	4.70	4.48	4.64	4.18	4.33	4.27
30 - 44	4.74	4.68	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.38
45 - 64	4.50	4.49	4.46	4.10	4.24	4.09
65+	4.39	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.03
EDUCATION						
Less than H.S.	4.45	4.42	4.62	4.38	4.55	4.15
H.S. diploma/GED	4.41	4.41	4.41	4.18	4.08	4.02
Some college	4.53	4.51	4.43	4.19	4.27	4.16
Associate degree	4.59	4.54	4.49	4.21	4.31	4.13
Bachelor's degree	4.49	4.45	4.47	4.09	4.17	4.12
Graduate degree	4.64	4.61	4.50	4.10	4.35	4.26
RESIDENCE						
Northwest-61101	4.44	4.42	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.16
Southwest-61102	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.28	4.48	4.36
North End-61103	4.57	4.54	4.44	4.19	4.27	4.07
East Central-61104	4.56	4.53	4.48	4.06	4.32	4.18
Near Northeast-61107	4.64	4.57	4.49	4.24	4.26	4.23
Southeast-61108	4.57	4.54	4.53	4.05	4.32	4.11
Bypass-61109	4.42	4.39	4.25	4.07	4.11	4.17
Loves Park-61111	4.42	4.48	4.48	4.18	4.20	3.97
Far Northeast-61114	4.46	4.39	4.45	4.09	4.14	4.11
GENDER						
Male	4.38	4.39	4.32	3.98	4.10	3.97
Female	4.61	4.57	4.54	4.26	4.32	4.23
RACE						
White, Non-Hispanic	4.51	4.50	4.46	4.14	4.24	4.13
Non-white	4.67	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.21	4.30
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME						
Yes	4.73	4.64	4.63	4.32	4.39	4.34
No	4.45	4.44	4.39	4.09	4.18	4.06

¹When 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree and 1 = strongly disagree.

Target Group Importance by Demographic Group

Results for target group prioritization reveals some differences in importance among demographic groups as shown below.

Table 6.4
TOP THREE DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS
GIVING **HIGHEST** TARGET GROUP MEAN SCORES: 2010

Target Group	Overall Mean Score	Top Three Groups Giving Highest Mean Score
Children 12 and under	4.53	30-44 (4.74), children at home (4.73), 18-29 (4.70)
Teenagers 13-18	4.51	30-44 (4.68), children at home (4.64), 61102 (4.64)
Low income	4.16	Non-white (4.49), < HS (4.38), children at home (4.32)
Adults 18+	4.14	30-44 (4.38), 61102 (4.36), children at home (4.34)
Adults 55+	4.24	< HS (4.55), 61102 (4.48), children at home (4.39)
Disabled persons	4.46	61102 (4.72), 18-29 (4.64), children at home (4.63)

The highest mean score among all demographic groups rating target groups was a 4.74 by respondents 30-44 for children 12 and over. In general, the highest scores were given by respondents 18-44, those with children at home, residents of 61102, persons without a high school diploma and non-white individuals.

On the other hand, selected demographic groups gave lower rates (although still quite high) for certain target groups. The lowest scores, under four, were from residents of 61111 for adults 18+ (3.97), males for the low-income (3.98) population and adults 18+ .

Respondents tending to give the lowest scores often were male, HS/GED education, 65+ and residents of 61109.

Table 6.5
TOP THREE DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS
GIVING **LOWEST** TARGET GROUP MEAN SCORES: 2010

Target Group	Overall Mean Score	Top Three Groups Giving Lowest Mean Score
Children 12 and under	4.53	Male (4.38), 65+ (4.39), HS/GED (4.41)
Teenagers 13-18	4.51	65+ (4.38), 61109 (4.39), Male (4.39), 61114 (4.39)
Low income	4.16	Male (3.98), 61108 (4.05), 61104 (4.06)
Adults 18+	4.14	61111 (3.97), Male (3.97), HS/GED (4.07)
Adults 55+	4.24	HS/GED (4.08), Male (4.10), 61109 (4.11)
Disabled persons	4.46	61109 (4.25), Male (4.32), 65+(4.34)

Mean Scores: 1999-2010

Table 6.6 compares the mean scores across the various survey years for target group preferences. Such a comparison is not easy because of changing groups and a 2010 rating system which differed from the earlier years.

Whereas earlier years were rated on a 1 to 10 scale, the current survey used 1 to 5. To facilitate comparison, the 2010 mean scores were doubled as shown below in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6
MEAN RATING FOR TARGETING OF RESOURCES: 1999-2010

Group	Mean ¹ (1 = Not Important at all to 10 = Very Important)					
	2010	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Children	9.1		8.9	8.8	9.4	8.2
Children 9 and under		8.5				
Children/teens 10 - 15		8.8				
Teenagers			8.7	8.3	8.8	7.8
Teens 13 – 18	9.0					
Teens 16 - 19		8.3				
Families where all parents work ²		7.7	7.8	7.6	8.7	7.9
People of all ages with disabilities ³	8.9	8.4		7.8	8.7	7.4
Low income persons ⁴	8.6	7.9	8.0	7.3	8.3	7.4
Senior citizens	8.5	7.8	7.7	7.4	8.3	7.3
Adults 20 and older ⁵	8.3	7.4	7.4	6.9	7.6	7.5
Single parent households		7.9	7.9			

¹2004, 2001, 1999 ratings were 1 = Little Emphasis to 10 = Great Deal of Emphasis.

²Families of working parents 1999-2006.

³People with disabilities, 1999-2004, not asked in 2006.

⁴Economically disadvantaged 1999-2006.

⁵Adults 1999-2006.

Children held the top spot in all six years while either teenagers or disabled persons were second in most years. Though disabled persons placed second in 2008, teens edged them out this time. Adults have received the lowest mean score in all of the last five surveys.

Chapter 7
APPEARANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF PARKS AND FACILITIES

Introduction

Repeating two questions used in earlier Park District surveys, the 2010 survey asked once again about the appearance and maintenance of RPD parks and outdoor areas as well as about RPD indoor recreational facilities (such as ice facilities, ISC, clubhouses, etc.).

Survey Results

Almost one-third (31.8%) of survey respondents rate the appearance and maintenance of parks and outdoor recreational areas including golf courses, sports fields, recreational paths, picnic shelters, tennis courts and playgrounds as “excellent,” while another 55.3% rate them as “good.” (Table 7.1) Another eight percent feel the appearance and maintenance of the parks and outdoor areas is “fair,” while 1.1% marked “poor.” No opinion or no answer was the response for 3.7%.

The response about outdoor areas was more favorable than in recent years though not quite reaching the 33.1% excellent in 2001.

Table 7.1
EXCELLENT RATINGS FOR PARKS AND
OUTDOOR AREAS: 2001-2010

Year	Percent
2010	31.8%
2008	22.6%
2006	28.5%
2004	29.8%
2001	33.1%

The 2010 version of the question provided examples of the parks and outdoor areas which was not the case in 2008. Otherwise, the questions were the same. The naming of specific types or areas may have had something of a positive effect on response.

The second question requested that District residents rate the appearance of buildings and facilities such as ice skating facilities, Indoor Sports Center, golf course clubhouses and museums. Ratings on a four point scale were excellent (23.0%), good (53.7%), fair (8.3%) and poor (0.5%). An additional 14.5% marked “no opinion” or did not answer.

Results were better than in the prior four administrations. The 23.0% excellent was much improved, well above the prior best of 14.2% in 2004.

Table 7.2
EXCELLENT RATINGS FOR BUIDINGS
AND FACILITIES: 2001-2010

Year	Percent
2010	23.0%
2008	10.5%
2006	13.0%
2004	14.2%
2001	14.0%

The question in 2010 was nearly identical to 2008 except that museums was added to the list of examples. The “don’t know” choice of the past was changed to “no opinion.”

The dominant comment type gave praise for parks and outdoor settings. Eight respondents said that Park District facilities look good. Another three persons especially like the golf courses. Eight persons, however expressed concern about the condition of the bathrooms.

Variations Among Demographic Groups

Virtually all surveyed groups rate outdoor and indoor sites quite well in appearance and maintenance.

Regarding parks and outdoor areas, the highest proportion of “excellent” ratings came from less than high school (45.5%) and 61104 (40.0%), while lower judgments of “excellent” were from 18-29 (18.2%), non-white (23.6%) and 61101 (25.0%). Males (27.4%) were less likely than females (34.7%) to give an excellent rating for the appearance and maintenance of parks and outdoor areas.

As for indoor facilities, the highest levels of “excellent” ratings were by persons 18-29 (33.3%) 61104 (31.4%) and 61111-Loves Park (30.7%).

