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Purpose of Master Plan

• Guide both long & short-range park planning.
• Provide equitable parks, trails and recreational facilities for all citizens.
• Identify areas underserved by parks and trails.
• Prioritize park, trail & recreational facility acquisition & development.
• Schedule capital improvement projects based on priority & available funding.
• Guide acquisition of parks and trails in new development areas in order to meet growth needs
• Achieve level of service standards and community vision goals.
2013 Parks, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan

• Kick-off meeting Oct 18, 2011
• Record number of citizen input
  – 1,539 completed citizen surveys
  – 58 park user/partner meetings (325 citizens)
• Two new chapters
  – P&R Strategic Plan
  – Accomplishments from 2002 P&R Master Plan
• Visioning goals and strategies
• Primary goal: identify needs for our park system for the next 10 years
Needs Identification
1. Standards
2. Trends
3. Public Input
4. Staff Analysis
Facility Standards

Comparison of Columbia’s outdoor facilities to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources “Outdoor Recreation Development Goals.”

These are the standards used for grants.

**Significant Deficiencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails</th>
<th>Picnic Shelters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Softball/Baseball Fields</td>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Fields</td>
<td>Horseshoe Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>Campsites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Outdoor Recreation Facilities--Deficits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Trail</td>
<td>24.07 miles</td>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>453 tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>33 shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail (gravel loop trails)</td>
<td>12.44 miles</td>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>6 pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Trail (natural or mowed trails)</td>
<td>12.87 miles</td>
<td>Softball/Baseball Football Fields</td>
<td>35 diamonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Trail (trails w/equipment)</td>
<td>28.07 miles</td>
<td>Campsites</td>
<td>33 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Trail (trails developed using AASHTO guides-MKT)</td>
<td>14.18 miles</td>
<td>Horseshoe Courts Shuffleboard Cts Basketball Cts</td>
<td>25 courts 26 courts 4 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Trail (hard surface)</td>
<td>25.84 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total trail deficit: 117.47 miles
## Outdoor Recreation Facilities Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Soccer fields</em></td>
<td>1 field</td>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rink</td>
<td>1 rink</td>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>4 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>2 parks</td>
<td>Handball and Racquetball Courts</td>
<td>3 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>13 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Surface Multi-Use Courts</td>
<td>39 courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Playfields</td>
<td>43 playfields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: When calculating total number of soccer fields in Columbia, 11 school fields are included.*
Trends

• Recreation trends are influenced by a continuous change in marketing, demographics, technology, education & economics.

• Purpose of chapter is to identify recreation & leisure trends that may impact programming & facility needs.

• Chapter has three sections
  I. National trends that impact P&R Dept.
  II. Municipal recreation policy and operating trends
  III. Facility and program trends related to P&R Dept.
Public Input

- Random Citizen Survey (ETC): March-April 2010
  - 753 surveys returned
- Park User Survey: November-December 2011
  - 786 surveys returned
- Met with 58 P&R User Groups & Partners
- Draft Plan Input:
  - 50+ attended open meeting on April 24, 2013
  - Multiple events
  - Posted online
Random Citizen Survey (ETC Institute)

**Major Findings**

- Usage of park system is high with excellent satisfaction:
  - 87% of households use the parks
  - 95% rate conditions as excellent or good
  - Walking & biking trails most visited
Random Citizen Survey (ETC Institute)

Major Findings

• Most important facilities and programs:
  - Walking and biking trails
  - Small neighborhood parks
  - Large community parks
  - Playground equipment and play areas
  - Special events/festivals
  - Adult fitness and wellness programs
  - Nature education programs
Staff Analysis of Identified Needs

1. Acquisition
   A. Neighborhood Parks
   B. Community Parks
   C. Regional Parks
   D. Special Purpose Parks
   E. Natural Resource Parks