Table 7.3
**APPEARANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT AREAS AND
 FACILITIES BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC: 2010¹**

Group Characteristic	PARKS AND OUTDOOR AREAS				INDOOR FACILITIES			
	Excel- lent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excel- lent	Good	Fair	Poor
ALL	32.4%	56.3%	8.2%	1.1%	23.8%	55.6%	8.6%	0.5%
AGE GROUP (Years)								
18 - 29	18.2%	66.7%	12.1%	3.0%	33.3%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%
30 - 44	28.3%	52.5%	15.8%	2.5%	25.5%	45.4%	19.3%	0.8%
45 - 64	32.4%	58.2%	6.6%	0.7%	23.2%	60.7%	6.0%	0.7%
65+	36.9%	54.5%	4.5%	0.6%	22.5%	54.3%	5.2%	0.0%
EDUCATION								
Less than H.S.	45.5%	36.4%	13.6%	4.5%	20.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%
H.S. diploma/GED	25.7%	56.9%	10.1%	1.8%	19.3%	53.2%	9.2%	0.9%
Some college	33.1%	56.4%	8.1%	0.6%	22.9%	60.6%	5.9%	0.6%
Associate degree	34.7%	56.9%	6.9%	1.4%	23.6%	55.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Bachelor's degree	30.0%	55.8%	10.0%	0.8%	24.4%	54.6%	10.1%	0.0%
Graduate degree	35.6%	59.3%	4.2%	0.8%	29.4%	52.1%	6.7%	0.8%
RESIDENCE								
Northwest-61101	25.0%	61.4%	9.1%	2.3%	23.3%	58.1%	14.0%	0.0%
Southwest-61102	30.8%	57.7%	11.5%	0.0%	24.0%	48.0%	8.0%	0.0%
North End-61103	26.9%	62.7%	9.0%	0.0%	21.2%	59.1%	7.6%	0.0%
East Central-61104	40.0%	45.7%	8.6%	2.9%	31.4%	40.0%	11.4%	0.0%
Near Northeast-61107	31.3%	58.3%	7.6%	1.4%	22.5%	54.9%	10.6%	0.7%
Southeast-61108	30.5%	57.3%	9.8%	0.0%	22.5%	60.0%	6.3%	0.0%
Bypass-61109	30.0%	54.3%	8.6%	2.9%	21.7%	47.8%	10.1%	1.4%
Loves Park-61111	37.8%	47.3%	10.8%	1.4%	30.7%	54.7%	6.7%	1.3%
Far Northeast-61114	36.7%	61.7%	1.7%	0.0%	23.3%	66.7%	5.0%	0.0%
GENDER								
Male	27.4%	61.3%	8.0%	2.4%	16.2%	65.2%	9.0%	0.5%
Female	34.7%	54.0%	8.2%	0.5%	27.9%	50.6%	8.5%	0.2%
RACE								
White, Non-Hispanic	33.3%	57.1%	6.6%	0.9%	23.8%	55.4%	7.8%	0.6%
Non-white	23.6%	52.8%	19.4%	2.8%	25.0%	52.8%	13.9%	0.0%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME								
Yes	25.4%	58.4%	14.5%	1.7%	28.9%	51.4%	14.5%	1.2%
No	34.7%	56.0%	5.7%	0.7%	21.8%	57.3%	6.2%	0.2%

¹"No opinion" not shown, no answer excluded.

Chapter 8
PROGRAM AND SERVICES RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Introduction

In this section of the questionnaire, residents were asked whether resources should be dedicated to certain programming options. The eight questions may be split into two groups, four related to activities for residents and four related to topics of nature.

Resources for Programs, Activities

Regarding the provision of certain programs and activities, District residents were favorable toward all four activities put forth, with high agreement (strongly agree plus agree) for children's outdoor environmental education (91.4% agree) addressing childhood obesity through physical activity (88.3%), teaching introductory sports skills (86.2%) and investing in museums (84.1%).

Table 8.1
AGREEMENT WITH ACTIVITY STATEMENTS

The Rockford Park District Should:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Dis-agree	Strongly disagree	No Answer
Teach introductory sports skills (such as tennis, ice skating, swimming and soccer) so that people can be active.	38.6%	47.6%	9.8%	2.4%	0.6%	1.1%
Offer outdoor environmental education programs with places for children to explore and learn about nature.	48.7%	42.7%	6.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.8%
Help to address childhood obesity by encouraging physical activity and playing outdoors.	50.7%	37.6%	8.3%	1.7%	0.8%	0.8%
Continue to invest in museums to enhance the culture, education, and quality of life in our community.	42.2%	41.9%	11.2%	3.0%	0.9%	0.8%

A few respondents commented that parents, not the Park District, are responsible for obesity in children.

Activity Differences Among Groups

The groups most in favor of allocating resources for teaching introductory sports skills so that people can be active were respondents 30-44 (95.1%) and those living in 61104 (94.3%). Less enthusiastic, though still at high agreement levels, were respondents at the lowest education levels.

Outdoor environmental education for children is strongly supported with almost all demographic groups agreeing at 90% or greater led by respondents 30-44 (95.9%) and 61101 respondents (95.6%). Lowest is 61104 at 85.0%.

Addressing childhood obesity through activity is also strongly supported, reaching 97.8% in 61101 and also receiving a 94.4% endorsement by the minority population.

Museum support was also notable for the approval of 18-29 respondents (90.9%) and households containing children (90.3%). Not quite as enthusiastic about continuing to invest in museums were 61101 residents (68.9%), men (78.4%) and high school graduates (78.6%).

Table 8.2
**AGREEMENT WITH ACTIVITY STATEMENTS
 BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP¹**

Group Characteristic	Introductory Sports Skills	Outdoor Environmental Education	Address Childhood Obesity	Invest in Museums
ALL	87.1%	92.1%	89.0%	84.8%
AGE GROUP (Years)				
18 - 29	84.8%	87.9%	84.8%	90.9%
30 - 44	95.1%	95.9%	91.9%	88.6%
45 - 64	85.1%	92.0%	88.5%	84.0%
65+	85.1%	90.3%	89.3%	82.4%
EDUCATION				
Less than H.S.	77.3%	81.8%	86.4%	81.8%
H.S. diploma/GED	81.1%	91.1%	90.2%	78.6%
Some college	85.4%	93.6%	92.4%	87.8%
Associate degree	91.8%	94.5%	86.3%	84.7%
Bachelor's degree	92.6%	92.6%	86.1%	89.3%
Graduate degree	88.1%	90.8%	89.8%	83.2%
RESIDENCE				
Northwest-61101	91.1%	95.6%	97.8%	68.9%
Southwest-61102	88.0%	92.3%	76.9%	84.6%
North End-61103	91.0%	94.0%	89.6%	89.6%
East Central-61104	94.3%	94.3%	91.4%	85.7%
Near Northeast-61107	88.1%	93.1%	88.1%	89.5%
Southeast-61108	82.1%	92.9%	90.5%	82.1%
Bypass-61109	83.1%	91.4%	88.7%	87.3%
Loves Park-61111	86.7%	92.0%	92.0%	84.0%
Far Northeast-61114	83.1%	85.0%	86.7%	83.3%
GENDER				
Male	82.2%	87.7%	85.9%	78.4%
Female	89.7%	94.4%	91.0%	88.5%
RACE				
White, Non-Hispanic	87.8%	92.7%	88.9%	85.5%
Non-white	87.5%	90.3%	94.4%	83.3%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME				
Yes	91.0%	93.2%	89.3%	90.3%
No	85.5%	91.6%	89.2%	82.7%

¹Excludes no answers.

Comparison to Past Surveys

All four activity questions were asked in 2008, the options at that time being agree, disagree and don't know rather than the current five choices. Some were also asked earlier. A comparison for agreement by year is shown below, though the questions do not fully match. Full results for the questions may be found in Appendix II.

Table 8.3
HISTORICAL RESPONSES ON SELECTED ACTIVITIES: 2004-2010

Activity	Percent Agree			
	2010	2008	2006	2004
Teach introductory sports	86.2%	78.8%	75.9%	65.1%
Outdoor environmental education	91.4%	53.0%		
Address child obesity	88.3%	53.0%		
Invest in museums	84.1%	62.6%	86.3%	

Within the limits of changing choices, all four questions appear to have maintained support. Gains in approval may have taken place for addressing childhood obesity and offering outdoor environmental education.

Devoting Resources to Nature and Good Environmental Practices

Four questions sought the survey respondents' reaction toward investing in or engaging in good environmental practices. District residents apparently support all four actions at very high levels.

Reforestation received the greatest agreement, 90.5% with 52.4% strongly agreeing. Green alternatives like recycling (86.2%) and providing natural areas for the public (86.3%) received similar support. Next, at 79.8% agreement was community beautification such as floral gardens and planters along streets (Table 8.4).

Table 8.4
 AGREEMENT WITH ACTIONS RELATED TO NATURE: 2010

The Rockford Park District Should:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Dis-agree	Strongly disagree	No Answer
Pursue green alternatives (recycling, alternative energy sources, reduce use of pesticides and herbicides) to help protect the environment	49.3%	36.9%	10.1%	2.4%	0.6%	0.8%
Provide natural areas & prairies for preservation & wildlife habitat for public access.	49.0%	37.3%	10.2%	1.7%	0.5%	1.3%
Continue with community beautification, with floral gardens & flower baskets/planters along the streets (City of Gardens)	41.4%	38.4%	14.2%	4.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Continue with reforestation efforts and planting tree	52.4%	38.1%	6.6%	1.6%	0.5%	0.8%

Table 8.5
 AGREEMENT WITH “GREEN” ACTIONS RELATED TO NATURE
 BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP¹: 2010

Group Characteristic	Green actions	Natural areas	Floral beauty	Plant trees
ALL	86.8%	87.4%	80.6%	90.6%
AGE GROUP (Years)				
18 - 29	87.9%	93.9%	78.8%	84.8%
30 - 44	87.0%	92.7%	82.9%	91.1%
45 - 64	86.8%	84.9%	79.9%	91.3%
65+	86.4%	87.6%	80.1%	92.7%
EDUCATION				
Less than H.S.	72.7%	86.4%	90.9%	81.8%
H.S. diploma/GED	83.0%	85.5%	78.6%	87.5%
Some college	89.5%	91.8%	80.2%	93.6%
Associate degree	86.1%	90.4%	84.7%	97.3%
Bachelor’s degree	90.2%	86.9%	78.7%	92.6%
Graduate degree	86.6%	83.2%	80.5%	89.1%
RESIDENCE				
Northwest-61101	86.7%	86.4%	71.1%	91.1%
Southwest-61102	80.8%	76.9%	80.8%	88.5%
North End-61103	91.0%	86.4%	83.6%	91.0%
East Central-61104	82.9%	85.7%	80.0%	88.6%
Near Northeast-61107	90.2%	88.2%	82.5%	93.1%
Southeast-61108	85.7%	91.5%	94.6%	95.2%
Bypass-61109	84.5%	91.5%	77.5%	92.9%
Loves Park-61111	85.3%	92.0%	78.7%	88.0%
Far Northeast-61114	85.0%	80.0%	81.7%	88.3%
GENDER				
Male	78.9%	83.1%	71.4%	87.3%
Female	91.2%	89.9%	85.5%	93.4%
RACE				
White, Non-Hispanic	87.2%	89.5%	79.9%	91.9%
Non-white	83.3%	76.4%	87.5%	88.9%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME				
Yes	86.4%	90.3%	85.2%	92.1%
No	87.2%	86.4%	78.6%	91.2%

¹Excludes no answers.

Nature Differences Among Demographic Groups

Across the four questions related to nature and beautification, the recurring difference is that women are more supportive of the actions than men with a difference of at least five percent for all questions, but extending to more than 12% for “green” actions.

Age did not predict differences for the pursuit of green alternatives. Geographically, residents of 61103 (91.0%) and 61107 (90.2%) are very supportive as are those with a bachelor’s degree (90.2%). Respondents without a high school diploma (72.7%) recorded the lowest agreement.

Natural areas receive elevated support levels for persons aged 18-29 (93.9%), 30-44 (92.7%), some college (91.8%) and zip codes 61111 (92.0%), 61108 (91.5%), and 61109 (91.5%). Lower were non-white (76.4%) and 61102 (76.9%) respondents.

Community beautification via gardens and floral planters along streets is really liked by 61108 residents (94.6%) and those without a high school diploma (90.9%), but less supportive are males (71.4%) and residents of 61101 (71.1%).

As mentioned earlier, reforestation was most popular for this question group, with combined “strongly agree” and “agree” topping 90% in 15 demographic groups, reaching 97.3% for respondents with an associate degree.

Comparisons to Past Surveys

Three of the questions were asked in 2008, though the options were agree, disagree and don’t know rather than the current five choices. One question was also asked in 2006. A comparison for agreement is shown below though the questions do not fully match. Full results for the questions may be found in Appendix II.

Table 8.6
HISTORICAL RESPONSES
ON “GREEN” ACTIONS: 2006-2010¹

Action	2010	2008	2006
Green actions, recycling	86.2%	82.2%	91.5%
Natural areas	86.3%	88.1%	
Beautification, flowers	79.8%	84.9%	
Reforestation	90.5%		

¹Percent agree

Within the limits of changing choices, results appear to be similar to the past. A small decline may have taken place for beautification efforts.

Chapter 9
PRIORITIZATION OF USE OF FUNDS

Introduction

In this section of the survey instrument, 12 actions were shown and the respondents were asked to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement for importance of allocating Rockford Park District resources for these actions. Five choices were offered for each – strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree.

Results are shown below in Table 9.1. At least half of respondents strongly agree or agree with each statement. The clear leader was to “maintain and repair existing parks and facilities” for which 58.0% strongly agreed and 38.0% agreed. A strong second with 40.6% strongly agree, and 47.2% agree was to “provide recreation programs for youth/teens.

Table 9.1
AGREEMENT WITH USING FUNDS FOR SELECTED PURPOSES

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No answer
Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities	58.0%	38.0%	2.0%	0.6%	0.3%	1.1%
Acquire land for new neighborhood parks	17.6%	34.3%	32.0%	10.9%	2.8%	2.4%
Preserve land for later development	19.4%	41.3%	29.9%	4.7%	1.9%	2.8%
Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)	29.4%	35.1%	26.6%	5.2%	1.4%	2.2%
Develop new neighborhood parks	20.9%	36.7%	27.9%	9.4%	2.5%	2.5%
Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)	25.2%	40.9%	23.0%	6.5%	2.0%	2.4%
Activities along the Rock River	31.2%	43.8%	17.5%	3.1%	1.4%	3.0%
Expand or connect existing recreation paths	33.9%	38.1%	18.0%	5.4%	2.2%	2.5%
Provide recreation programs for youth/teens	40.6%	47.2%	9.0%	0.9%	0.3%	1.9%
Provide recreation programs for adults/senior citizens	32.0%	47.1%	16.1%	2.7%	0.3%	1.9%
Maintain District museums	34.2%	49.3%	11.2%	2.4%	0.9%	2.0%
Expand District museums	19.7%	31.2%	32.6%	9.0%	4.3%	3.3%

A shortcut for comparing the response to the 12 actions is to assign scores to the responses, specifically – strongly agree (5), agree (4), neither agree nor disagree (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). “No answers” are excluded from these calculations.

Table 9.2
MEAN SCORES FOR FUNDS USE

Rank	Statement	Mean Score
1.	Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities	4.54
2.	Provide recreation programs for youth/teens	4.29
3.	Maintain District museums	4.16
4.	Provide recreation programs for adults/senior citizens	4.10
5.	Activities along the Rock River	4.03
6.	Expand or connect existing recreation paths	3.99
7.	Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)	3.88
8.	Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)	3.83
9.	Preserve land for later development	3.74
10.	Develop new neighborhood parks	3.66
11.	Expand District museums	3.55
12.	Acquire land for new neighborhood parks	3.54

Results would appear to indicate that residents favor maintaining resources and programs with less (though still substantial) support for new development.

Five actions scored four (agree) or higher. These were maintain and repair existing parks and facilities (4.54), provide youth/teen recreation programs (4.29), maintain District museums (4.16), provide adult/senior recreation programs (4.10) and (support) activities along the Rock River (4.03). Lowest were acquiring new land for neighborhood parks (3.54) and expanding District museums (3.55).

Nineteen respondents expressed the opinion that this is a time to maintain rather than expand resources. On the other hand, eight persons would like to see attention to expanding or connecting paths.

Comparison: 2008 and 2010 Priority Uses of Funds

Some comparisons are possible between 2010 and 2008 results. The 2010 questions used five choices from strongly agree to strongly disagree. In 2008, for five questions the choices were agree/disagree/don't know. For four questions in 2008, the five choices ranged from would definitely support to definitely would not support. Two 2010 questions were not asked in 2008.

Table 9.3
 PRIORITY OF FUNDS
 STATEMENT AGREEMENT: 2008-2010

Statement	2010	2008	
	Strongly agree or agree	Would def. support or might support	Agree
Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities	96.0%	79.7%	
Acquire land for new neighborhood parks	51.9%	62.1%	
Preserve land for later development	60.7%		42.5%
Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)	64.5%		
Develop new neighborhood parks	57.6%		69.6%
Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)	66.1%	66.2%	
Activities along the Rock River	75.0%		65.1%
Expand or connect existing recreation paths	72.0%		70.8%
Provide recreation programs for youth/teens	87.8%	78.6%	
Provide recreation programs for adults/senior citizens	79.1%		
Maintain District museums	83.5%		
Expand District museums	50.9%		55.1%

Table 9.3, within the question differences, appears to show increased support for maintaining existing parks, preserving land for later development and providing youth/teen recreation programs. Some decline took place for acquiring land and developing new neighborhood parks. Some gain in support appeared for activities along the Rock River.

Table 9.4
MEAN SCORES: PRIORITY USE OF FUNDS BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP

Group Characteristic	Maintain, repair parks, facilities	Acquire neighborhood parks, new land	Preserve land for later development	Increase managed natural areas	Develop new neighborhood parks	Develop indoor year-round facilities
ALL	4.54	3.54	3.74	3.88	3.66	3.83
AGE GROUP (Years)						
18 - 29	4.67	3.85	3.70	3.94	4.06	4.30
30 - 44	4.59	3.67	3.72	3.94	3.81	4.14
45 - 64	4.54	3.53	3.75	3.87	3.62	3.76
65+	4.49	3.42	3.72	3.83	3.54	3.62
EDUCATION						
Less than H.S.	4.32	3.48	3.62	4.00	3.81	4.05
H.S. diploma/GED	4.35	3.54	3.55	3.88	3.52	3.83
Some college	4.57	3.58	3.84	3.88	3.70	3.73
Associate degree	4.58	3.45	3.73	3.92	3.60	3.86
Bachelor's degree	4.55	3.61	3.73	3.92	3.73	3.84
Graduate degree	4.67	3.48	3.78	3.78	3.63	3.87
RESIDENCE						
Northwest-61101	4.36	3.55	3.65	4.00	3.67	3.58
Southwest-61102	4.54	3.24	3.73	3.88	3.65	4.00
North End-61103	4.63	3.63	3.69	3.81	3.76	3.91
East Central-61104	4.60	3.69	3.91	4.06	3.89	4.15
Near Northeast-61107	4.60	3.63	3.77	3.91	3.70	3.83
Southeast-61108	4.61	3.47	3.71	3.86	3.57	3.85
Bypass-61109	4.45	3.71	3.84	3.99	3.74	3.99
Loves Park-61111	4.45	3.42	3.57	3.85	3.62	3.77
Far Northeast-61114	4.58	3.31	3.66	3.63	3.34	3.56
GENDER						
Male	4.50	3.46	3.67	3.83	3.56	3.69
Female	4.56	3.59	3.77	3.91	3.71	3.90
RACE						
White, Non-Hispanic	4.56	3.55	3.76	3.93	3.65	3.79
Non-white	4.48	3.55	3.60	3.50	3.74	4.21
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME						
Yes	4.57	3.70	3.71	3.86	3.83	4.13
No	4.53	3.48	3.74	3.88	3.59	3.71

Table 9.4 (cont'd.)
MEAN SCORES: PRIORITY USE OF FUNDS BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP

Group Characteristic	Activities along Rock River	Connect existing recreation paths	Provide youth/teen recreation program	Provide adult/senior recreation program	Maintain District museums	Expand District museums
ALL	4.03	3.99	4.29	4.10	4.16	3.55
AGE GROUP (Years)						
18 - 29	4.30	4.33	4.48	4.12	4.36	3.91
30 - 44	4.13	4.11	4.45	4.13	4.25	3.70
45 - 64	4.06	4.03	4.30	4.13	4.18	3.57
65+	3.86	3.75	4.11	4.01	4.03	3.39
EDUCATION						
Less than H.S.	4.05	4.05	4.41	4.36	4.00	3.21
H.S. diploma/GED	3.90	3.73	4.14	4.08	4.10	3.54
Some college	4.09	4.03	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.62
Associate degree	4.04	3.92	4.30	4.17	4.21	3.60
Bachelor's degree	4.04	4.07	4.34	4.01	4.18	3.63
Graduate degree	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.00	4.19	3.44
RESIDENCE						
Northwest-61101	4.09	3.57	4.14	4.09	3.98	3.44
Southwest-61102	4.17	4.12	4.46	4.27	4.36	3.76
North End-61103	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.01	4.18	3.67
East Central-61104	4.24	4.00	4.37	4.31	4.26	3.71
Near Northeast-61107	4.04	4.04	4.30	4.09	4.23	3.60
Southeast-61108	4.06	4.05	4.35	4.11	4.19	3.59
Bypass-61109	4.04	4.14	4.23	4.13	4.11	3.56
Loves Park-61111	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.07	4.07	3.49
Far Northeast-61114	3.83	3.93	4.24	3.97	4.10	3.32
GENDER						
Male	3.93	3.86	4.15	3.92	3.95	3.39
Female	4.09	4.05	4.36	4.19	4.27	3.65
RACE						
White, Non-Hispanic	4.04	4.00	4.28	4.08	4.18	3.57
Non-white	3.96	3.91	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.57
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME						
Yes	4.06	4.18	4.46	4.16	4.33	3.82
No	4.01	3.91	4.22	4.07	4.09	3.46

Top Actions by Demographic Group

Maintaining parks and facilities received the highest mean score for all demographic groups (except for those without a high school diploma which placed youth/teen programs in the first spot). All except one rated youth/teen programs second highest and all except five placed maintaining museums in the third spot (Table 9.5).