2. Development
   A. Existing Parks and Facilities
   B. New Facilities
## Additions/Removals to the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions/Removal</th>
<th>2008 Plan</th>
<th>2013 Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of Blue Ridge School and east of Oakland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Area primarily commercial/office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of County Rd. WW and east of El Chaparral Nghbrhd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scheduled for Acquisition</td>
<td>Developer agreement to transfer portion to City for park purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Scott Blvd. &amp; South of Vawter School Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Large single family lot development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Farm Area</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>University does not seem to have plans to sell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of I-70 near Perche Creek</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td>129.37 ac acquired on Strawn Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of I-70 near Barberry Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td>5.28 acres acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Changed</td>
<td>2008 Plan</td>
<td>2013 Plan</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 in 2013</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Priority moved up with likelihood of residential development near Battle High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 in 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19 in 2003</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Less priority for park land acquisition with type of development in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17 in 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Location Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Changed</th>
<th>2008 Plan</th>
<th>2013 Plan</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of Lake of the Woods Park</td>
<td>#13</td>
<td>#9</td>
<td>Location shifted north due to likely development patterns around Battle HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle High School Area</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Location shifted north and west due to likely development patterns around Battle HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs are met.
Needs are met.
H3 Studio report identifies AmerenUE site as possible Public Park or Square.
Our Natural Legacy Plan is underway.
## Additions/Removals to the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions/Removal</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thornbrook Connector 0.9 miles</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connects Thornbrook Subdivision to proposed Mill Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bonne Femme Trail 6.8 miles</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connects RBSP to the Katy Trail along the Little Bonne Femme Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hominy Creek Trail 1.0 m Molly-Mexico</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connects future residents to Battle High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hominy Creek Trail 1.3 m Molly-Battle Ave.</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connects future residents to Battle High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hominy Creek Trail 1.2 m Clark-Rice Rd.</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connects NE residents to trail system via Hominy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Rd. to Hinkson Creek Trail Connector 0.4 miles</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connecting residential along Rice Rd. to future phase of Hinkson Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Additions/Removals to the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions/Removal</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Drive to Cosmo Park 0.8 miles</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Creasy Springs Rd. at Texas Ave. to CCRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Park Connector 0.7 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>East-West connector from Shepard Blvd. &amp; Old 63 Roadside Park to East Campus at Rollins Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor Park Connector to Bear Creek Trail 0.4 miles</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connecting Proctor Park to Bear Creek Trail at the Garth Nature Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Oak Connector 0.2 miles. Lynnwood to Crawford via existing Red Oak ROW</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Very steep terrain leads to a high cost of development for the few residents it would serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmo-Bethel Connector 0.7 miles</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
<td>Connecting Cosmo-Bethel and RBHS from Bedford Walk to S. Providence Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes in Priority Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Priority</th>
<th>2013 Priority</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Fork of the Grindstone Creek Trail 5.3 miles. Maguire-Battle High School</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Connects the new Battle High School to the trail system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmo Park (CCRA) 0.8 miles. Stadium-Bear Creek Trail</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>North-South trail from the Cosmo Park hard surface trail to the Bear Creek Trail at north end of park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hominy Creek Trail 0.8 miles. Old 63 to Green Valley Drive</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Connects Hinkson Creek Trail to the Hominy Creek Trail via Hominy Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trail Projects Completed, Funded or Under Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott’s Branch Trail 1.5 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County House Trail 2.0 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hominy Creek Trail 2.6 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Providence Trail 1.7 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbriar Connector 0.4 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindstone Creek Trail 1.75 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkson Creek Trail (pedway) 2 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasslands to Garth Connector 0.2 miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Place Connector 0.4 miles</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips Lake/Gans Creek internal trails 2.0+/- miles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trails Chapter

• Chapter now include pros/cons of all types of trail surfaces.
  – Natural Surface
  – Granular Stone
  – Asphalt

• Cost estimates based on concrete and gravel, as these are most used for destination trails.
Recommended Capital Improvements