The exceptions were as follows. Adult/senior programs appeared second for respondents without a high school diploma and third for 61101, 61104, 61111 and non-white. Activities along the Rock River gained the third priority for residents of 61101 and those living in 61109 chose the connecting of existing recreation paths as third.

Table 9.5
TOP THREE PRIORITY FUND USES BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

AGE GROUP (Years)	TOP THREE FUND USES
18 - 29	Maintain parks, facilities (4.67), youth/teen programs (4.48), maintain museums (4.36)
30 - 44	Maintain parks, facilities (4.59), youth/teen programs (4.45), maintain museums (4.25)
45 - 64	Maintain parks, facilities (4.54), youth/teen programs (4.30), maintain museums (4.18)
65+	Maintain parks, facilities (4.49), youth/teen programs (4.11), maintain museums (4.03)
EDUCATION	
Less than H.S.	Youth/teen programs (4.41), adult/senior programs (4.36), maintain parks, facilities (4.32)
H.S. diploma/GED	Maintain parks, facilities (4.35), youth/teen programs (4.14), maintain museums (4.10)
Some college	Maintain parks, facilities (4.57), youth/teen programs (4.30), maintain museums (4.17)
Associate degree	Maintain parks, facilities (4.58), youth/teen programs (4.30), maintain museums (4.21)
Bachelor's degree	Maintain parks, facilities (4.55), youth/teen programs (4.34), maintain museums (4.18)
Graduate degree	Maintain parks, facilities (4.67), youth/teen programs (4.32), maintain museums (4.19)
RESIDENCE	
Northwest-61101	Maintain parks, facilities (4.36), youth/teen programs (4.14), Rock River activities, adult/senior programs (4.09)
Southwest-61102	Maintain parks, facilities (4.54), youth/teen programs (4.46), maintain museums (4.36)
North End-61103	Maintain parks, facilities (4.63), youth/teen programs (4.34), maintain museums (4.18)
East Central-61104	Maintain parks, facilities (4.60), youth/teen programs(4.37), adult/senior programs (4.31)
Near Northeast-61107	Maintain parks, facilities (4.60), youth/teen programs (4.30), maintain museums (4.23)
Southeast-61108	Maintain parks, facilities (4.61), youth/teen programs (4.35), maintain museums (4.19)
Bypass-61109	Maintain parks, facilities (4.45), youth/teen programs (4.23), connect paths (4.14)
Loves Park-61111	Maintain parks, facilities (4.45), youth/teen programs (4.28), adult/senior programs, maintain museums (4.07)
Far Northeast-61114	Maintain parks, facilities (4.58), youth/teen programs (4.24), maintain museums (4.10)

Table 9.5 (cont'd.)
TOP THREE PRIORITY FUND USES BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

GENDER	TOP THREE FUND USES
Male	Maintain parks (4.50), Youth/teen recreation (4.15), Maintain museums (3.95)
Female	Maintain parks (4.56), Youth/teen recreation (4.36), Maintain museums (4.27)
RACE	
White, non-Hispanic	Maintain parks (4.56), Youth/teen recreation (4.18), Maintain museums (4.18)
Non-white	Maintain parks (4.48), Youth/teen recreation (4.45), Maintain museums (4.25)
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME	
Yes	Maintain parks (4.57), Youth/teen recreation (4.46), Maintain museums (4.33)
No	Maintain parks (4.53), Youth/teen recreation (4.22), Maintain museums (4.09)

Differences Among Demographic Groups

As with most portions of the survey, variations could be observed among demographic groups as to where they would allocate resources (Table 9.6).

In observing differences among groups, the strong ratings by respondents 18-29 stand out, leading for nine of the twelve groups. Also in the top three for many spending priorities are zip codes in west and central Rockford – 61101, 61102, 61103 and 61104. Two other groups favoring many of the listed actions were households with children at home and residents of 61109.

Table 9.6
TOP THREE DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS BY FUND USES: 2010

Statement	Top Three Groups
Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities	18-29 (4.67), Grad. Degree (4.67), 61103 (4.63)
Acquire land for new neighborhood parks	18-29 (3.85), 61109 (3.71), child at home (3.70)
Preserve land for later development	61104 (3.91), some college (3.84), 61109 (3.84)
Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)	61104 (4.06) , HS (4.00), 61101 (4.00)
Develop new neighborhood parks	18-29 (4.06), 61104 (3.89), child at home (3.83)
Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)	18-29 (4.30), non-white (4.21), 61104 (4.15)
Activities along the Rock River	18-29 (4.30), 61104 (4.24), 61102 (4.17)
Expand or connect existing recreation paths	18-29 (4.33), child at home (4.18), 61109 (4.14)
Provide recreation programs for youth/teens	18-29 (4.48), child at home (4.46), non-white (4.45)
Provide recreation programs for adults/senior citizens	< HS (4.36), 61104 (4.31), 61102 (4.27)
Maintain District museums	18-29 (4.36), 61102 (4.36), child at home (4.33)
Expand District museums	18-29 (3.91), child at home (3.82), 61102 (3.76)

Chapter 10
SAFETY AT PARKS, PATHS AND FACILITIES

Introduction

Assuring safety for patrons has always been a primary concern of the District. Questions on safety monitor how residents feel about their safety when using Park District facilities, programs and outdoor areas.

Safety Results: 2010 and 2008

Two questions sought resident perceptions of safety, both indoors and out. Results for those questions are shown below in Table 10.1.

Table 10.1
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT SAFETY: 2010
"I feel safe when using Rockford Park District."

Response	Parks, recreation paths and outdoor spaces		Indoor facilities	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	99	15.6%	167	26.3%
Agree	347	54.6%	285	44.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	142	22.4%	154	24.3%
Disagree	30	4.7%	7	1.1%
Strongly disagree	8	1.3%	6	0.9%
No answer	9	1.4%	16	2.5%
Total	635	100.0%	635	100.0%

Survey results indicate that most citizens do feel safe at Park District sites. For outdoor, 70.2% feel safe (strongly agree or agree) and 22.4% neither agree nor disagree. For indoor locations, 71.2% feel safe and 24.3% neither agree nor disagree.

These questions were also asked in 2008 but with different choices, agree, disagree and don't know. At that time, for outdoor sites, 74.2% agreed to feeling safe and 12.8% said don't know. For indoor facilities in 2008, 67.8% agreed and 27.9% said don't know.

Comparing the two years does not yield clear findings. Slight improvement appears to have taken place indoor with higher uncertainty outdoor.

Comments were of the following types: nine respondents said that parks and facilities seem safe; however, seven would like to see greater security or supervision; eight cited situations in which they were uneasy about the actions of others, and five felt that some areas are not safe. Four do not feel safe at night.

Table 10.2
SAFETY IN ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT OUTDOOR AND INDOOR PLACES
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC: 2010

Group Characteristic	Percent Agreement ¹	
	I feel safe when visiting District parks, recreation paths, and outdoor spaces.	I feel safe using District indoor facilities.
ALL	71.2%	73.0%
AGE GROUP (Years)		
18 - 29	75.8%	84.8%
30 - 44	69.9%	82.1%
45 - 64	71.5%	73.9%
65+	71.1%	64.1%
EDUCATION		
Less than H.S.	63.6%	57.1%
H.S. diploma/GED	60.6%	64.8%
Some college	75.1%	77.3%
Associate degree	68.5%	76.7%
Bachelor's degree	72.1%	73.3%
Graduate degree	78.6%	76.5%
RESIDENCE		
Northwest-61101	56.8%	65.9%
Southwest-61102	65.4%	73.1%
North End-61103	74.6%	77.3%
East Central-61104	71.4%	60.0%
Near Northeast-61107	71.1%	75.9%
Southeast-61108	77.4%	73.2%
Bypass-61109	69.0%	64.3%
Loves Park-61111	71.2%	79.5%
Far Northeast-61114	76.7%	83.1%
GENDER		
Male	74.6%	69.4%
Female	69.6%	75.6%
RACE		
White, Non-Hispanic	73.3%	75.0%
Non-white	59.2%	69.4%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME		
Yes	71.2%	83.6%
No	71.3%	69.3%

¹"No answer" responses excluded from calculations. Strongly agree plus agree.

Safety Perceptions of Demographic Groups

Though safety perceptions were generally similar across demographic groups, variations did emerge as shown in Table 10.3 and 10.4.

Table 10.3
PERCEPTION OF GROUP SAFETY WHEN VISITING
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT PARKS, PATHS, OUTDOOR SPACES

Feel Most Safe		Feel Least Safe	
Graduate Degree	78.6%	61101 – Northwest	56.8%
61108 – Southeast	77.4%	Non-white	59.2%
61114 – Far Northeast	76.7%	High School/GED	60.6%

Table 10.4
PERCEPTION OF GROUP SAFETY WHEN VISITING
ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT INDOOR FACILITIES

Feel Most Safe		Feel Least Safe	
18-29	84.8%	Less than HS	57.1%
Children at home	83.6%	61104	60.0%
61114 – Far Northeast	83.1%	65+	64.1%

While age does not appear to predict outdoor safety perceptions, indoor safety is seen as best by younger respondents and less so by seniors. Households with children are more positive about indoor safety while males feel better about outdoor safety than females.