Existing Facilities

- Every park & facility evaluated for needed improvements over the next 10 years.
- Four Categories:
  1. Misc. Park Improv (signs, lights, etc.)
  2. Repair
  3. Renovate
  4. Replace
## Existing Parks & Facilities Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atkins Park</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation well pump station</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct four medium shelters (FAL)</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct three medium playgrounds</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install three synthetic playground safety surfaces</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct restroom</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct two new 285' fields with lights</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop five field complex (200' fields/t-ball fields) w/ concession restroom</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (roads, parking, stormwater development, utilities, etc.)</td>
<td>$1,383,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleachers, shade structures, batting cages, and drinking fountains</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian loop trail &amp; connection to Fairgrounds (partner w/Boone County)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auburn Hills Park</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misc. park improvements - includes lights (FAL)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert existing gravel trail to concrete (FAL)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Capital Improvements
New Facilities

- Tourism Development Facilities
  - Campground
  - Disc Golf
  - Multi-sports Field House
  - Synthetic Turf Sports Complex
Recommended Capital Improvements

New Facilities – Location Undetermined or Multiple Locations

- **Indoor Examples**
  - Ice Rink
  - Community/Rec Center
  - Pickleball (4-6 courts)
  - Racquetball (2-4 courts)

- **Outdoor**
  - Archery to Winter Sports Park
Recommended Capital Improvements

Cooperative Joint-Use Facilities

- Indoor competition/recreation pool
- Tennis bubble (4 courts)
- Nature/interpretative center
- Elementary school gymnasium expansion
- Mid-Missouri Events Center (home of the Boone County Fair)
2013 Public Comments

• Comments & recommendations summarized on Attachment C & included in plan on website.

• Staff recommends inclusion of:
  – Add small bicycle campsites along/near MKT.
  – N. Fork of Grindstone Trail-Maguire to Battle HS from Secondary to Primary.
  – Trails chapter includes all surfaces.

• Includes CIP Chapter Updates.
Concludes Presentation

• Following the public hearing, Council may direct staff to revise the master plan as presented and/or with Council revisions.
  – If further discussion is needed, Council may schedule a work session.

• Once direction is given, staff will return to Council with an Ordinance to approve the 2013 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.
Supporting Slides

• Following slides provide further information but will not be discussed in the presentation.
National Trends

• Adult & Childhood Obesity
  – Approx 10% of BoCo children are overweight or obese.

• Ethnic Diversity
  – 2035: 1/3 of American youth U18 will be Latino

• Economic Climate
  – Columbia’s 22.9% poverty rate is higher than both state and national rate

• Bicycles & Non-Motorized Transportation
  – Bicycle trips in Columbia increased 26% 2007-2010

• Technology & Social Learning
Policy Trends

- Power-Driven Mobility Devices on Trails & Parks
- Tobacco-Free Zones in Parks & Playgrounds
Policy Trends

• Sustainable Design & Management Practices
• Special Events Increasing
• Urban Wildlife and Habitat Management
P&R Facility & Program Trends

• Sports Tourism Facilities
  – Large, quality destination site complexes
  – Range from $9-$36 million price tag

• Waterparks
  – Generate revenue for aquatic programs

• Bike Parks & Mountain Bike Facilities

• Outdoor Adult Gyms

• Nature Playgrounds/Nature Explorer Classrooms
P&R Facility & Program Trends

- Community Gardens
- Sensory Gardens
- Skate Spots
- Bocce Courts
- Dog Parks
- Shade Structures
- Artificial Turf Fields
- Synthetic Playground Surfaces
- Archery
- Lacrosse
Trends

B. Participation Trends

1. National Sporting Goods Association
2. Parks and Rec Program Participation
# National Sporting Goods Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>2011 Total (million)</th>
<th>Percent Change from 2010</th>
<th>2007 Total (million)</th>
<th>2003 Total (million)</th>
<th>2011 vs. 2001 Sports with over 15% change in participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Walking</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising with Equipment</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (vacation/overnight)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Exercise</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Riding</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workout at Club</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends

B. Participation Trends

1. National Sporting Goods Association

2. Parks and Rec Program Participation
   a. Adult Sports – Steady
   b. Youth Sports – Programs decreasing. Field rentals increasing (competitive)
   c. Golf – Recovering
   d. Special Events, Community Recreation, Life Enrichment, Special Olympics – Increasing
   e. ARC – Increasing
   f. Pools – Weather dependent
Technology Requests: Park User Survey

Q20. Indicate level of support for various actions to improve technology within the parks and recreation system by percentage of respondents:

- Develop online reservation system for picnic shelters: 50% Very Supportive, 40% Somewhat Supportive, 6% Not Supportive, 4% Not Sure
- Develop mobile applications for smartphones: 42% Very Supportive, 35% Somewhat Supportive, 15% Not Supportive, 8% Not Sure
- Provide wireless internet access in the parks: 27% Very Supportive, 35% Somewhat Supportive, 34% Not Supportive, 4% Not Sure
- Develop online videos: 14% Very Supportive, 43% Somewhat Supportive, 27% Not Supportive, 16% Not Sure
- Develop online golf tee time reservations: 18% Very Supportive, 31% Somewhat Supportive, 31% Not Supportive, 20% Not Sure
- Provide webcams at various parks and facilities: 16% Very Supportive, 27% Somewhat Supportive, 42% Not Supportive, 14% Not Sure

Source: 2011 Park User Survey
How Many Parks are Needed?

- National standards are disappearing.
- Focus is on specific community demands compared to the existing level of services offered.
- Consideration is based:
  - Areas not served
  - Barriers to service (ie, major roads)
  - Proximity of private or other public lands
  - Partnerships (Public Schools, MDC, Columbia College, etc.)
Park Acres – 1994

• Columbia Population: 74,072
• Park Acres: 1,839.7
• 25 acres/1000 population
Park Acres – 2002

- Columbia Population: 88,291
- Park Acres: 2,094
- 24 acres/1000 population
Park Acres – 2013

- Columbia Population: 116,843
- Park Acres: 3,172
- 27 acres/1000 population
- 1,078 ac. Growth Includes:
  - Southeast Regional Park: 460 acres
  - Waters-Moss Transfer: 110.3 acres
  - Battle High School property: 30.19 acres
Park Acres – 2022 Projection

- Columbia Population: 145,921 (2.5% annual growth)
- Park Acres: 3,172 (same as 2013)
- 22 acres/1000 population
- Acquisition needs:
  - 767 acres to meet 2013 ratio of 27 acres per 1,000 population.
  - 476 acres to meet 1994 ratio of 25 acres per 1,000 population
COMPONENTS OF THE PREFERRED PLAN

1. Urban Boulevard: Make College Avenue a signature street by adding medians, street trees, safe pedestrian connections, and way-finding signage.

2. Campus Entrance: Enhanced institutional development at intersection of College and Broadway.

3. Hotel Gateway: Private hotel development (with pedestrian pathway from Broadway to Walnut) as catalytic project and gateway to downtown.

4. Columbia College Connector: Enhance the pedestrian connections from Columbia College to Broadway Street.

5. Neighborhood Network: Reconfigure the street grid to the north of Walnut Street and east of College Avenue.

6. Public Park/Square: Convert Ameren UE site to public space and amenity.

7. Neighborhood Stormwater: Add bike boulevard to Park Avenue with stormwater retention for the neighborhood.

8. Artist Studio's Live/Work Trail: Add more housing and link to future trail connection to Centralla along COLT line.

9. Residential Infill Development: Encourage a diversity of housing types throughout the priority area.

10. Campus Housing: Embrace the campus expansion plans and future student housing and development.

11. Elm Street Extension: Extend Elm Street from 10th St to College Avenue.

12. Lee Expressive Arts School: Expand and reconfigure the school grounds to create drop off and more open space.

13. Development Opportunity: Encourage private infill development and redevelopment near the campuses south of Broadway and west of College Avenue.
Public Input Slides

• Key slides from surveys.
Q1a. Parks that households visit most often (top 10 shown) by percentage of respondents