Chapter 11
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

Finances constitute an important aspect of the Rockford Park District operation. Vital topics include fees and financial assistance relative to consumers plus revenue and expenses of the District.

Fees and Financial Assistance

Seven of ten (70.5%) survey respondents strongly agree or agree that “fees are generally reasonable to participate in park district facilities, services and programs.” Because this question has been asked in each survey since 1999, a long-term comparison is possible although choices varied.

Table 11.1
AGREEMENT WITH FEE STATEMENTS

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Dis-Agree	Strongly disagree	No Answer
Fees are generally reasonable to participate in park district facilities, services and programs.	18.1%	52.4%	19.4%	6.5%	0.8%	2.8%
Financial assistance (partial scholarships) for families who meet income guidelines should be offered.	26.1%	34.3%	25.5%	9.1%	3.0%	1.9%

Table 11.2 displays a summary of results for the six surveys. Results have been relatively similar across the years, ranging from 63.7% (1999) to 74.2% (2006). The 2010 result of 70.5% was similar to, though just above the 69.5% average in the five prior years.

Table 11.2
AGREEMENT THAT FEES ARE REASONABLE¹

Year	Percent Agree
2010	70.5%
2008 ³	65.3%
2006 ²	74.2%
2004	70.1%
2001 ³	74.4%
1999 ³	63.7%

¹Strongly agree and agree – 2010, 2006 and 2004 (five choices).

²Fees are generally affordable.

³Agree 2008, 2001 and 1999 (three choices).

Another question asked whether respondents agreed or disagreed with offering “Financial assistance (partial scholarships) for families who meet income guidelines.” Three of five (60.4%) residents agree (26.1% strongly agree, 34.3% agree), one-quarter (25.5%) neither agree nor disagree and 12.1% disagree, while another 1.9% did not respond.

The “financial assistance” question was also asked in 2008, when 58.0% agreed, 21.0% disagreed and 21.0% marked “don’t know” or did not answer. The 2010 results appear a bit more favorable toward providing partial scholarships.

A look at views on fees being reasonable reveals some demographic differences (Table 11.3). A definite finding is the agreement that fees are reasonable is directly related to education. Individuals with lower education are less likely to find fees reasonable (54.9% without high school diploma) with greatest agreement among respondents with a graduate degree (80.9%).

Other groups whose agreement levels were lower included 65+ (60.7%), 61101 (59.1%) and non-white (52.8%). These groups are more likely to find fees reasonable – some college and higher education and these zip codes – 61107 (76.6%) and 61114 (77.7%).

Table 11.3
FEES, SCHOLARSHIPS, REVENUE BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP¹

Group Characteristic	Fees are reasonable	RPD should offer scholarships	Explore revenue, saving ideas
ALL	72.6%	61.6%	84.8%
AGE GROUP (Years)			
18 - 29	71.9%	78.8%	90.6%
30 - 44	75.2%	74.3%	84.3%
45 - 64	73.3%	57.6%	85.3%
65+	60.7%	56.7%	83.5%
EDUCATION			
Less than H.S.	54.6%	59.1%	90.9%
H.S. diploma/GED	59.6%	58.1%	80.0%
Some college	74.1%	63.7%	87.1%
Associate degree	76.7%	67.2%	90.4%
Bachelor's degree	76.3%	64.1%	84.3%
Graduate degree	80.9%	56.4%	81.0%
RESIDENCE			
Northwest-61101	59.1%	47.7%	84.1%
Southwest-61102	69.2%	73.1%	92.3%
North End-61103	75.4%	65.1%	77.6%
East Central-61104	74.3%	62.9%	82.9%
Near Northeast-61107	76.6%	69.5%	86.3%
Southeast-61108	68.7%	54.8%	84.7%
Bypass-61109	71.4%	63.4%	81.7%
Loves Park-61111	72.3%	58.9%	91.8%
Far Northeast-61114	77.7%	53.4%	83.3%
GENDER			
Male	75.1%	49.8%	77.8%
Female	71.6%	68.1%	88.4%
RACE			
White, Non-Hispanic	75.7%	60.1%	84.1%
Non-white	52.8%	76.4%	86.1%
CHILDREN UNDER 18 AT HOME			
Yes	71.1%	74.8%	89.1%
No	73.1%	56.7%	83.2%

¹No answers excluded.

Exploring Ways to Save

Another fiscal question asked whether “The Park District should explore every opportunity to increase revenues, reduce expenses including selling or leasing existing buildings and land not useable for park activities.” This question was new in 2010.

Table 11.4
AGREEMENT WITH SAVINGS STEPS

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Dis-Agree	Strongly disagree	No Answer
The Park District should explore every opportunity to increase revenues, reduce expenses including selling or leasing existing buildings and land not useable for park activities.	43.8%	39.4%	12.1%	2.4%	0.5%	1.9%

Most survey participants agree with taking steps to save, a total of 83.2% - 43.8% of whom strongly agree and 39.4% agree.

Some demographic groups expressed very strong agreement with increasing revenue and reducing expenses, notable residents of 61102 (92.3%) and 61111 (91.8%), younger respondents (90.6%), and those without a high school diploma (90.9%) or with an associate degree (90.4%). The lowest levels of agreement came from males (77.8%) and residents of 61103 (77.6%).

Financial Comments

The most common comment (6) was to make programs and activities more affordable. Three persons suggested selling or leasing underused land or facilities, although two others said to be careful before selling.

Chapter 12 OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

Introduction

Respondents to the 2010 survey had several opportunities to express themselves through open-ended comments. Those comments have been integrated into the text except for the final question which asked if they wished to convey anything else for the Rockford Park District Board of Commissioners to consider when establishing priorities. These are summarized.

Converting open-ended comments into categories is a subjective exercise sometimes requiring interpretation of the thoughts of the respondents. Nevertheless, the comments offer insights into thinking in the community not possible to gain from structured questions.

Advice for the Commissioners

Asked “Is there anything else that you would like your Rockford Park District Board of Commissioners to consider when prioritizing programs and funding for services?” 190 persons wrote in their thoughts (30.0%). Verbatim comments for this question and all others may be found in Appendix 3. A summary of the comments receiving at least three mentions for this question is found below.

Praise for the District (38) dominated the comments such as “great parks.” Others included “keep services affordable” (12) maintain what you have (don’t expand now – 11) and increase parks, facilities in low-income areas (9).

Table 12.1
OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS
(Three or more mentions for question 67)

Comment	Number of Mentions
Praise for RPD, doing a good job	38
Keep services affordable	12
Maintain what you have	11
More services in low-income areas (not east side)	9
More paths/connect paths	5
More dog paths	4
Don’t need Riverwalk	3
Taxes too high, don’t raise	3
Improve restrooms	3

Appendix 1

SURVEY INSTRUMENT



June 2010

Greetings!

As a resident of the Rockford Park District, you are an “owner,” and the Board of Commissioners elected to represent you would like your ratings of the performance of our Rockford Park District. Please also give us your input to help allocate resources as we plan for the future.

You need not have used Rockford Park District facilities or programs to participate in this survey. Your household was selected at random to receive this survey.

The 2010 Citizen Survey will take no more than ten minutes and should be completed by an adult 18+ in your household. Your responses are anonymous.

As a “thank you” for completing and returning the survey by July 6, a page of coupons is included which are valid at: Carlson Ice Arena, Forest City Queen, Lockwood Park, Magic Waters, Sapora Playworld, the Trolley and Museums.

Sincerely,

Rockford Park District Board of Commissioners:

Jack L. Armstrong
Nate Martin

Douglas J. Brooks
Tyler Smith

Chuck Brown, PhD

**ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT
2010 CITIZEN SURVEY**

In each question, please mark the one category which best represents your views, feelings or experiences. Please feel free to add comments in the spaces provided.

Importance of the Rockford Park District

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
1. Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. It is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest resources to keep parks & recreation facilities well maintained.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Rockford Park District services should provide residents with diverse and well-supported recreational activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. It is important that Rockford Park District residents have exceptional parks and recreation facilities, services and programs at reasonable cost.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Performance of the Rockford Park District

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
5. There are excellent park spaces and recreation opportunities in our community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Rockford Park District parks and recreation facilities are well maintained.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Rockford Park District services meet my/my family's recreational needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Recreation is an essential part of my health/life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Recreational opportunities offered by the Rockford Park District encourage me to have a healthy lifestyle.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Safety and security

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
10. I feel safe when using Rockford Park District parks, recreation paths and outdoor spaces.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. I feel safe when using Rockford Park District indoor facilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comment _____					

Programs/Services and resource allocation

To guide decisions for programming and resource allocation, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

The Rockford Park District Should:	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
12. Teach introductory sports skills (such as tennis, ice skating, swimming and soccer) so that people can be active.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Offer outdoor environmental education programs with places for children to explore and learn about nature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Help to address childhood obesity by encouraging physical activity and playing outdoors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Pursue green alternatives (recycling, alternative energy sources, reduce use of pesticides and herbicides) to help protect the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Continue to invest in museums to enhance the culture, education, and quality of life in our community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Provide natural areas and prairies for preservation and wildlife habitat for public access.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Continue with community beautification, with floral gardens and flower baskets/ planters along the streets (City of Gardens)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Continue with reforestation efforts and planting trees.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Financial considerations

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
20. Fees are generally reasonable to participate in park district facilities, services and programs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Financial assistance (partial scholarships) for families who meet income guidelines should be offered.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. The Park District should explore every opportunity to increase revenue, reduce expenses, including selling or leasing existing buildings and land not useable for park activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comment _____					

Targeting services

Providing recreation programs and services for the following groups is very important.

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
23. Children 12 and under	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Teenagers 13-18	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Low income persons	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Adults 18 and over	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Adults 55+	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. People of all ages with disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Others _____					

Prioritization of funds

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement as to whether allocating Park District resources for the following uses is very important.

Statement	(5) Strongly agree	(4) Agree	(3) Neither agree nor disagree	(2) Disagree	(1) Strongly disagree
29. Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. Acquire land for new neighborhood parks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. Preserve land for later development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. Develop new neighborhood parks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Activities along the Rock River	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36. Expand or connect existing recreation paths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. Provide recreation programs for youth/teens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
38. Provide recreation programs for adults/senior citizens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39. Maintain District museums	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. Expand District museums	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comment _____					

Appearance and maintenance of parks and facilities

41. Please rate the appearance and maintenance of **parks and outdoor recreational areas/open space** including golf courses, sports fields, recreational paths, picnic shelters, tennis courts, and playgrounds, etc.

(5) <u>Excellent</u>	(4) <u>Good</u>	(3) <u>Fair</u>	(2) <u>Poor</u>	(1) <u>No opinion</u>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comment _____				

42. Please rate the appearance and maintenance of buildings and facilities such as ice skating facilities, Indoor Sports Center, golf course clubhouses, and museums, etc.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (5)
<u>Excellent</u>
○ | (4)
<u>Good</u>
○ | (3)
<u>Fair</u>
○ | (2)
<u>Poor</u>
○ | (1)
<u>No opinion</u>
○ |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|

Comment

Motivation or barriers to participation

43. Have you or a member of your household visited a Rockford Park District park, facility, museum or attended a Rockford Park District program in the past year?

- (1) Yes (2) No (Skip to Q. 51-60) (3) Not sure

Please mark any of the following reasons why you participate in leisure and recreation activities. **(Mark all that apply)**

- 44. Family time
- 45. Health and wellness
- 46. Fun/enjoyment
- 47. Relaxation and/or stress reduction
- 48. Skill development
- 49. Socialize
- 50. Any other reasons? _____

If no, which of the following barriers keep you or household members from participating in Rockford Park District programs or activities? **(Mark all that apply)**

- 51. Lack of time
- 52. Cost to participate
- 53. Need public transportation to RPD sites
- 54. Lack of ease (socializing, trying something new)
- 55. Not interested
- 56. Not aware of offerings
- 57. Language
- 58. Locations or times not convenient
- 59. Age, health or disability
- 60. Any other reasons? _____

Just a few questions about you

61. Are you?

- (1) Male (2) Female

62. Which is your age group?

- (1) 18-29 (2) 30-44 (3) 45-64 (4) 65+

63. Do you have children under 18 living in your home?

- (1) Yes (2) No

64. What is the highest grade that you finished in school?

- (1) Less than high school
 (2) High school diploma, GED
 (3) Some college, no degree
 (4) Associate or similar degree
 (5) Bachelor's degree
 (6) Graduate or Professional degree

65. Of what racial or ethnic group do you consider yourself?

- (1) White, Caucasian
 (2) Black or African American
 (3) Asian, Pacific Islander
 (4) Hispanic or Latino
 (5) Multi-racial
 (6) Other

66. What is your zip code? _____

What else would you like to tell us?

67. Is there anything else you would like your Rockford Park District Board of Commissioners to consider when prioritizing program and funding for services? (Please continue onto back page)

Study approved by the University of Illinois College of Medicine Institutional Review Board (IRB) on May 29, 2010. Research Support Services may be reached at 1.815.395.5942.

Appendix 2

Survey Frequencies

**ROCKFORD PARK DISTRICT
2010 CITIZEN SURVEY FREQUENCIES**

In each question, please mark the one category which best represents your views, feelings or experiences. Please feel free to add comments in the spaces provided.

1. Park space and recreation opportunities are essential for the quality of life in our community. (2010)

Recreation is a vital part (“essential” in 2006) of the quality of life in our community. (Question from 2008 and 2006.)

Response	2010		2008		2006	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	Response	Percent
Strongly agree	433	68.2%			Strongly agree	59.4%
Agree	177	27.9%	Agree	96.3%	Agree	39.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	2.2%				
Disagree	6	0.9%	Disagree	1.8%	Disagree	0.8%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%			Strongly disagree	0.0%
			Don't know	1.8%	Don't know	0.7%
No answer	3	0.5%				
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%		100.0%

Parks and open space are essential for the quality of life in our community. (Question from 2008 and 2006.)

Response	2010		2008		2006	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	Response	Percent
Strongly agree	433	68.2%			Strongly agree	61.5%
Agree	177	27.9%	Agree	96.3%	Agree	37.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	2.2%				
Disagree	6	0.9%	Disagree	1.1%	Disagree	0.3%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%			Strongly disagree	0.0%
			Don't know	2.5%	Don't know	0.4%
No answer	3	0.5%				
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%		100.0%

2. It is important that the Rockford Park District continue to invest resources to keep parks & recreation facilities well maintained.

Response	2010		2008		2006
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	
Strongly agree	420	66.1%			No comparison available
Agree	191	30.1%	Agree	87.9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	17	2.7%			
Disagree	3	0.5%	Disagree	2.3%	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%			
			Don't know	7.8%	
No answer	4	0.6%	No answer	2.1%	
Total	635	100%	Total	100.0%	

3. Rockford Park District services should provide residents with diverse and well-supported recreational activities.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	363	57.2%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	231	36.4%		
Neither agree nor disagree	29	4.6%		
Disagree	6	0.9%		
Strongly disagree	1	0.2%		
No answer	5	0.8%		
Total	635	100.0%		

4. It is important that Rockford Park District residents have exceptional parks and recreation facilities, services and programs at reasonable cost.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	403	63.5%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	201	31.7%		
Neither agree nor disagree	20	3.1%		
Disagree	7	1.1%		
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%		
No answer	4	0.6%		
Total	635	100.0%		

5. There are excellent park spaces and recreation opportunities in our community.

Response	2010		2008		2006
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	
Strongly agree	275	43.3%			No comparison available
Agree	301	47.4%	Agree	81.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	43	6.8%			
Disagree	10	1.6%	Disagree	7.3%	
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%			
			Don't know	11.6%	
No answer	6	0.9%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

6. Rockford Park District parks and recreation facilities are well maintained.

Response	2010		Response	Parks & Outdoor Facilities				Indoor Recreational Facilities			
	Number	Percent		Percent				Percent			
				2008	2006	2004	2001	2008	2006	2004	2001
Strongly agree	186	29.3%	Excellent	22.6%	28.5%	29.8%	33.1%	10.5%	13.0%	14.2%	14.0%
Agree	343	54.0%	Good	58.8%	55.7%	58.7%	57.7%	41.8%	39.5%	51.6%	48.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	78	12.3%	Fair	9.4%	12.4%	6.9%	7.7%	6.8%	9.7%	11.8%	16.9%
Disagree	20	3.1%	Poor	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.2%	1.1%	0.8%	1.7%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%	Don't know	6.6%	3.0%	3.5%	1.4%	40.2%	34.0%	21.2%	18.8%
No answer	6	0.9%	No answer	0.7%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7. Rockford Park District services meet my/my family's recreational needs.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	178	28.0%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	332	52.3%		
Neither agree nor disagree	99	15.6%		
Disagree	13	2.0%		
Strongly disagree	5	0.8%		
No answer	8	1.3%		
Total	635	100.0%		

8. Recreation is an essential part of my health/life.

Response	2010		2008		2006
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	
Strongly agree	233	36.7%			No comparison available
Agree	275	43.3%	Agree	95.0%	
Neither agree nor disagree	95	15.0%			
Disagree	21	3.3%	Disagree	2.3%	
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%			
			Don't know	2.7%	
No answer	9	1.4%	No answer		
Total	635	100%	Total	100.0%	

9. Recreational opportunities offered by the Rockford Park District encourage me to have a healthy lifestyle.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	152	23.9%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	266	41.9%		
Neither agree nor disagree	173	27.2%		
Disagree	30	4.7%		
Strongly disagree	6	0.9%		
No answer	8	1.3%		
Total	635	100.0%		

10. I feel safe when using Rockford Park District parks, recreation paths and outdoor spaces.

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	99	15.6%			No comparison available
Agree	347	54.6%	Agree	74.2%	
Neither agree nor disagree	142	22.4%			
Disagree	30	4.7%	Disagree	12.1%	
Strongly disagree	8	1.3%			
			Don't know	12.8%	
No answer	9	1.4%	No answer	0.9%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

11. I feel safe when using Rockford Park District indoor facilities.

Response	2010		Response	2008	2006
	Number	Percent		Percent	
Strongly agree	167	26.3%			No comparison available
Agree	285	44.9%	Agree	67.8%	
Neither agree nor disagree	154	24.3%			
Disagree	7	1.1%	Disagree	3.2%	
Strongly disagree	6	0.9%			
			Don't know	27.9%	
No answer	16	2.5%	No answer	1.1%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

To guide decisions for programming and resource allocation, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

12. Teach introductory sports skills* (such as tennis, ice skating, swimming and soccer) so that people can be active

Response	2010		2008		Response	Percent	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent		2006	2004
Strongly agree	245	38.6%			Strongly agree	20.8%	15.0%
Agree	302	47.6%	Agree	78.8%	Agree	55.1%	50.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	62	9.8%					
Disagree	15	2.4%	Disagree	8.9%	Disagree	15.2%	21.0%
Strongly disagree	4	0.6%			Strongly disagree	2.0%	3.0%
			Don't know	12.3%	Don't know	6.9%	11.0%
No answer	7	1.1%	No answer		No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%

*Question varied in previous surveys – “The Park District should teach people lifetime sports skills, such as tennis, golf, ice skating, swimming and soccer.”

13. Offer outdoor environmental education programs with places for children to explore and learn about nature.

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	309	48.7%			No comparison available
Agree	271	42.7%	Agree	90.2%	
Neither agree nor disagree	43	6.8%			
Disagree	4	0.6%	Disagree	3.4%	
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%			
			Don't know	5.3%	
No answer	5	0.8%	No answer	1.1%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

14. Help to address childhood obesity by encouraging physical activity and playing outdoors.

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	322	50.7%			No comparison available
Agree	239	37.6%	Agree	53.0%	
Neither agree nor disagree	53	8.3%			
Disagree	11	1.7%	Disagree	26.5%	
Strongly disagree	5	0.8%			
			Don't know	19.6%	
No answer	5	0.8%	No answer	0.9%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

*Question varied in previous surveys – “The Park District should provide programs and services that address childhood issues such as truancy and obesity.”