- Cosmo Park: 77%
- Stephens Lake Park: 52%
- Cosmo-Bethel Park: 23%
- Twin Lakes Recreation Area: 13%
- Albert-Oakland Park: 10%
- Flat Branch Park: 14%
- Grindstone Nature Area: 10%
- Capen Park: 8%
- Rock Quarry Park: 7%
- Forum Nature Area: 6%

Source: 2011 Park User Survey
Q3. City of Columbia Parks and Recreation Facilities That Households Have Visited Over the Past 12 Months

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Walking, hiking, and biking trails: 70%
- Picnic shelters: 50%
- Playgrounds: 47%
- Nature trails: 41%
- Activity & Recreation Center (ARC): 38%
- Natural areas: 28%
- Swimming pools: 25%
- Spraygrounds/spray parks: 22%
- Stephens Lake swim beach: 22%
- Stephens Lake Activity Center: 21%
- Off-leash areas/dog parks: 20%
- Softball/baseball fields: 17%
- Golf courses: 17%
- Soccer fields: 16%
- Historic home/farm: 14%
- Tennis courts: 13%
- Boating and fishing areas: 11%
- Armory Sports Center: 9%
- Mountain biking trails: 6%
- Outdoor basketball courts: 6%
- Skateboard/roller hockey park: 6%
- Football/lacrosse fields: 5%
- Disc golf: 5%
- Other: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Park User Survey

Q2a. Parks and Recreation trails that households visit most often
by percentage of respondents

- MKT Trail: 75%
- Stephens Lake Park - Lake or Perimeter Trail: 44%
- Bear Creek Trail: 26%
- Twin Lakes Recreation Area - Lake Trail: 23%
- Grindstone Nature Area/Capen Park - Nature Trails: 20%
- Forum Nature Area - Nature Trails: 14%
- Cosmo Park - Fitness Trail (asphalt): 13%
- Hinkson Creek Trail: 13%
- (Any) Neighborhood Park Trails: 12%
- Albert-Oakland Park - Fitness Trail: 8%
- Cosmo Park - Nature Trails: 8%
- Rock Quarry Park - Perimeter Trail: 7%
- Cosmo-BETHEL Park - Lake Trail: 5%
- Providence Road Pedway: 3%
- County House Trail: 1%
- Cosmo Park - Rhett's Run Mountain Bike Trail: 0%

Source: 2011 Park User Survey
Q7. Recreation Programs Provided by the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department That Households Have Participated in Over the Past 12 Months

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

1. Special Events (28%)
2. Youth & Adult Sports (26%)
3. Aquatics (22%)
4. Fitness/Exercise (14%)
5. Golf (11%)
6. Volunteerism (7%)
7. Outdoor/nature education (6%)
8. Community recreation programs (5%)
9. Adaptive programming (5%)
10. Life enrichment classes (5%)
11. Senior programs (2%)
12. Youth at-risk programs (1%)
13. Other (4%)

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Households learn about parks and recreation programs and activities through a variety of ways.

- Learning about activities through the Parks and Recreation Website significantly higher than national benchmark of 15%.
- Learning about activities through Activity Guide significantly higher than national benchmark of 51%.

Q14. Ways Respondents Learn About City of Columbia Parks and Recreation Programs and Activities

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- “Leisure Times” Activity Guide: 63%
- Newspaper articles/advertisements: 47%
- From friends and neighbors: 47%
- Parks & Recreation Website: 35%
- Radio: 30%
- Television: 28%
- School flyers/newsletter: 22%
- Repeat Customer: 19%
- Flyers/Newsletters in mail: 19%
- Info displayed at P&R facility: 10%
- E-mail bulletins or E-newsletters: 6%
- Conversations with P&R staff: 3%
- Facebook: 3%
- Twitter: 1%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q5. Reasons That Prevent Households from Using Columbia’s Parks and Recreation Facilities

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

We are too busy or not interested: 26%
Household uses facilities from other organizations: 13%
Location of City facilities not close to my home: 12%
Fees are too expensive: 11%
Security is insufficient: 7%
Not enough shade/trees: 5%
I don't know where City facilities are located: 5%
Facilities are not well maintained: 4%
Parks do not contain the facilities we need: 3%
Hours of operation are not convenient: 3%
Facilities do not have the right equipment: 2%
Rules are too restrictive: 2%
Poor customer service by staff: 1%
City does not have quality programs: 1%
Other: 12%

City does not have quality programs is significantly lower than national benchmark of 7%
I do not know where City facilities are located is significantly lower than national benchmark of 13%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q9. Households That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Walking and biking trails 76%
- Park shelters and picnic areas 70%
- Small (2-10 acres) neighborhood parks 68%
- Large community parks 66%
- Nature trails 55%
- Playground equipment and play areas 51%
- Outdoor pool and aquatic area 47%
- Indoor fitness and exercise facilities 45%
- Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool 45%
- Nature trails 45%
- Outdoor running/walking track 45%
- Spraygrounds/spray parks 45%
- Ice skating 33%
- Outdoor amphitheater/theater 31%
- Off-leash dog parks 31%
- Baseball and softball fields 30%
- Golf courses 29%
- Sledding hills & cross country skiing 29%
- Boating and fishing 29%
- Outdoor tennis courts 25%
- Soccer fields 24%
- Indoor shelters/meeting space 23%
- Outdoor basketball courts 22%
- Mountain bike trails 21%
- Nature interpretive center 21%
- Indoor basketball/volleyball courts 21%
- Football/Lacrosse fields 21%
- Skateboard park/bike park 11%
- Equestrian trails 5%

Households have a need for a wide range of parks and recreation facilities

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q9a. Estimated Number of Households in the City of Columbia That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities

by number of households based on 40,315 households in Columbia

Walking and biking trails: 30,438
Park shelters and picnic areas: 28,221
Small (2-10 acres) neighborhood parks: 27,414
Large community parks: 26,406
Nature trails: 21,972
Playground equipment and play areas: 20,440
Outdoor pool and aquatic area: 19,069
Indoor fitness and exercise facilities: 18,830
Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool: 18,263
Outdoor running/walking track: 17,980
Spraygrounds/spray parks: 13,385
Ice skating: 12,659
Outdoor amphitheater/theater: 12,457
Off-leash dog parks: 11,893
Baseball and softball fields: 11,772
Golf courses: 11,490
Sledding hills & cross country skiing: 11,490
Boating and fishing: 10,119
Outdoor tennis courts: 9,998
Soccer fields: 9,514
Indoor shelters/meeting space: 9,353
Outdoor basketball courts: 8,789
Mountain bike trails: 8,506
Nature interpretive center: 8,466
Indoor basketball/volleyball courts: 8,426
Football/Lacrosse fields: 4,556
Skateboard park/bike park: 4,435
Equestrian trails: 2,137

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q10. Parks and Recreation Facilities That Are Most Important to Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

Walking and biking trails are the #1 most important facility for households without children and households with children 10-19 years of age (none under 10)

Small neighborhood parks are the #1 most important facility for households with children under 10 years of age

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q12. Recreation Programs That Are Most Important to Households
by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

Special events/festivals: 29%
Adult fitness and wellness programs: 26%
Youth Learn to Swim programs: 16%
Youth/teen sports programs: 15%
Nature education programs/Outdoor adventure: 15%
Adult sports programs: 12%
Education/Life skills programs: 10%
Pre-school programs: 8%
Water fitness programs: 8%
Golf lessons: 8%
Adult art, dance, performing arts: 7%
Youth/teen summer camp programs: 7%
Senior programs: 6%
Before and after school programs: 6%
Travel programs: 6%
Tennis lessons, clinics and leagues: 6%
Youth/teen fitness and wellness programs: 5%
Martial arts programs: 4%
Adult swim programs: 4%
Gymnastics and tumbling programs: 4%
Programs for people with disabilities: 3%
Youth/teen art, dance, performing arts: 3%
At-risk programs for youth: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
## Q12. Recreation Programs That Are Most Important to Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Participate Most Often At City of Columbia Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special events/festivals</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Learn to Swim programs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/teen sports programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature education programs/Outdoor adventure</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Life skills programs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school programs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf lessons</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities exist to increase market share in a number of programs of importance.