15. Pursue green alternatives (recycling, alternative energy sources, reduce use of pesticides and herbicides) to help protect the environment.

Response	2010		2008		Response	2006 Percent
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent		
Strongly agree	313	49.3%			Strongly agree	40.2%
Agree	234	36.9%	Agree	82.2%	Agree	51.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	64	10.1%				
Disagree	15	2.4%	Disagree	5.9%	Disagree	3.2%
Strongly disagree	4	0.6%			Strongly disagree	0.9%
			Don't know	11.9%	Don't know	4.3%
No answer	5	0.8%	No answer		No answer	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	Total	100.0%

16. Continue to invest in museums to enhance the culture, education, and quality of life in our community.

Response	2010		2008		Response	2006 Percent
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent		
Strongly agree	268	42.2%			Strongly agree	31.0%
Agree	266	41.9%	Agree	62.6%	Agree	55.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	71	11.2%				
Disagree	19	3.0%	Disagree	15.8%	Disagree	7.4%
Strongly disagree	6	0.9%			Strongly disagree	1.2%
			Don't know	21.7%	Don't know	5.0%
No answer	5	0.8%	No answer		No answer	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	Total	100.0%

17. Provide natural areas and prairies for preservation and wildlife habitat for public access.

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	311	49.0%			No comparison available
Agree	237	37.3%	Agree	88.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	65	10.2%			
Disagree	11	1.7%	Disagree	3.9%	
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%			
			Don't know	7.3%	
No answer	8	1.3%	No answer	0.7%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

*Question varied in previous survey – “The Park District should provide natural areas and prairies for preservation and wildlife habitat.”

18. Continue with community beautification, with floral gardens and flower baskets/planters along the streets (City of Gardens)

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	263	41.4%			No comparison available
Agree	244	38.4%	Agree	84.9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	90	14.2%			
Disagree	26	4.1%	Disagree	5.7%	
Strongly disagree	6	0.9%			
			Don't know	8.0%	
No answer	6	0.9%	No answer	1.4%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

19. Continue with reforestation efforts and planting trees.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	333	52.4%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	242	38.1%		
Neither agree nor disagree	42	6.6%		
Disagree	10	1.6%		
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%		
No answer	5	0.8%		
Total	635	100.0%		

20. Fees are generally reasonable to participate in park district facilities, services and programs.

Response	2010		2008		Response	Percent		Response	Percent	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent		2006*	2004		2001	1999
Strongly agree	115	18.1%			Strongly agree	15.2%	14.7%			
Agree	333	52.4%	Agree	65.3%	Agree	59.0%	55.4%	Agree	74.4%	63.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	123	19.4%								
Disagree	41	6.5%	Disagree	10.0%	Disagree	10.3%	8.3%	Disagree	10.9%	8.3%
Strongly disagree	5	0.8%			Strongly disagree	2.2%	3.4%			
			Don't know	23.7%	Don't know	18.3%	11.0%	Not sure	14.5%	27.3%
No answer	18	2.8%	No answer	0.9%	No answer			No answer	0.2%	0.7%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%

*Fees are generally affordable in Park District facilities, services and programs.

21. Financial assistance (partial scholarships) for families who meet income guidelines should be offered.

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	166	26.1%			No comparison available
Agree	218	34.3%	Agree	58.0%	
Neither agree nor disagree	162	25.5%			
Disagree	58	9.1%	Disagree	21.0%	
Strongly disagree	19	3.0%			
			Don't know	19.4%	
No answer	12	1.9%	No answer	1.6%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

22. The Park District should explore every opportunity to increase revenue, reduce expenses, including selling or leasing existing buildings and land not useable for park activities.

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	278	43.8%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	250	39.4%		
Neither agree nor disagree	77	12.1%		
Disagree	15	2.4%		
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%		
No answer	12	1.9%		
Total	635	100.0%		

Providing recreation programs and services for the following groups is very important.

23. Children 12 and under

Response	2010		2008 ¹		Percent ²			
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	2006	2004	2001	1999
Strongly agree	379	59.7%	1 – Not important at all	3.7%	1.2%	1.8%	0.5%	0.0%
Agree	200	31.5%	2	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	30	4.7%	3	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%
Disagree	7	1.1%	4	0.9%	0.4%	1.0%	0.2%	1.2%
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%	5	6.2%	5.1%	4.5%	1.7%	10.0%
			6	2.3%	2.2%	1.7%	0.5%	5.1%
			7	4.8%	4.2%	4.8%	1.7%	12.0%
			8	16.0%	16.2%	13.8%	12.8%	24.1%
			9	7.1%	10.5%	11.3%	10.1%	6.6%
			10 – Very important	51.8%	54.5%	52.5%	67.9%	34.6%
No answer	17	2.7%	No answer	6.2%	4.9%	7.8%	4.1%	6.3%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹Children 9 and under” in 2008.

²In previous surveys 1 = “Little emphasis” and 10 = “Great deal of importance.”

24. Teenagers 13-18

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	358	56.4%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	220	34.6%		
Neither agree nor disagree	28	4.4%		
Disagree	8	1.3%		
Strongly disagree	1	0.3%		
No answer	20	3.1%		
Total	635	100.0%		

25. Low income persons

Response	2010		2008		Percent ²			
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	2006	2004	2001	1999
Strongly agree	271	42.7%	1 – Not important at all	3.7%	1.6%	4.3%	3.4%	0.2%
Agree	211	33.2%	2	2.5%	1.5%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	98	15.4%	3	1.1%	0.8%	2.1%	0.5%	0.2%
Disagree	30	4.7%	4	0.9%	1.3%	4.1%	0.7%	2.0%
Strongly disagree	5	0.8%	5	10.3%	11.2%	12.7%	5.6%	14.6%
			6	4.1%	4.7%	4.1%	3.1%	9.0%
			7	7.8%	7.3%	8.8%	8.9%	18.3%
			8	15.1%	15.7%	20.4%	19.8%	25.9%
			9	6.8%	10.9%	8.2%	8.5%	9.0%
			10 – Very important	40.9%	36.0%	24.2%	42.0%	14.1%
No answer	20	3.1%	No answer	6.8%	8.9%	9.7%	7.0%	6.6%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

26. Adults 18 and over

Response	2010		2008 ¹		Percent ²			
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	2006	2004	2001	1999
Strongly agree	211	33.2%	1 – Not important at all	4.1%	2.0%	2.5%	1.2%	0.0%
Agree	300	47.2%	2	1.8%	1.2%	0.6%	0.7%	0.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	86	13.5%	3	1.4%	0.8%	2.3%	0.7%	0.0%
Disagree	15	2.4%	4	2.5%	2.3%	3.9%	0.7%	1.7%
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%	5	14.2%	14.0%	16.2%	12.3%	12.4%
			6	7.3%	9.0%	10.0%	8.5%	9.8%
			7	10.3%	13.1%	14.1%	14.5%	20.0%
			8	16.0%	19.6%	24.2%	27.1%	26.1%
			9	6.8%	7.2%	5.4%	5.3%	8.0%
			10 – Very important	28.8%	22.8%	12.4%	23.9%	15.4%
No answer	20	3.1%	No answer	6.8%	8.0%	8.4%	5.1%	6.3%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹“Adults 20 and over” in 2008.

27. Adults 55+¹

Response	2010		2008		Percent			
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	2006	2004	2001	1999
Strongly agree	258	40.6%	1 – Not important at all	2.1%	1.9%	2.6%	1.9%	0.0%
Agree	269	42.4%	2	1.8%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	75	11.8%	3	1.6%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%	0.0%
Disagree	12	1.9%	4	1.4%	2.0%	3.1%	1.4%	1.2%
Strongly disagree	3	0.5%	5	9.8%	12.4%	14.2%	6.0%	14.9%
			6	8.4%	7.7%	6.0%	5.1%	10.7%
			7	11.2%	11.2%	12.9%	8.5%	24.4%
			8	14.2%	17.4%	21.9%	21.0%	26.6%
			9	5.7%	8.1%	7.5%	8.0%	5.1%
			10 – Very important	36.8%	29.3%	22.0%	41.1%	10.7%
No answer	18	2.8%	No answer	7.1%	7.8%	8.3%	5.3%	6.3%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹“Senior citizens” in all previous surveys.

28. People of all ages with disabilities

Response	2010		2008	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent
Strongly agree	344	54.2%	1 – Not important at all	2.5%
Agree	224	35.3%	2	0.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	43	6.8%	3	1.1%
Disagree	3	0.5%	4	0.7%
Strongly disagree	4	0.6%	5	8.2%
			6	4.3%
			7	5.9%
			8	13.9%
			9	5.0%
			10 – Very important	51.6%
No answer	17	2.7%	No answer	5.9%
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement as to whether allocating Park District resources for the following uses is very important.