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q15. Level of Support for Various Actions the City of Columbia Parks and Recreation Commission Could Take to Improve the Parks and Recreation System

by percentage of respondents

- Fix-up/repair park facilities/shelters/playgrounds: 66% Very Supportive, 26% Somewhat Supportive, 6% Not Supportive
- Upgrade/improve pools/sports fields/golf courses: 55% Very Supportive, 28% Somewhat Supportive, 12% Not Supportive
- Acquire land for developing neighborhood parks: 47% Very Supportive, 28% Somewhat Supportive, 13% Not Supportive
- Acquire land for preservation & walk/hike trails: 49% Very Supportive, 25% Somewhat Supportive, 12% Not Supportive
- Acquire land to preserve open space & environment: 48% Very Supportive, 24% Somewhat Supportive, 15% Not Supportive
- Develop & connect hard surface walk/bike trails: 43% Very Supportive, 26% Somewhat Supportive, 18% Not Supportive
- Acquire land/develop athletic fields/rec fac: 32% Very Supportive, 35% Somewhat Supportive, 19% Not Supportive
- Develop nature/education trails: 31% Very Supportive, 32% Somewhat Supportive, 22% Not Supportive
- Develop a permanent indoor ice-skating facility: 33% Very Supportive, 23% Somewhat Supportive, 22% Not Supportive
- Begin developing 320 acre Gans Creek Rec Area: 29% Very Supportive, 26% Somewhat Supportive, 32% Not Supportive
- Develop indoor recreation center: 26% Very Supportive, 24% Somewhat Supportive, 27% Not Supportive
- Develop youth and adult athletic fields: 21% Very Supportive, 29% Somewhat Supportive, 34% Not Supportive
- Develop indoor multi-sports center: 25% Very Supportive, 25% Somewhat Supportive, 28% Not Supportive
- Develop outdoor swimming pool/aquatic facility: 25% Very Supportive, 25% Somewhat Supportive, 32% Not Supportive
- Develop an outdoor ice-skating facility: 25% Very Supportive, 25% Somewhat Supportive, 24% Not Supportive
- Develop off-leash dog parks: 18% Very Supportive, 21% Somewhat Supportive, 30% Not Supportive
- Develop equestrian trails: 10% Very Supportive, 14% Somewhat Supportive, 35% Not Supportive
- Acquire and develop a new golf course: 12% Very Supportive, 12% Somewhat Supportive, 27% Not Supportive

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q16. Actions Respondents Would Be Most Willing to Fund with Their Columbia Parks and Recreation Tax Dollars

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Most Willing</th>
<th>2nd Most Willing</th>
<th>3rd Most Willing</th>
<th>4th Most Willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fix-up/repair park facilities/shelters/playgrounds</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/improve pools/sports fields/golf courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for preservation &amp; walk/hike trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land to preserve open space &amp; environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for developing neighborhood parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a permanent indoor ice-skating facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; connect hard surface walk/bike trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin developing 320 acre Gans Creek Rec Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop indoor recreation center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop nature/education trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop indoor multi-sports center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an outdoor ice-skating facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outdoor swimming pool/aquatic facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop youth and adult athletic fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land/develop athletic fields/rec fac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop off-leash dog parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire and develop a new golf course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop equestrian trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)
Q21. Allocation of $100 of the Park Sales Tax

by percentage of respondents

- Maintaining condition of existing parks, trails and facilities: $45
- Acquiring, protecting and preserving parks, green space and stream corridors: $21
- New park/facility development: $17
- Trails - new construction, improvements, acquisition, and connections: $17

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (May 2010)