29. Maintain and repair existing parks and facilities

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	368	58.0%	Would definitely support	43.2%	No comparison available
Agree	241	38.0%	Might support	36.5%	
Neither agree nor disagree	13	2.0%			
Disagree	4	0.6%	Not likely to support	6.4%	
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%	Definitely would not support	7.1%	
			Don't know	6.9%	
No answer	7	1.1%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

30. Acquire land for new neighborhood parks

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	112	17.6%	Would definitely support	24.0%	No comparison available
Agree	218	34.3%	Might support	38.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	203	32.0%			
Disagree	69	10.9%	Not likely to support	20.1%	
Strongly disagree	18	2.8%	Definitely would not support	7.8%	
			Don't know	10.0%	
No answer	15	2.4%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

31. Preserve land for later development

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	123	19.4%			No comparison available
Agree	262	41.3%	Agree	42.5%	
Neither agree nor disagree	190	29.9%			
Disagree	30	4.7%	Disagree	24.0%	
Strongly disagree	12	1.9%			
			Don't know	32.9%	
No answer	18	2.8%	No answer	0.7%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

32. Increase managed natural areas (prairies, no-mow areas, wildlife habitat)

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	187	29.4%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	223	35.1%		
Neither agree nor disagree	169	26.6%		
Disagree	33	5.2%		
Strongly disagree	9	1.4%		
No answer	14	2.2%		
Total	635	100.0%		

33. Develop new neighborhood parks

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	133	20.9%			No comparison available
Agree	233	36.7%	Agree	69.6%	
Neither agree nor disagree	177	27.9%			
Disagree	60	9.4%	Disagree	11.6%	
Strongly disagree	16	2.5%			
			Don't know	16.9%	
No answer	16	2.5%	No answer	1.8%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

34. Develop indoor year-round facilities (basketball, volleyball, turf sports)

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	160	25.2%	Would definitely support	22.6%	No comparison available
Agree	260	40.9%	Might support	43.6%	
Neither agree nor disagree	146	23.0%			
Disagree	41	6.5%	Not likely to support	16.7%	
Strongly disagree	13	2.0%	Definitely would not support	7.5%	
			Don't know	8.0%	
No answer	15	2.4%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

35. Activities along the Rock River

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	198	31.2			No comparison available
Agree	279	43.8	Agree	65.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	111	17.5			
Disagree	20	3.1	Disagree	14.8%	
Strongly disagree	9	1.4			
			Don't know	18.7%	
No answer	19	3.0	No answer	1.4%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

36. Expand or connect existing recreation paths

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	215	33.9%			No comparison available
Agree	242	38.1%	Agree	70.8%	
Neither agree nor disagree	114	18.0%			
Disagree	34	5.4%	Disagree	9.1%	
Strongly disagree	14	2.2%			
			Don't know	18.7%	
No answer	16	2.5%	No answer	1.4%	
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

37. Provide recreation programs for youth/teens

Response	2010		Response	2008 Percent	2006
	Number	Percent			
Strongly agree	258	40.6%	Would definitely support	37.7%	No comparison available
Agree	300	47.2%	Might support	40.9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	57	9.0%			
Disagree	6	0.9%	Not likely to support	6.6%	
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%	Definitely would not support	6.6%	
			Don't know	5.9%	
No answer	12	1.9%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

38. Provide recreation program for adults/senior citizens

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	203	32.0%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	299	47.1%		
Neither agree nor disagree	102	16.1%		
Disagree	17	2.7%		
Strongly disagree	2	0.3%		
No answer	12	1.9%		
Total	635	100.0%		

39. Maintain District museums

Response	2010		2008	2006
	Number	Percent		
Strongly agree	217	34.2%	No comparison available	No comparison available
Agree	313	49.3%		
Neither agree nor disagree	71	11.2%		
Disagree	15	2.4%		
Strongly disagree	6	0.9%		
No answer	13	2.0%		
Total	635	100.0%		

40. Expand District museums

Response	2010		2008	2006	
	Number	Percent	Response	Percent	
Strongly agree	125	19.7%	Would definitely support	16.7%	No comparison available
Agree	198	31.2%	Might support	38.4%	
Neither agree nor disagree	207	32.6%			
Disagree	57	9.0%	Not likely to support	23.1%	
Strongly disagree	27	4.3%	Definitely would not support	11.2%	
			Don't know	10.7%	
No answer	21	3.3%	No answer		
Total	635	100.0%	Total	100.0%	

41. Please rate the appearance and maintenance of **parks and outdoor recreational areas/open space** including golf courses, sports fields, recreational paths, picnic shelters, tennis courts, and playgrounds, etc.

Response	2010		Percent			
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001
Excellent	202	31.8%	22.6%	28.5%	29.8%	33.1%
Good	351	55.3%	59.8%	55.7%	58.7%	57.7%
Fair	51	8.0%	9.4%	12.4%	6.9%	7.7%
Poor	7	1.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%
No opinion ¹	13	2.0%	---	---	---	---
Don't know ²	---	---	6.6%	3.0%	3.5%	1.4%
No answer	11	1.7%	0.7%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹"No opinion" response available in 2010 only

²"Don't know" response not available in 2010.

42. Please rate the appearance and maintenance of buildings and facilities such as ice skating facilities, Indoor Sports Center, golf course clubhouses, and museums, etc.

Response	2010		Percent			
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001
Excellent	146	23.0%	10.5%	13.0%	14.2%	14.0%
Good	341	53.7%	41.8%	39.5%	51.6%	48.6%
Fair	53	8.3%	6.8%	9.7%	11.8%	16.9%
Poor	3	0.5%	0.2%	1.1%	0.8%	1.7%
No opinion ¹	70	11.0%	---	---	---	---
Don't know ²	---	---	40.2%	34.0%	21.2%	18.8%
No answer	22	3.5%	0.5%	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹"No opinion" response available in 2010 only.

²"Don't know" response not available in 2010.

43. Have you or a member of your household visited a Rockford Park District park, facility, museum or attended a Rockford Park District program in the past year?

Response	2010		Percent				
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Yes	478	75.3%	81.5%	87.2%	79.6%	86.7%	85.6%
No	97	15.3%	13.7%	9.4%	16.2%	12.1%	8.5%
Not sure	18	2.8%	3.0%	1.5%	2.2%	1.2%	5.6%
No answer	42	6.6%	1.8%	1.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

44-50. Please mark any of the following reasons why you participate in leisure and recreation activities. (Mark all that apply)

Response	2010		Percent	
	Number	Percent	2008	2006
Family time	324	51.0%	58.0%	61.4%
Health and wellness	352	55.4%	67.8%	50.2%
Fun/enjoyment	458	72.1%	74.9%	73.3%
Relaxation and/or stress reduction	334	52.6%	62.1%	73.3%
Skill development	120	18.9%	15.3%	22.9%
Socialize	226	35.6%	41.8%	45.3%
Any other reason	52	8.2%	5.5%	6.1%

51-60. If no, which of the following barriers keep you or household members from participating in Rockford Park District programs or activities? (Mark all that apply)

Barriers	2010		Percent			
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2001	1999
Lack of time	103	16.2%	37.7%	29.4%	6.0%	1.7%
Cost to participate	68	10.7%	24.9%	17.0%	9.7%	0.2%
Need public transportation to RPD sites	14	2.2%	7.1%	5.0%	1.2%	1.0%
Lack of ease (socializing, trying something new)	16	2.5%	---	---	---	---
Not interested	25	3.9%	8.7%	7.0%	1.4%	0.5%
Not aware of offerings	68	10.7%	33.6%	---	---	---
Language	5	0.8%	1.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%
Locations or times not convenient	48	7.6%	---	---	---	---
Age, health or disability	64	10.1%	---	---	---	---
Any other reasons?	25	3.9%	---	---	---	---

61. Are you?

Response	2010		Percent				
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Male	214	33.7%	35.8%	34.5%	40.9%	37.7%	38.8%
Female	413	65.0%	62.8%	64.6%	58.7%	62.1%	61.0%
No answer	8	1.3%	1.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

62. Which is your age group?

Response	2010		Percent				
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
18-29	33	5.2%	5.3%	9.4%	7.9%	13.3%	13.7%
30-44	123	19.4%	20.5%	23.3%	21.5%	24.6%	29.5%
45-64	290	45.7%	45.2%	40.6%	37.3%	32.1%	33.9%
65+	180	28.3%	27.4%	25.5%	32.6%	29.7%	22.7%
No answer	9	1.4%	1.65	1.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

63. Do you have children under 18 living in your home?

Response	2010		Percent	
	Number	Percent	2008	2006
Yes	177	27.9%	27.6%	35.5%
No	448	70.6%	71.0%	64.0%
No answer	10	1.6%	1.4%	0.5%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

64. What is the highest grade that you finished in school?

Response	2010		Percent				
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
Less than high school	22	3.5%	2.1%	6.2%	4.8%	11.4%	7.1%
High school diploma, GED	112	17.6%	21.5%	24.0%	25.9%	38.6%	50.2%
Some college, no degree	175	27.6%	22.1%	25.6%	26.8%	19.8%	16.8%
Associate or similar degree	73	11.5%	12.8%	10.3%	10.9%	6.3%	5.6%
Bachelor's degree	122	19.2%	19.9%	20.1%	18.4%	14.0%	13.4%
Graduate or professional degree	120	18.9%	19.2%	12.8%	12.2%	9.2%	5.4%
No answer	11	1.7%	2.5%	0.9%	1.2%	0.7%	1.5%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

65. Of what racial or ethnic group do you consider yourself?

Response	2010		Percent	
	Number	Percent	2008	2006
White, Caucasian	538	84.7%	85.4%	82.9%
Black or African American	31	4.9%	5.3%	8.2%
Asian, Pacific Islander	9	1.4%	0.9%	0.9%
Hispanic or Latino	15	2.4%	2.1%	4.2%
Multi-racial	11	1.7%	1.6%	0.9%
Other	6	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%
No answer	25	3.9%	3.9%	1.6%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

66. What is your zip code?

Response	2010		Percent				
	Number	Percent	2008	2006	2004	2001	1999
61101 – NW Rockford	45	7.1%	5.9%	8.4%	8.3%	11.1%	10.7%
61102 – SW Rockford	26	4.1%	5.5%	6.3%	6.1%	9.7%	8.8%
61103 – North End Rockford	68	10.7%	12.8%	12.7%	11.8%	12.8%	13.4%
61104 – Near SE Rockford	35	5.5%	6.2%	5.5%	6.6%	9.7%	10.7%
61107 – Near NE Rockford	146	23.0%	24.2%	18.9%	20.3%	14.3%	13.7%
61108 – Far SE Rockford	80	12.6%	15.5%	15.4%	14.5%	13.0%	13.9%
61109 – Bypass area Rockford	71	11.2%	6.2%	9.0%	11.6%	11.1%	12.2%
61111 – Loves Park	75	11.8%	10.3%	12.4%	9.3%	10.1%	8.3%
61114 – Far NE Rockford	60	9.4%	9.6%	9.3%	9.2%	8.2%	8.3%
Other	5	0.8%	0.7%	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
No answer	24	3.8%	3.2%	0.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	635	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

67. Is there anything else you would like your Rockford Park District Board of Commissioners to consider when prioritizing program and funding for services? (Please continue onto back page)